

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, July 28, 1977

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

ABALONE FISHING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Minister of Fisheries about abalone fishing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It was reported recently in the press that considerable concern was being expressed in Victoria and New South Wales at the pirate operations of unlicensed abalone fishermen in those States. It is reported that the fishermen are illegally taking fish in huge quantities in Queensland and that many abalone grounds are, because of the follow-up operations, completely fished out. Is the Minister aware of the extent of the illegal abalone fishing taking place in South Australia waters? Is it a fact that fish taken illegally in South Australia are sold regularly on the Melbourne market? Has the Minister received any information from concerned people, particularly in this State, as to who is involved in the illegal fishing for abalone? Does the Minister intend issuing any further licences for taking abalone in South Australia; if so, what method does he intend to adopt?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Naturally, we are aware that there is some poaching of abalone stocks in South Australia and we are doing everything we possibly can to prevent this. I think we have been reasonably successful and have caught a number of poachers who have been taking abalone illegally. We have successfully launched prosecutions against those involved. Although we realise that this will always be a problem, the steps taken by my department in enforcing the regulations have been adequate. Also, I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that amendments to the Fisheries Act which were passed last year make prosecutions easier. "Take" has been redefined, so that it is easier to obtain proof against people who have been poaching abalone without a licence.

Regarding the final part of the honourable member's question concerning the issuing of new permits to dive for abalone, I do not intend to issue any such new permits at this stage. I make clear the distinction between new permits and permits that should, for any reason whatsoever, lapse. Should any abalone divers withdraw from the industry, the permits involved will be renewed. However, I do not intend at present to issue any new licences. We have had considerable discussions with the Abalone Divers Association, and are in the process of carrying out an extensive research programme to obtain a more detailed assessment of abalone stocks, and any decisions regarding

new permits will be taken on the results of that research. Numbers will also be determined as a result of that research work.

COMMITTEE FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, regarding the so-called Committee for Good Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Mr. President, I rise on this matter. Yesterday I said that I intended to take up this matter with you.

The PRESIDENT: Order! What is the honourable member's point of order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The manner in which the Hon. Mr. Hill dealt with your "direction". He was somewhat flippant when he said "so-called". It is either a subject matter or it is not: it is not a "so-called" subject matter.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Does the honourable member know the name of the committee?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The subject is the so-called Committee for Good Government.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: It's not the "so-called" committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is "so-called", because that is what the committee calls itself. However, it is not good government at all: it is a Labor Party front.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Is he not getting too political, Mr. President, following your remarks yesterday?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I hasten to say that this is causing much amusement among the South Australian community, and that the Government is losing many votes on the matter.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Hill is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The subject matter of the honourable member's question is this committee, and I ask the Hon. Mr. Hill whether he will direct his remarks, which the Council has given him leave to make, to that subject only.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I bow to your ruling without question, Sir.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: This is ridiculous.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Committee for Good Government, which is responsible for these radio announcements, is, I have been told (I have not heard any of the announcements myself), a group that claims political independence and that it is not associated with, or supported in any way, by any political Party. My question is: have any officers of the Premier's Department or the Premier's staff been in contact with any members of the so-called Committee for Good Government to assist the committee with its planning or financing of these advertisements?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not think that this is really a matter for the Government. The committee is some body that recognises the worth of the State Government. It wants to continue to combat the propaganda put out by the Opposition. I understand that this committee considers that there is an extremely good Government in South Australia. Nevertheless, I will take

the matter up with the Premier. If I were the Premier, I would tell the honourable member what to do about the matter.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You will answer the question.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have already told the honourable member what I will do.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is taxpayers' money.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is not taxpayers' money if these people are working outside and are independent. They do have private time, and they are using that private time and can do what they like.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In view of the Minister's attitude, I ask him, as the Minister representing the Premier, whether Mr. Kevin Crease travelled to Sydney at public expense when he was a member of the Premier's staff and arranged for the promotion of the Premier's cookery book in Sydney at that time. You answer that, if you want to go on like that.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Foster.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No-one is going to respond to that rubbish, surely.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are too frightened to respond.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have called on the Hon. Mr. Foster.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Cancel your telexes.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am waiting for you to call them to order.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Cameron will refrain from interjecting.

QUESTION PROCEDURE

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yesterday, after you had taken the Chair and informed the House of certain changes to the rules applying in the House, I raised some matters with you and asked whether the Chair (you yourself) would consider having a circular notice, as it were, placed on members' desks in the normal way by those responsible for carrying out the functions of this Council. I did that because I thought it would afford members the opportunity to follow from such notices what you were reading. If they could, that would tend to make what you were reading less confusing to members. Often the acoustics in this place (and I include noise made by me) are not always all that they could be, and not all that is said by the Chair is heard. I think that the time to raise with you matters of procedure is soon after you have made statements in this Council. The procedure applies, I understand, in almost every Parliament in the English-speaking nations. Therefore, as yesterday you said that you would consider this matter, I ask whether you have done so and whether you can tell us whether you will carry out such a procedure in future.

The PRESIDENT: I can inform the honourable member that, if any major changes were involved, I would do what he has suggested. I think that, if he looks carefully at what I said (and I suppose he has now read that), he will see that I made one minor and insignificant change from a procedural point of view. I also point out to the honourable member that he can hardly be expected to understand what I am saying if he is not present in the Chamber when I am reading a statement.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I was present. I rise on a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member was not present then.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I was not present when you started, but most certainly I heard the statement from

the third line down. It is wrong for the Chair to imply that I was not in the Chamber when I damn well was. It is quite dishonest and, whatever you may say, I was in the Chamber. The imputation you make as President of this place, that I was absent during the whole of that discussion yesterday, is false and almost malicious. I will not cop it. Why should I?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise again to ensure that it is recorded in *Hansard* that I was in this building, and that the utterance of yourself as President is irresponsible.

The PRESIDENT: I am perfectly aware that the honourable member was not present when I started to read my statement.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I was present; if I was not here, how is it that I was able—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I warn the honourable member that I will name him if he argues with the Chair. I warn the honourable member for the first time.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, on the subject of the State Government being subject to consumer protection legislation. Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: On the first day of the latter part of the last session of Parliament I asked a question on this matter, pointing out that the then Federal Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs, Mr. Howard, had said in reply to a question from a South Australian member that he would make the Federal Government, when it entered into business and commercial enterprises, subject to the Federal Trade Practices Act. My question was whether the State Government would make the Government subject to the Trade Practices Act and State consumer protection legislation. I did not receive a reply to that question and I asked the same question on April 14 and again on April 26. Subsequently, I received a letter from the Minister saying that the State Government Insurance Commission would abide by consumer protection measures. True, when Mr. Grant Chapman asked the question initially in Federal Parliament the example he gave concerned insurance, but my question was general, as Mr. Howard's reply was general. My question was whether the State Government would in all instances make the Government, when it entered into commercial enterprises, subject to consumer protection legislation in the same way as private enterprise is subject to such laws. Will the Minister please answer the original question?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

THIS WEEK IN ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport and it is as follows: first, did the Minister see a report in this morning's *Advertiser* of a statement attributed to Mr. Millhouse, M.P., in another place, that the South Australian Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department was co-operating in the publication of the magazine *This Week in Adelaide*, which advertised facilities for what Mr. Millhouse described as escort agencies and, secondly

if he did see that report, will the Minister outline to the Council what co-operation, if any, the department provides for this publication?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I was rather concerned when I read the report concerning Mr. Millhouse, M.P. in another place, implying, as I saw it, that we, that is, the Government Tourist Bureau, was responsible in some way for the advertising appearing in a brochure entitled *This Week in Adelaide* publicising escort agencies which Mr. Millhouse went on to say were a disguise for prostitution. *This Week in Adelaide* is published by Peter Isaacson Publications.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Private enterprise!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That firm does the same kind of thing for every capital city in Australia. The only information that the Tourist Bureau provides is a booklet entitled *What is on in Adelaide*. The edition of that booklet for the period July 25 to August 8 lists what is happening in the theatres, the music field, the Festival Centre, the Adelaide Town Hall, sporting activities, art exhibitions, free film shows, festivals, markets, art galleries, and museums. We make available to the publishing firm photographs of Adelaide buildings and scenery; for example, in this week's edition there is a photograph of Ayers House. That is the only way in which we co-operate with this publishing firm.

QUESTION PROCEDURE

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Mr. President, regarding your accusation that I was not in this Chamber yesterday afternoon when you were addressing this Council, I wish to inform you that I entered this Chamber as you called for petitions. *Hansard* records that, after you had spoken for but a few seconds, I interjected:

Are we allowed to get political?

Nine or 10 seconds after that, I interjected:

You are not going to allow that, surely?

My interjection followed your having told the Council that Ministers should expect that some questions from Opposition members would have a political slant to them. During yesterday's sitting, prior to the business of the day being called on, you and I were engaged in questions and answers in accordance with the procedures of this Council. I therefore suggest that, with due respect to your office, your statement that I was not in the Council while you were addressing it in connection with changed procedures is false; otherwise you must regard yesterday's *Hansard* as irresponsible and incorrect.

The PRESIDENT: I did not say, and I did not mean to suggest, that the honourable member was absent during the whole of the time I was making my statement, but I have a distinct recollection that the honourable member was not here when I started to make my statement.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I came in when you called for petitions.

The PRESIDENT: I have a different recollection from the honourable member on that.

MOUNT GAMBIER INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I desire to ask the Minister of Forests questions about the Government's recent acquisition of an interest in a timber and hardware supply enterprise established at Mount Gambier. First, how much of the taxpayers' money is involved in the Government's

acquisition plans? Secondly, why was it considered necessary for the Government to make such a purchase? Thirdly, has the Government any further plans to buy into private enterprise operations anywhere, thereby expanding the Government's socialist policies in this State?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I have explained the reasons adequately several times, particularly during a debate last season on the Forestry Act Amendment Bill. I said that we were concerned about the large increase in retail margins in the timber industry. The indisputable fact that we have learnt from our own research is that the margin on pine timber in South Australia was considerably higher than in Victoria, and the comparative figures between Adelaide and Melbourne mentioned particularly in that debate showed that, whereas five years ago in the comparison between pine and oregon in Adelaide, pine was cheaper, the situation has now been reversed, in spite of the fact that it has not changed in Melbourne. It was clearly identified as an increase in the retail margin from about 42 per cent to about 80 per cent. That figure speaks for itself but there was a need to become involved in the merchandising side of the pine produced by the Woods and Forests Department. I am not sure why the honourable member thinks that the private timber merchants are so frightened of this competition, because there is already a major timber supplier in the South-East owned by another large producer of timber and we are merely competing in the market place as other producers are.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: On similar terms?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yes. The other point the honourable member raised was, what did this cost the taxpayer? If he had followed the history of the Woods and Forests Department over a considerable period of years, he would have realised that it has not cost the taxpayer anything. In fact, the Woods and Forests Department has made considerable payments to the consolidated revenue of this State. So the operation has been extremely successful and profitable and I have no doubt whatever about the capabilities of this department in running this operation successfully.

DARTMOUTH DAM

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I ask a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, and it is self-explanatory. Can the Minister tell me what is the present stage of construction of the Dartmouth dam? Is it ahead of or behind schedule, and when is it expected that the dam will be finished? Following from that, when is it expected that the dam will be full?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

ABALONE FISHING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As a supplementary question to the one I asked the Minister about alalone fishing, can he reply to one part of that question that he has overlooked: has he received any information from concerned people in this State as to who is involved in the illegal fishing for abalone and its sale?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I have not that information but whether it has been supplied to people within my department I shall have to check to make sure. I will find out whether that information has been supplied to people in my department; it has not been supplied to me.

CLASSIFICATION OF ADVERTISEMENTS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I understand the Minister of Health has a reply to a question I asked recently about the Classification of Publications Act.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Cabinet has already approved of an amendment to the Classification of Publications Act to eliminate the need to publish lists in the *Advertiser*, and this amendment will be included with others, suggested by the Classification of Publications Board, in an amending Bill later this session. The separate cost of advertisements in the *Advertiser* for this purpose is not kept.

POLICE TELEX

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary about the *Advertiser's* report of the police telex incident.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No doubt, if one read the report in the paper—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections. Interjections from members on both sides of the Council are out of order. There are so many of them that, unfortunately, I cannot warn every member.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will quote the last part of the report in the *Advertiser*, where the Premier is reported as saying:

When I was informed I said it was quite inappropriate for a message to be sent through the police telex machine and that it was not to happen again.

My questions to the Chief Secretary, as Leader of the Council, are: who drafted the telex message in the first place? What instructions were given in relation to its transmission, and is it the usual practice in the Premier's Department for messages of a purely political nature to be sent to Australian Labor Party candidates by police telex at public expense?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I not only read the report but saw Mr. Tonkin on the air last night and I thought he just did not go too well at all.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Your Premier refused to go on air with him.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He did not go too well.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Minister has been asked a series of questions which I think he can answer.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am attempting to answer them. I agree with the people who rang up the television station and said he did not go too well. I also remember reading *Hansard* when the Minister of Works indicated that it was significant that the cost of the telephone bill from Parliament House rose significantly at the time of the preselection of the Liberal candidates. However, I will refer the Leader's questions to my colleague.

CLASSIFICATION OF ADVERTISEMENTS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General, on the matter of classification of advertisements.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My question is supplementary to the reply I have been given. I had asked the cost of advertisements in the *Advertiser* for the last 12 months setting out the classifications under the Classification of Publications Act.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster is out of order in talking to the Hon. Mr. Cameron across the Chamber—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I was talking to the Hon. Mr. Whyte.

The PRESIDENT: —while the Hon. Mr. Burdett is on his feet, and he knows that.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The answer given was that the separate cost of advertisements in the *Advertiser* for this purpose is not kept. There are not many such advertisements; in a period of 12 months there would not be many setting out classifications under the Classification of Publications Act. I cannot find it credible that it is not easily possible to ascertain the cost. The Government pays the bill; there are not many such advertisements. The Government must be able to find out the cost. Will the Minister again ask his colleague in another place whether he will ascertain the total cost of such advertisements appearing in the public press during the 12 months to the end of June, 1977?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague has indicated that a separate account is not kept in this regard. If the honourable member knows how many advertisements there were and their size, perhaps he could indicate the cost.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Oh, come off it!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: What does the honourable member do in his spare time? Perhaps he thinks this is the way in which public money ought to be spent.

CONVENTIONS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in the Council, a question regarding conventions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There have over many years been a number of accepted conventions that have been faithfully followed by all members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown. One of those conventions is that, when a Minister visits the district of a member of the House of Assembly, that member is always recognised by the Minister. Also, the member for the district has always been informed of any announcements to be made regarding his district. However, it has come to my notice recently that in Mount Gambier a number of announcements are being issued through the Australian Labor Party's endorsed candidate for the district, who has no association with Parliament whatsoever. I ask the Chief Secretary to raise this matter with the Cabinet to see whether we can return to the convention that has always been observed in that regard—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You should talk about conventions!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: —and return some sort of morality to the representation of members of Parliament in their respective districts.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Leader has a much shorter memory than that for which I gave him credit. I recall many occasions during the term of office

of the former Liberal Government when this so-called convention was not honoured.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: When?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Yes, give us some examples.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Oh, for goodness sake pull your head in, Murray.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Hill is out of order. If he wants to ask a supplementary question, the honourable member can do so.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: We sure will.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course you sure will, and I sure will tell you, without naming specific dates, that it happened between 1968 and 1970.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: We'll certainly ask questions.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member can ask what he likes. As I said previously, I did not realise that the Leader had such a short memory. As I understand it, there has been no real convention regarding this matter, although there have been occasions, when the Liberal Government was in office, when it paid some A.L.P. members this courtesy. I remember on one occasion, when the Hon. Mr. Casey as member for the district was in Leigh Creek, that he had received no indication that the then Premier was visiting that area. I do not know of any hard and fast conventions that have been followed in this respect. I will draw the honourable member's question to the Government's attention, although I assure him that this was not an accepted convention.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It was.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: On odd occasions when the Party to which members opposite belong was in Government, A.L.P. members were paid this courtesy when it suited the then Government, just the same as the convention along these lines continues today.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Will the Minister of Health ask the Premier to ascertain whether there is any convention that prevents an A.L.P. endorsed candidate or sub-branch taking up any matter that concerns the district involved and publishing any replies received from Ministers as emanating from the sub-branch or the endorsed candidate? Is there anything at all improper in that procedure?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think the Premier follows the same practice that I follow. Any inquiry that is made by a member, a sub-branch, or a Liberal Party or A.L.P. member is always answered. This will continue to happen, irrespective of the source of the inquiry. I understand that there is no convention, one way or the other, regarding this matter. However, I will take up the matter for the honourable member.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Council, regarding the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Mr. Blevins.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I hope that, in view of the question he asked, the Leader of the Opposition, who seems to be otherwise engaged at the moment, takes heed of what I am saying. Being one who holds a seat that was wrenched from the Liberal Party, I can tell the Leader that, if he would like to visit my office one day, I will tell him—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member cannot say what happened in his office.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If you'll be patient, I will come to the question.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not be patient when this sort of thing occurs. I ask the honourable member to ask his question now.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Very well. To which Liberal member will information be given? Is it to be given to the endorsed Liberal Party candidate, or is it to be given to the member of Parliament who is actually already occupying a seat in Parliament? I refer to the extraordinary situation that arises in another place, for example, in relation to Messrs. Wotton and Wardle. To which of those members will the Premier direct information? I also ask whether such information will be directed to Mr. Vandeeper or Mr. Nankivell, or to Mr. Connelly or Mr. Venning. I suggest to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, through the Minister, that—

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Question!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The question has been asked. I suggest that the Minister direct the Leader, who has not in recent weeks kept track of who represents what and who intends to contest which seat in another place.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This certainly is a most difficult matter that the Government will have to consider. Recently we had a direction from the Chair that questions should be referred to an acting shadow Minister, and that acting shadow Minister is no longer a preselected candidate for the coming election. It will be difficult, but we will consider this matter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.
Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My personal explanation concerns the important subject, with which I dealt in the Address in Reply debate on Tuesday, July 26, of Government policy regarding ethnic minority groups. I refer particularly to the following part of the *Hansard* report:

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Do you favour such separation, compared to the former assimilation approach?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Of course.

A substantial part of the interchange that followed between the Hon. Mr. Hill and me relates to that interjection. At the time the interjection was made, other honourable members started interjecting, and I did not hear the precise words of the interjection. I thought that it was something to the effect, "Do you favour this sort of policy compared to the former assimilation approach?" However, *Hansard* recorded the word "separation", and the Hon. Mr. Hill assures me that he used that word in his interjection. I accept this unreservedly. I believe that the Hon. Mr. Hill accepts, in the same way, that I did not hear that word. Although I believe that the context of the whole speech adequately explains my position (I refer particularly to my response to a further interjection by the Hon. Mr. Hill, namely, "Do you favour a 'them and us' concept?") the use of the word "separation", if taken out of context, gives an entirely erroneous impression of the thrust of my argument. In fact, it gives a completely contrary impression and has connotations that I completely repudiate. I restate in brief my argument that, whether from an Anglo-Saxon background or not, we are all Australians, with equal political and social rights, and we are all

entitled to equal consideration. The proposals outlined by me imply the creation of a unique Australian society based on mutual respect for the languages, cultures and lifestyles of the different groups that now comprise the Australian nation, and it is a policy not of separating one group from another but of interaction between them, to the benefit of all Australians.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 27. Page 220.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Before the adjournment last evening, I was speaking of the alternative fuel resources that would be available to the Electricity Trust of South Australia after 1985, by which time a decision will have to be made about future power generation in the State. I told the Council of my opinion of the merits of using black coal from New South Wales or Queensland. I pointed out that some of the major problems that will face society in the years to come (regrettably, I consider that they have not been faced correctly previously) are the health of the miner who mines the coal and of persons directly handling coal and what kinds of restriction may be imposed in the industry in 10 or 15 years time.

We in South Australia remember the blackouts and power rationing that occurred when this State depended on New South Wales, soon after the Second World War, for coal supplies. Disputes arose in New South Wales about industrial grievances and we in this State had no control over those disputes. We could do little about them, but they caused serious dislocation of the lifestyle and of industry in the State. Therefore, the economic factors, plus the dependence on coal supply from another State, could well preclude consideration of New South Wales regarding electricity planning by those who make the decisions.

This leaves the planners with one alternative, namely, nuclear power. Many experts predict that nuclear power is only a stopgap until the alternative forms of energy are more efficient and more economical. They refer to solar power, wind power, and tidal power as being the non-pollutant energy sources that will provide the energy needs into the next century. Many millions of dollars are being spent in exploring this interesting matter and, regrettably, both rich and poor countries overseas have far more recognition of the need for research at industry and scientific level than Australia, including South Australia, has.

Experts suggest that it would be up to 20 to 30 years before we could do this, and the Electricity Trust cannot wait until then to secure energy sources for South Australia. Therefore, the Electricity Trust, in its report for the year ended June 30, stated that, before solar or wind power alternatives became available, it would have to consider another alternative. As I have suggested, this could be nuclear power. Sales of electricity by the trust in the past 10 years have increased at an average rate of 5.8 per cent per annum. The increase will make necessary the building of the next power station, because, as the trust states, there will be basic power output from the use of conventional fuel until the end of this century. I suggest that, by planning now to conserve electrical energy in houses and in industry, and by our social behaviour, we may well be able to defer the establishment of a nuclear power station for several years. I now present to the Council

an argument for the conservation of energy. The remarks that I will make are not original: I was fortunate enough to see the conservation programme being undertaken in Canada regarding energy.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Mr. President, I draw attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The programme in Canada was initiated in 1974. The Canadian conservation programme provides for a 3.5 per cent increase in energy usage per annum, as against the current 10-year average increase of 5.5 per cent per annum, similar to the average increase of 5.8 per cent in sales by the trust here. Canada, which has a far more difficult climate than we have, is planning to increase the amount of electrical energy used by 2 per cent, and this type of planning could well be adopted in South Australia. In Canada, there are new building codes and guidelines for the design, construction and operation of energy-efficient buildings of all sizes.

Canada is examining the amount of heat that the walls of high-rise buildings receive from the sun and considering heat pumps so that the heat from those walls can be used. It is considering the sites of domestic houses so that, instead of the maximum rays of the sun penetrating the walls as happens in Australia, the maximum penetration of heat from the sun in winter time will warm the house. In that way, the cost of domestic houses is reduced. Financial assistance is given for the purchase of insulation materials for existing houses. It also has been made mandatory to insulate all new houses adequately.

If the ceiling of every house in South Australia were insulated, there would be a reduction of 30 per cent in the cost of heating or cooling a house. Furthermore, if the walls were insulated, there would be a reduction of 60 per cent in the amount of electrical energy needed. Government members may be interested to note that the Liberal Party a few weeks ago announced that this would be part of its policy. Another matter that has been adopted in Canada is the appliance efficiency standard, by which minimum energy efficiency standards have been established for major home appliances and office equipment. The industry is expected to apply the standards in a voluntary capacity. The standards will be enforced only if an industry continues to sell inefficient equipment.

This has been planned for the type of manufacturer who manufactures refrigerators with doors that are not sealed or that are not sealed correctly, because energy loss can result from such doors. This applies to the type of automatic defrost refrigerator that we have in South Australia that uses more energy in defrosting than the amount required to operate a conventional refrigerator for 24 hours. These items are on sale in Adelaide, but we do not know about the amount of energy they consume. This leads me to another energy conservation programme, a home appliance labelling programme that seeks to identify clearly the approximate energy consumption and the associated costs with the use of major household appliances, for example, the electric iron, the electric radiator, fans for cooling a house and similar equipment. The objective of this measure is to inform consumers of energy consumption, cost of operation and the benefits of purchasing a more efficient model.

I now refer to the industrial aspect and the problem of conserving electricity through the industrial assistance programme, which is described in Canada as a type of energy audit. Experts are sent around to manufacturing industry to advise it on whether it is using correctly the heat that

is supplied in the factory or plant and to ensure that it is not under-using it.

I refer to an instance in South Australia involving a food-processing industry, which boils water to obtain steam and passes that steam through pipes to various cooking outlets used in the food-processing factory. The steam is then cooled, and the water used in the cooking process to make tomato sauce. What an enormous energy waste occurs in that process. Apparently it is sensible for the industry to operate like that but, certainly, it is not economic from an energy conservation viewpoint. Finally, in regard to Canada, an instruction was given that in the 1976-77 financial year all Government departments should reduce their energy consumption by 10 per cent, and that percentage is to be held at that level for the next 10 years.

In this regard I have had the opportunity of seeing a 16-storey building in which the lights had been left on throughout, in a manner not uncommon in the streets of Adelaide every night, for the whole 12 hours of darkness. However, by merely inserting time switches, every light except emergency lighting was turned off at a prescribed time at night, and the saving in energy consumption in relation to that one building was amazing. Unfortunately, I do not have those figures to give the Council.

It is interesting to note that most of the programmes initiated by the Canadian Government are planned for voluntary acceptance by Canadian citizens. This is done by a massive advertising programme in the press, as well as by the issuing of free pamphlets on related subjects to whoever requires them. They are delivered to people's letter boxes or provided on demand. I emphasise that everyone of these plans that I have outlined could be applied here in South Australia.

South Australia has the added advantage of solar power to provide adequate hot water for the average house for about 85 per cent of the year. I now refer to ETSA domestic electricity charges (J tariff) for heating hot water. The cost of supplying hot water to an average residential house is between \$58 and \$77 a year. The J tariff consumption of electrical energy in the last financial year amounted to 27.99 per cent of the total energy provided by ETSA.

The revenue from the night heating of water in the last financial year for residential purposes was \$8 350 000. Much of that money and energy could have been conserved. Further, figures have been given indicating that 26 per cent of the domestic energy budget in the private house goes to pay for the heating and cooling of that house.

Whilst travelling in the United States I visited the small city of Gainesville, Florida, and visited the Florida University's Engineering Department and met the remarkable Dr. Farber, who has established a research unit in that faculty with a budget of a mere \$150 000. This sum is provided by the State, with no Federal funds whatever. Under this programme it has been proved that solar heat can provide the most comprehensive range of requirements for the normal needs of the house.

The solar unit that I saw in operation in the house owned by the university in a normal suburban environment included air-conditioning. That system used water at temperatures no greater than 140°F. The heated water was mixed with ammonia and water solution, and they were producing three tonnes of cold air a day at 55°. That is an extremely cold temperature to hold, and it is much more efficient than most electrical appliances, which normally operate at between 60 and 65°.

The cost of energy to operate that system was nil, because it was solar powered. Also, I saw clothes-drying apparatus, which used a conventional cabinet without the gas or electricity elements. Solar-heated water circulated through the cabinet to dry clothes with the same efficiency as that obtained in a conventional drier. Again, the saving in energy by not using fossil fuels was great. No American house would be complete without space heating, but in the house I saw all the heating of the three bedrooms and associated rooms was provided by solar energy.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: What about the Canadian winter?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Canada is doing much research but my previous remarks concerned the situation in Florida. Canada is more concerned with conserving heat through insulation and preventing it from running away. Interestingly, more heat is lost in a conventional Canadian house through the cellar, or basement, as they call it, than is lost through the roof. Canadians must be careful to provide insulation around the base and the foundations of their houses to ensure that there is not a heat loss into the ground.

Whilst I have been away, much reference has been made to the great uranium debate. Mr. Justice Fox in his two reports suggested that the Australian people should debate what is to happen with uranium resources in Australia. The Federal Australian Labor Party conference in Perth, as I interpreted press reports, has advocated that the uranium debate should also continue. Therefore, at this stage I am surprised at the lack of initiative shown by Government members in this regard, because surely this is the forum in which to debate the pros and cons of uranium—whether we should mine and sell it, or whether there is a need for uranium in the world. Surely this debate should take place within the walls of this Parliament, especially as South Australia has such a wonderful opportunity to be involved in the establishment of an enrichment plant.

The fact that we have uranium mines and vast resources of uranium is important. On *This Day Tonight* earlier this week, the Minister of Mines and Energy said that our resources in the Far North near Roxby Downs could be another Mount Isa, but that a Roxby Downs set-up will not proceed unless the green light is given to the sale of uranium. I wish to enter into the debate on the premise that, if we as a nation withhold our uranium, there could be much suffering in Europe, where millions of people are dependent upon nuclear power.

We have had two references in this debate to human rights, one by the Hon. Mr. Sumner and another by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. However, the human rights of people in Europe will be denied if there is not an adequate supply of uranium for their needs. The British Coal Board is currently developing a mine in Queensland for the purpose of exporting coal to Great Britain, Holland, Belgium, West Germany, and France, because the coal produced from that mine is top-grade coking coal, which is unavailable in Europe nowadays.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Are we getting a good enough price for it?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I cannot debate the question of the price that will be received, because that matter is very complex. The Chairman of the British Coal Board is in Australia at present debating this point. The owners of the mine are the British Coal Board and three private enterprise companies. If South Australia fails to establish a uranium enrichment plant, the odds are that the Premier

of Queensland, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, will eagerly take the initiative. The State that takes the initiative will become far richer.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Is it a good idea for the British Coal Board to go into partnership with private enterprise?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I met with the Coal Board in London; the Coal Board officials thought I was there to negotiate the contract. As a result, I was told far more than possibly I should have been told; they told me the whole story. Because South Australia has huge uranium resources and because it has common borders with Western Australia and Queensland, its geographic location makes it ideal for the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant. The Government went to great pains to prepare an excellent feasibility report 18 months ago. A complex of the Mount Isa type will not be possible at Roxby Downs if approval for the sale of uranium is not given. At Roxby Downs, the mining company cannot mine the copper without mining the uranium; the company must process both. The price of uranium is very high, particularly the price of enriched uranium.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You should measure the price in other than monetary terms. It is the price of life.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The price of uranium is high because of supply and demand pressures. There are very few minerals in the world whose price is not fixed on a supply and demand basis. There are 157 nuclear reactors already operating and providing power for the citizens of 19 countries. The Governments of those countries decided to establish nuclear reactors because they had no alternative economic fuel to use.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You are quite wrong.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Why is it that for the next five years Italy will need nuclear power to provide 90 per cent of its electrical energy? The answer is, first, that the Government made a decision along these lines; secondly, Italy has very limited natural resources; and, thirdly, the oil producing countries increased the price of oil to such an extent that it became uneconomic to use furnace oil for certain purposes. France is using so much nuclear power because that country is deficient in natural resources. Why are West Germany and Belgium doing the same thing? It is estimated that in the period 1976-85 between 500 000 tonnes and 590 000 tonnes of uranium will be needed by countries with this type of power generation. It is only natural that these countries will need to have forward orders, not a month-by-month supply of uranium or U235. They will need supplies that are guaranteed years in advance.

Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris related the dilemma that Lucas Heights will face once its uranium stockpile is depleted. The Governments of the countries to which I have referred had no alternative when they made their decisions. There are 157 nuclear reactors operating now, and by 1985 there will be 448 nuclear power plants completed or in the course of completion in 32 countries. The Governments of those countries will decide, or have decided, that they cannot be hamstrung in connection with future fuel supplies. If the cost of uranium becomes so exorbitant, those Governments will spend more money on the development of the next stage of nuclear power generation—the plutonium breeder. The plutonium breeder is a far worse and more dangerous regeneration unit than is the conventional nuclear reactor. The oldest nuclear reactor is 21 years old and is in Great Britain; it is the oldest in the world and is still operating

with the same efficiency of 85 per cent, which no coal- or gas-fired generator can do; it is still operating as efficiently as it did in the days of its running-in trials 20 years ago. Because the plutonium reactor makes use of the atoms or neutrons from within plutonium, the atomic or neutron action that takes place within the fast breeder reactor is far quicker and more active than it is in a nuclear reactor.

So, if one of those units should get out of control, there is no way of stopping it, whereas the conventional reactor can be stopped within a matter of minutes. The effect of the nuclear rods can be nullified within a matter of minutes but it would take a fortnight for the inside to cool down sufficiently for work to be continued, but there is no way as yet, I am told, to stop the fantastic neutron and atomic movement within a plutonium or fast breeder reactor. So, should one of these catch fire, should there be some problem within the neutron-fired area, the fall-out, once it had consumed itself in smoke, would be difficult to control in the surrounding districts; the pollution of the atmosphere is something we cannot predict but it would not be at all agreeable. The reference I am making in my humble submissions to the uranium debate is this: if there is a shortage of uranium and, because of that shortage, costs rise and the nations that depend on this type of generation for their power needs move into the next stage, those people who are concerned about pollution, about their children's future, and about the mutations of their genes will possibly have more to fear from this type of sophisticated reactor than from the problems we have now. Scientists can grapple with nuclear waste from the conventional reactor.

As I said earlier, the Hon. Mr. Sumner referred to human rights in his speech, as did the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. The Hon. Mr. Sumner referred to the immigrant sections of the population and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the injustices done to his Northern Territorians. If we are not careful, there will be a degree of negligence in these things (the human rights and dignity of man and of people in Europe, particularly those in Europe who depend on nuclear power), if this nation does not make up its mind on the processing and sale of uranium in the foreseeable future.

Finally, I direct one question to the Government and I would appreciate an answer to it at the conclusion of this debate. Ever since Parliament resumed, and possibly before that, there has been increasing conjecture that the State may face an early election. Political writers, political watchdogs and interested by-standers all read the signs as indicating a strong probability that the Government will terminate its office as soon as possible. It is clear that the Government would not announce an election before August 24, when the Federal Budget will be announced. That should need no explanation. However, the speculation does raise an interesting point: has any Government the constitutional right to call for an election before its time has expired on purely Party political considerations? The Government's thinking on an early election is based on the fact that the next Federal Budget, of necessity, will be a relatively tough Budget. If it is not a relatively tough Budget, there is little chance of containing inflation, reducing taxation, or overcoming the unemployment problems currently facing Australia. If the Government decides to go to the polls earlier than the constitutional time—

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Is this the State or the Federal Government you are speaking of?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I am referring to the State Government.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: This would apply equally to the Federal Government; have you addressed the same remarks to Mr. Fraser?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If the Government decides to go to the polls earlier than the constitutional time, it will be an attempt by the Government to cash in on what it believes will be a politically desirable climate following the Federal Budget. I believe that the general strategy to reduce inflation, interest rates, and finally unemployment will be seen to be effective by the last quarter of the financial year 1977-78. It must be the thinking of the Government, if it is contemplating an early election, to capitalise on the period immediately following the Federal Budget. I raise the question whether any State Government is able to go to the polls before the end of its constitutional term without a constitutional reason for so doing.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The constitutional term is the maximum term.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I support the motion.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I support the motion and express my appreciation of the services of those former members of Parliament whose deaths were mentioned by the Lieutenant-Governor when he was opening this session of Parliament. I join with other honourable members in extending my sympathy to their families. I also commend His Excellency for the manner in which he performed the opening ceremony and I also compliment him on the way in which he has fulfilled his task as Lieutenant-Governor of this State. The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech reminds me somewhat of the end of an era, because I believe it will be the last Speech prepared by the Labor Government for many years to come.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Are you willing to put any money on that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government has held office since 1970 and, to my mind, it has reached a stage where it has run down in many ways, and the problems concerning the people of this State at present are such that they need urgent attention; they are problems about which one hears so much when one mixes with the people at large. There has certainly been a run down in the work that the Government has done in Parliament. I remember quite clearly—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You used to complain it did too much.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I never complained about that; the honourable member is wrong in making that accusation or suggestion. I remember clearly back in 1970 when the present Government came to power it was full of zest and enthusiasm and it told Parliament it was going to work it almost to death. It produced programmes and occupied much time here in Parliament on its work. It is interesting to see that the first Parliament of this present Government in 1970-73 extended over a period of 198 sitting days. That first session, from July 14, 1970, to April 8, 1971, occupied 72 sitting days. However, the programme for this session, which was opened by His Excellency last week, involves only 42 sitting days. It is, as I read the records, the shortest session of the whole seven years. If we sit for those 42 days, the Forty-Second Parliament will, over the previous three years, have comprised 144 sitting days. That is a long way short of the 198 days that occupied the Fortieth Parliament from 1970 to 1973.

So, if we can use this as any guide, there is certainly a run-down in the graph of activity by the Government. Based on what one hears outside this Chamber when one talks about politics and the problems that confront the people of South Australia in their general economic and social life, one cannot escape the feeling that people are

most unhappy with the present Government and that this could well be its last term of office.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Why is Dick Geddes so frightened of an early election, then?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Geddes did not indicate in any way at all that he was afraid of an election. I assure the Hon. Mr. Blevins that no member on the Opposition benches has any fear of an election. Indeed, as far as we are concerned, the Government can hold an election at any time it likes. I listened with interest to what the Hon. Mr. Geddes said, and he did not express any fear of the kind referred to by the Hon. Mr. Blevins.

Some of the problems that confront the South Australian public should be emphasised at a time such as this. However, before I do that, I should like to refer to certain matters that were raised by the Hon. Mr. Sumner when he spoke in this debate. He asked questions of me, and I told him, properly, I thought, that I would give him the answers at the appropriate time, and that is now, when I am speaking in this debate.

The honourable member referred to the Government's plan to implement an Ethnic Affairs Branch. I am somewhat amused by the Government's announcement of this proposal. Indeed, it follows a pattern to which we on this side of the Chamber have become accustomed in recent months: when a policy initiative is announced or some proposal is put forward by the Opposition in this Parliament, the Government hastens to make public an alternative proposal.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The Liberals did that for 23 years in Canberra. Do you know that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know that at all.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Well, you haven't been reading the papers.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Time and time again, as I believe I can prove to the honourable member, the Government has followed the initiatives of the Liberal Party in this State. This is yet another example of that course of action, in which the Government is prompted into some sort of action, announcement or new idea, because of an initial announcement made by the Party of which I am a member.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You don't think the matter had been under consideration by the Government for some time?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am afraid that I do not know what the Labor Government considers.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Well, I can tell you that it had been.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That could be said regarding many of these matters. I hope that the Government has something under consideration as a running programme. However, that is not very satisfactory, as the people want to know a little about open Government. They want to hear an announcement or two being made without the prodding that has occurred recently.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: But this is the policy of the Labor Party. All sections of the community, including the churches and everyone else, are told about our policies.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is not a bad sort of approach, although occasionally it would be nice to know that the Labor Party has ideas of its own.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: We listen to the consensus of public opinion.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member keeps on listening, he will probably keep on following the Liberal Party. On April 10 this year, my Party announced that it intended, on assuming office, to establish an Ethnic Affairs Commission. A week or two after that, the Government said it intended to establish an Ethnic Affairs Branch. It was, without any doubt at all, prodded into action by the Opposition.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What absolute nonsense.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Some aspects of the Government's proposal have raised considerable concern and, indeed, alarm among the ethnic communities in this State. The Liberal Party said clearly (and it intends to stand by this statement, which I take from my Party's announcement) that "it will be responsible directly to the Premier". There is a big difference between the situation of being responsible directly to the Premier, in the Liberal Party's case, and the proposal put forward by the Government concerning its Ethnic Affairs Branch.

First, the Chairman of the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission will be independent of the Public Service Board. Secondly, the Chairman will not be restrained by the silencing rules (if I can use that expression) directed by the Public Service Board. Thirdly, in every sense the Chairman will be directly responsible to the Premier. There will not be a buffer, intermediary or a senior public servant between the Chairman and the Premier, and, finally, the commission will be given specific powers to deal with the provision of services offered by all State Government departments and some semi-governmental authorities.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Does that mean that that commission would take over the administration of welfare services?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, it does not mean that at all. It simply means what I have said, and I hope, as I explain this matter further, that the honourable member will not only understand fully what I am trying to say but will also agree with me that the Liberal Party's proposal is far better than the Labor Party's scheme. These features that I have pointed out are totally lacking in the Government's proposal. Also, the commission, under the Liberal Party's scheme, will have real status. It will have the required and necessary standing, independence and neutrality in dealing with departments and semi-governmental authorities. It will be truly effective and, if criticisms are warranted of the services available or being delivered to ethnic people, those criticisms will not be watered down or hushed up. They will be taken directly by the Chairman of the commission to the Premier. This is what the ethnic people want, and it is what they will get from a Liberal Government. Therefore, the Government's plan is a poor imitation of the initiative outlined by the Opposition regarding its Ethnic Affairs Commission.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What sort of staff would you have on this commission?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I could go into considerable detail if the Hon. Mr. Sumner wanted me to disclose what my Party has been planning regarding staff, but to do so would take a long time. I do not think it is a point that need be expanded now. It is more important that the Hon. Mr. Sumner be interested in the reply that I have told him I would give to his request that I state the Liberal Party's views on ethnic needs, and I will state them briefly.

The Liberal Party believes in the concept of a multi-national society. We accept that there are differences between citizens, but we do not believe in the superiority of one group compared to another. All will have equal

opportunity. We see the State as a crucible and the total community as its contents. With the passage of time, this crucible will contain a homogenous population. The interaction between all these people of different cultural backgrounds will influence the whole rather like the Swiss concept, not like the Canadian experience.

My vision for South Australia is that we will ultimately emerge as a truly multi-cultural society in which differences no longer will exist. I want to see all community groups communicating freely. I want to see that ethnic groups gain rather than lose in the process of change. I want to see every citizen gain that measure of dignity that is the birthright of every person. I want to see every member of every ethnic group proud and secure in his or her own identity on both a personal and national basis. I want to help destroy for all time that unfortunate cynical attitude that still exists on the part of some of the host population towards migrants.

The Liberal Party actively encourages all ethnic groups to develop in their own way and to bring such development to a stage where the total South Australian community benefits by increased knowledge of and involvement in the various languages, customs, art forms, cultures, human characteristics and values from all parts of the world.

This active encouragement will be manifest in the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission. Ethnic communities will have direct access to it and will raise with it any matter they so desire. When a member of the host population has an issue or problem concerning ethnic people, he or she also will have access. In other words, there will be total involvement for the benefit of all. The commission therefore will have an active rather than a passive stance. Its targets will include the important objective of breaking down barriers between groups in the community and thereby bringing about a free exchange of information and understanding. The commission will foster cultural exchange through the public media and also, of course, foster cultural displays such as exhibitions and festivals, for the benefit of the total community.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is what the Government is doing already.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It will not do it if it proceeds with its stated plan about its Ethnic Affairs Branch. Most important, the commission will create an accrediting body for all interpreters and translators. We have already announced this policy initiative. All that the Government has done so far has been to call for a report and say it is studying that report. The objective from our point of view is to improve the quality of interpreting and translating in this State. In establishing a service of this kind, the emphasis must be on quality rather than quantity.

This is not a problem that can be solved with money only. High standards of training and much care and attention in planning and selection, with the involving of ethnic people in the establishment and maintenance of our plan, are most important and essential ingredients. I refer now briefly to some points raised by the Hon. Mr. Sumner in his speech yesterday. The honourable member listed a carefully-prepared Government commitment towards migrants. To some migrants, this is distasteful and even cynical. The Hon. Mr. Sumner took the stance, "We are here and this is how we will help them", with emphasis on "them", and then he listed these measures on the (1), (2), and (3) system.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is a total misrepresentation of what I said.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I want to be fair to the honourable member and, because he has said that, I will read exactly what he said, as follows:

Each ethnic group has a right to the preservation of its culture, language and lifestyle. The special problems of minority ethnic communities should be recognised. Policies should be directed towards (1) fostering recognition and acceptance by the community of the multi-cultural nature of Australian society.

I emphasise that he said "one in brackets". He continued:

(2) encouraging the retention of the language, culture (in all its manifestations), and lifestyles of ethnic groups, and (3) overcoming their special disabilities and problems.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I do not resile from that, but that is not what you said before.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member cannot resile from that, because that is what he said. All migrant groups have expressed the view that they wish to be consulted and not have paternalistic policies imposed on them. The Hon. Mr. Sumner is telling them what the Government will do for them, whereas our approach is non-paternalistic.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is a total misrepresentation of what I said.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is not. We do not discriminate between citizens.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is exactly what I said.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am giving my opinion of how the honourable member stated the case. He fell for the trap that I hoped his Party would have escaped from years ago, namely, the trap of adopting an "we, us, and them" approach to migrants.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr. President, I cannot allow this total misrepresentation of what I said to continue. In fact, in reply to a specific interjection by the Hon. Mr. Hill when he said, "Do you favour the 'them and us' approach?" I repeated my view. To continue as he has been speaking does no credit to the Hon. Mr. Hill or to the serious contribution that I want to make.

The PRESIDENT: I think that the honourable member, in that statement, has explained his position.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not want to upset the Hon. Mr. Sumner, but I have read his speech and I have noticed that he has taken that attitude by specifying three headings under which he has said his Government intends to help migrants, and I consider that that approach is wrong. I do not retract that.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I am pleased you do not agree with those three points. If that is the attitude of your Party, you are totally and utterly neglectful of the problems and needs of these communities.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not agree with your approach, which is a paternalistic one.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr. President, my approach is not paternalistic and I cannot allow that remark to continue. It is a total misrepresentation of everything I said yesterday. In fact, it was completely contrary to a paternalistic approach. For the Hon. Mr. Hill to continue in this vein does little credit to him.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I placed my interpretation on what the honourable member said. I have made my position clear. I believe that was his approach, and I believe it is the wrong approach. I do not retract from that. I remind the Hon. Mr. Sumner that I am not the only one who has taken objection to his comments. Migrant folk have already come to me and pointed this out,

saying that they are concerned about what the honourable member said on that point.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Who has come to see you?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Never mind about that. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Sumner will raise the same objection to this matter. In his speech yesterday he was in full flight, quoting all the occasions that his Government had contributed to various ethnic groups, societies and the like and under this heading he got down to Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated claiming that the Government had given that organisation \$8 000. However, that is absolutely untrue, and the honourable member knows it. The State Government has not given that organisation \$8 000, because that organisation was given Federal money, and the honourable member knows that, too. The honourable member was completely in error there. Perhaps he made a genuine mistake.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Wasn't that an Australian Assistance Programme?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That was chopped out.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It came through the A.A.P.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The earlier grants: the A.A.P. has been disbanded by the Federal Government as from the present time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: From July 1, but the grant came before that.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I am talking about the Government's having picked up that grant for the coming year, when the A.A.P. was disbanded. That is the information I obtained from the Minister of Community Welfare. The reason the State Government had to make those contributions to such organisations was that the A.A.P. had been disbanded.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In regard to this matter, I should like to quote from the report of Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated. In regard to the State Government the report states:

A submission for interim funding and other proposals are at the moment being drafted for the Premier by the working party on ethnic broadcasting, which was set up by the Premier. We have had to turn to the State Government for help since we cannot secure Federal aid. The report continues:

The Western Adelaide Regional Council for Social Development (funded by Australian Assistance Plan), before the above council wound down its activities, E.B.I. received a grant of \$8 000 for the 1977-78 financial year. The grant is administered by the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee.

I am willing to treat with the honourable member on this matter, but so far as I am informed the \$8 000 was Commonwealth money.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I'll check that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member should check and look into that matter further.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You cannot deny what I said about the other two grants.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not care about them: I am interested only in that one where I believe you made an honest mistake.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I just dislike misrepresentation.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There is another matter in which I believe the honourable member was wrong in his presentation yesterday. He dealt with the education system in Switzerland and he claimed—I do not think it is unfair to say this—that because of his world travels and

his previous tours abroad he was somewhat of an expert on the system applying in Switzerland. The honourable member stated:

As a result of what I saw overseas recently, I consider that what the Government is doing in this area is in advance of what is happening in other countries, particularly Switzerland and Germany, where little bilingual teaching in the Government-sponsored schools has been commenced, despite the large amount of migration to those countries.

I am told on good authority that the French-speaking part of Switzerland can by no means be included in the category referred to by the honourable member, because the French education system in that part of Switzerland has made allowances for foreign students for at least the past 100 years. Therefore, I question whether the information given by the honourable member to this Council regarding Switzerland is correct. Further, the honourable member did get on to a serious subject indeed when he talked about the teaching of native languages in our schools and in regard to this programme the honourable member stated:

It involves teaching in the native language of the child at the commencement of the course and then transfers to teaching in English later.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's a pilot programme.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member cannot slip away by calling it a pilot programme. He did not say that yesterday. That is not contained in the speech he made. I make the position clear that the Liberal Party believes that only English should be the official language, and that no other language should be used as a primary medium of instruction, as this fosters a separatist attitude, and in that regard one need go no further than the position obtaining in Quebec.

The examples quoted by the Hon. Mr. Sumner, and obviously supported by him, are anathema to the majority of migrants. If another language is used as an auxiliary medium, or as a means of instruction, that has my wholehearted support. If a child is taught in a non-English language for some years and then transfers into the normal stream, that child is disadvantaged and isolated.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's not true. The purpose is completely contrary to that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Just a moment. The honourable member had his go yesterday. This in turn must breed a sense of separation and difference. Conversely, the mere existence of such classes within the school system will also provoke this feeling of difference among the children following the normal course. I make the Liberal Party's position clear regarding languages. We are firm about the retention of English as the official language and the encouragement of any other language as a second language.

We are in extreme sympathy with migrants who find difficulty in learning solely in English, and we have long held the belief that a greater number of teachers, fluent in their native language, should be using that skill to assist children in schools where there is a high migrant population. The last point upon which I query the Hon. Mr. Sumner concerns his reference to the Further Education Department teaching English in the work place. The honourable member may be right on this point because I have been unable, as he has been able, to obtain inside information on many of these matters. However, if that is the case now, it was not the policy some years ago because, during the period 1971-73, companies in South Australia were willing to allow their employees time during working hours to attend English classes at the work place, but the scheme at that time was vetoed by the department or the relevant education authorities.

The initiative taken by the Liberal Party regarding an ethnic affairs commission is only one announcement of many which has caused the Government concern and which has caused the Government to bring out alternative policies, as I said at the start of my speech. Another example is associated with the announcement of the Liberal Party's arts policy. After the Liberal Party had announced that it intended to establish a separate Ministry of the arts, the Premier and his officers announced that they would establish a separate arts branch within the Premier's Department. They elevated a senior officer to the position of Director.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Is there anything in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech about the arts?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No. That is another example of the Government's run-down attitude. The arts were the "in" thing when the Government first came to office, and at that stage it made generous allocations to the arts but, when there is no political benefit, the Government forgets the arts. This week we had another example in connection with a hospital for Christies Beach. The Liberal Party had announced that it intended to establish a hospital there and, within a week or so, the Government came forward with an alternative scheme.

As this era comes to a close, perhaps one should outline some of the serious problems facing the people. When I mix with people outside, they continually complain about costs, and they sheet home the blame to the present Labor Government in this State. They strongly object to the socialist bureaucracy that this Government has developed over the past seven years.

Whenever housing costs are mentioned, the Premier claims that housing is cheap in South Australia. On one occasion he said that South Australia had the lowest housing costs, and on another occasion he said that South Australia had the second lowest housing costs. The Committee for Good Government is publicising what it alleges to be the low building costs in this State. When one examines the most recently published figures for building costs issued by the Bureau of Statistics, which surely will not be questioned by honourable members opposite, one finds that Adelaide's building costs for an average size house are higher than those in any other mainland capital city. According to the Bureau of Statistics, the figure is \$209 a square metre in connection with building an average size house in Adelaide.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Of what kind of construction?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It does not matter, because the same kind of construction would be used for the purposes of comparison. Is the honourable member trying to tell me that the Bureau of Statistics would take figures for a brick house here and make a comparison with figures for a timber house in another capital city? The corresponding figure for Melbourne is \$199 a square metre; for Perth, \$189 a square metre; for Sydney, \$184 a square metre; and for Brisbane, \$184 a square metre. For a young couple buying their first house, the extra money that must be found in Adelaide, compared with the sum applying in other cities, may be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The Government has announced stamp duty concessions.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Premier and others are continually saying that we have cheaper housing here, but they are incorrect. Actually, our housing costs are the highest of any mainland capital city.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What about the price of land?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is about the same in every capital city.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: No.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: About 20 years ago, land was cheaper in Adelaide, but that is no longer the case. I can get the figures for the honourable member. How will the honourable member compare a block of land in Sydney with a block of land in Adelaide? Should we consider the distance from the General Post Office as a guide?

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Do you expect people to believe that nonsense?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is not nonsense. I turn now to the question of stamp duties, which apply only when a completed house is purchased. The Government recently introduced a moratorium alleviating this burden for a specific time for some purchasers, but the Government did not do it to help young people. The advertisement stated that it was to help the building industry. The Premier called industry representatives together and announced it to them personally; he said it was to help them.

Irrespective of the moratorium, this Government slugs young people through the imposition of stamp duties to a greater extent than is the case in other States. Let us consider the purchase by a young couple of a house for \$35 000. As most members on both sides will agree, that is about the average price that a young couple buying a house would pay; but they are faced with a bill for \$730 for stamp duty. In Victoria it is \$700.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: How much does real estate get out of it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It gets nothing out of it; it is money that the Government gets as revenue.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: If you sell a house for \$35 000, what is your commission on that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know; I am out of touch with that. In Victoria a young couple pays \$700 in stamp duty; in New South Wales it is \$612.50; in Queensland it is \$600; in Tasmania \$587.50; and in Western Australia \$525. As I said earlier, as this Government's reign is coming to a close, this is one of those great achievements that I suppose it takes some credit for, simply taxing young people here far in excess of what other young couples have to pay for the same consideration when they purchase a house in another State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And they are getting less for the same consideration here.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, they are, because the house costs more and there are limitations; smaller houses are built to keep the price down so that sales can be made. I have raised this point previously and I know it has been brought to the Government's notice, and yet the Government persists in imposing a duty of this kind on people who cannot afford it; compared with people in other States, the young people in this State say they are not getting a fair deal and it would be better if they lived in another State. I condemn the Government for that. An adjustment in stamp duty affects people of very moderate means and, in most cases, young married people establishing themselves. Not only do they like to buy or build a house: they also like to buy a motor car, but how do they fare in this State compared with their counterparts in other States? When they buy a motor car in Adelaide, the cost is by far the highest of any State. An average size car is a Holden Kingswood 202. When a young couple buy that car, they pay registration, third party, and stamp duty and they are up for \$331. The comparable figures for other cities are:

Melbourne, \$328; Sydney, \$260; Brisbane, \$162; and Perth, \$131. Does the Government have no shame in this situation? For instance, does it have no shame that it is charging a young couple \$180 in stamp duty on the purchase of that car, whereas a young couple in Perth pays only \$45, in Brisbane \$60, in Melbourne \$150, and in Sydney \$120? What is the Government's answer to this? These are problems that people are coming forward with today and saying, "I hope we get rid of that Government because the costs and charges being imposed on us in this State are too high."

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Who is saying that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I assure the honourable member that, if he is in touch with the man in the street—

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I am more in touch with him than you are; I have seen more of it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think you are confused if you have not heard stories of this kind. Not only need one deal with that but let us look at the housewife and her problems. She is complaining about her costs in the supermarket, about the cost of clothing, etc., and so she should complain, because it is interesting to look at the cost price index figures, which again are issued by an unquestionable authority, the Bureau of Statistics. We find in South Australia for the last eight quarters the clothing index has been higher than that in any other State.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Because of price control?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We have price control here. Other States without price control are selling clothing more cheaply.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Where?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is why, therefore, prices are cheaper than they are here. Government members want price control; they cannot live without socialist measures of that kind. What do we find as a result? For eight consecutive quarters, clothing here in Adelaide has been the dearest of any city. Then the housewives turn to food. Under the Federal statistics for the last four quarters, food costs here have been higher than in any other capital city. This Government has set that pattern; it cannot escape its responsibilities within the economic structure of this State. The Government wanted these controls; if it wants price control for clothing, it can do it tomorrow without any legislation; it has the power to do so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are you advocating that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, I am not. We had this out when the Minister was not present. It does not matter under which heading one looks at the situation, whether building, buying a necessary house or an average size motor car, or whether it is the housewife buying food at the supermarket, or the family having to buy clothes for the children: the Government seems to be proud of the fact that those prices are higher than they are in any other State. Therefore, it is little wonder that I make the point that we are coming to the end of an era; I think the Speech delivered to us the other day will be the last Speech prepared by the present Government. The housewives are fed up with the socialist bureaucracy that the present Government has established during its reign. The Government has established a socialist bureaucracy in this State.

I have gone back only three years, as they are the most recently available figures, leading up to June, 1976, and looked at the increase in the Public Service of this State. These figures are official figures issued by the Government itself and they indicate that the State Public

Service for the three years ending June, 1976, increased by 27.1 per cent. The comparable figures are: in New South Wales, 24.3 per cent; in Tasmania, 14.7 per cent; in Victoria, 21.9 per cent; and in Western Australia, 16.6 per cent. Our increase was well above the increases in those other States, and we are not far behind the Commonwealth Government. As honourable members will recall, this was a period mainly of the Whitlam regime, and certainly the whole of the planning increase in the Public Service during that period fell on the shoulders of that Labor Government.

The whole of Australia criticised and resented the increase in the Commonwealth Public Service during those three years. It rose by 29.8 per cent. We in this State were not far behind with 27.1 per cent. That is why the Government must slug the people of this State with stamp duties, fees and costs. The people must service this bureaucracy, and the people outside are taking strong objection to this.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You're just Fraser's apprentice, and you know—

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member wants to dissect those figures, he need go no further than the Premier's Department, because it makes an interesting story. I now refer to some figures contained in Parliamentary Paper No. 2. When the former Liberal Government came to office in 1968—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The year after that, you cut down on hospitals.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We saved where we could while we were in Government. Indeed, the Liberal Government did not slug the people or increase motor registration or licence fees. Our first thoughts were for the people.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R. A. Geddes): Order! Constructive criticisms or interjections would be appreciated.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In 1968, when the Hall Government came to office, the Premier's Department had a staff of 27. When that Government left office in 1970, the staff numbered 30. The latest available figure is that relating to June 30, 1976. In the six years from 1970 to 1976, the staff in the Premier's Department increased from 30 to 175. What more damning evidence than that can one find? We have a socialist octopus ruining this State! It is little wonder that those people who claim to have justifiable complaints about the standard of living in this State are totally fed up with the present Government and want to see change.

I have tried to highlight the attitude of my Party towards the ethnic communities, and I think I have satisfied the Hon. Mr. Sumner that my Party's plans regarding that matter are in the best interests of the whole community. I have stressed the manner in which this Government is rushing in and making alternative announcements whenever the Opposition shows initiative and makes policy announcements leading up to the forthcoming election.

On the matter of costs, fees and duties, the public questions the credibility of the present Government, and it is asking the question, which is coming through loud and clear, "Just what has this Government accomplished in the last seven years?" I can only say that the Government has done its best. Unfortunately, its best is not good enough. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In contributing to the debate, I join with my colleague the Hon. Mr. Sumner in wishing Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls the very best for a long and happy retirement. I also congratulate Mr. Walter Russell Crocker, the Lieutenant-Governor, on his Speech when opening this session of the Parliament.

Although several matters concern me, I should like to raise two specific matters today. The South Australian public should know what the Fraser Liberal Party and Anthony Country Party coalition Government has done to this country. Those two crazy graziers have certainly the greatest record of incompetence of any Government in our history. They have managed to destroy the confidence of the rural community, as well as that of their greatest supporters, the multi-nationals and industrialists.

They have been ably supported in their 18-month term of mismanagement by the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Lynch), who, I believe, is referred to appropriately in Canberra as "the plastic man". I refer to the position obtaining in this country in June, 1976, when unemployment was just over 260 000. Some 12 months later, the number of registered unemployed was 332 793.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They promised to do something about it, and they did: they increased it.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am getting to that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I am sorry. It's just that it's so obvious.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In 1975, Mr. Fraser said (and I hope the Hon. Mr. Hill is listening to this):

Under a Liberal and National Country Party coalition Government, there will be jobs for all who want to work. I ask Opposition members whether they suggest that the 100 000 people who have been unemployed since June last year do not want to work. I assure members opposite that those people are certainly looking forward to having a vote. Mr. Fraser went on to say:

We have a comprehensive strategy to restore prosperity. The only prosperity which I have seen and about which I have read in recent months has been the record profit made by Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, Utah Mining and, more recently, General Motors-Holden's. In addition, only recently G. J. Coles, which has a 49 per cent equity in K-Mart stores, recorded a \$29 000 000 profit.

The Hon. Mr. Hill suggested that housewives are going crook at the cost of foodstuffs, clothing and other necessary commodities that they must purchase for their families. If the profits were reasonable (and they would be reasonable if they were halved), we would not have the problem of housewives complaining to the Hon. Mr. Hill and other honourable members about this matter. Small businesses continually fall and go bankrupt, and, of course, these people are now thinking about whether or not they did the right thing in voting for the Fraser Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There's no doubt about it.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: They will not agree that they should have done so and, if the Leader is honest, he will admit that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I am honest.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Leader may be honest. However, he does not know what is going on outside this place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Yes I do.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: No, he does not. Mr. Fraser also said, "We will retain Medibank." We all know that Medibank provides cheap and efficient medical services for those earning more than \$9 000 a year. Medibank was put forward by the Labor Government in order to share the

cost of medicines equally and fairly throughout the community. It seems to me that it is wrong that Mr. Fraser, earning \$75 000 a year and perks, should receive the same Medibank cover, and pay the same charge for it, as a person who earns only \$9 000 a year. That comment applies to all members of Parliament and to everyone who earns more than \$9 000 a year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How much do you pay for petrol?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am talking not about petrol but about Medibank. What has this got to do with petrol?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I am just asking a question.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I do not know what the honourable member is getting at.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The pensioner has to pay the same as everyone else for petrol.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Of course, but I am talking about Medibank and the lies that Mr. Fraser has told the public. He did not mention petrol. I would not be surprised if, to get the vote of the common people, he said, "I will give you cheap petrol, too." He has not delivered the goods in relation to what he has promised.

Another promise that came out very loudly and clearly (and most wives of workers believed it) was when Mr. Fraser said, "We will maintain wage indexation." On every occasion to my knowledge in the 18 months, Mr. Fraser has done everything possible, through application and contribution to the Arbitration Court, to destroy wage indexation. Wage indexation, of course, means that increases in the consumer price index are reflected in the wage earner's pocket, but that has not happened: the wage earner has got half the correct amount.

A further promise by Mr. Fraser was, "We will not devalue." All these promises, and many more, have been broken. He did devalue, and by 17½ per cent. These actions affect everyone in the community, particularly those least able to afford to pay. If members opposite had any decency and if they were fair dinkum, they would say exactly what I have been saying. However, they are not free to attack their Party.

In dealing with unemployment, it is sad to see the young people of our country being so adversely affected. There have been many articles written on unemployment, and I must congratulate the *Age* of November 27, 1976, for putting out a series of articles entitled "The Jobless Generation". This is part of an opening paragraph:

We have had recessions before in Australia but never one which has struck so selectively at one group of society. At the end of October, 1976, Australia had 261 990 people unemployed. Three in every eight were aged between 15 and 20. In the month of the year when unemployment is normally at its lowest, just under 100 000 young people under 21 were unemployed. They are now about to be joined by some 250 000 school and college leavers. It is estimated that by January more than 200 000 juniors, as the Commonwealth Employment Service calls them, will be unemployed in the front line of Australia's long recession.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you the figures for 1972 to 1975?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: They were in a series of reports in four double-page spreads, in graph form. They are available for the Leader from the research officer. The report continues:

Employment prospects for the year ahead are similarly bleak, the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations has warned. The Government in a confidential submission said the number of unemployed is likely to remain at least 4 per cent of the work force all year

long. If something has gone wrong for the economy, it has gone terribly wrong for the teenagers looking for work.

At a meeting in Canberra yesterday attended by Government members and Ministers and large employers in the manufacturing industry, the employers predicted that next year 400 000 would be unemployed. We look at a recent edition of the *Age*, some seven or eight months later, and find an article by Lindsay Arkley titled, "Monday Job Market—young Australians are hit hard by work famine". I quote:

Overall about 40 per cent of the O.E.C.D. members unemployed are under 25 but in Australia about 55 per cent of the unemployed are aged between 15 and 24 years. This is a higher proportion than in Austria, Belgium, Britain, Canada, Finland, France, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the U.S. and West Germany.

If the Fraser Government is allowed to remain in office and if the trends continue, I am predicting a depression in this country much bigger and with more unemployed than we ever had in the 1930's. Of course, associated with that depression would be more crime, more poverty, a lowering and lessening of opportunities for the underprivileged, and all sorts of deprivation for our pensioners.

I prepared this speech two evenings ago, and yesterday the captains of industry predicted that 400 000 would be unemployed next year. I am not using my own propaganda here: the view I am putting is supported by manufacturing industry. I believe that there is a planned policy by the Liberal Party to have a permanent unemployed work force in Australia. I believe its mentality is such that they believe that, if they can have workers waiting outside the gate for their comrade's job in the event of a dispute, they will weaken the strength and resolve of workers and the unions for better wages and working conditions. I believe the callous decision by Fraser regarding Whyalla and Newcastle has been condemned by the whole community.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What would you have done about it?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I would have done something very different. I will tell the honourable member what the Fraser Government did. It proposed a package deal to the unions that it knew was completely unacceptable and then, of course, blamed the unions. It suggested that there be no wage indexation for two years and no strikes. The Fraser Government knew, when it put that to the unions, that it would not be accepted. Why would any section of the community ask workers to accept \$7 a week less? If the Newcastle workers had accepted, they would have been \$15 a week worse off. Under that proposal, the Liberals would say, "We will do nothing for the workers regarding safety, improved retrenchment leave, or anything else, and they will take no action."

Shipping is of vital importance to an island nation with a large trade. From the first settlement until after the First World War, the Shipping Conference controlled transport in Australia, imports and exports. It was a big and experienced organisation, no doubt very efficient. The then Prime Minister, Billy Hughes, in 1920 exposed its exorbitant profits, and after the war an Australian shipping line was set up. Freight on wheat, for example, dropped to less than half that charged by the Conference Line. I wonder whether some of the farmers on the other side of the Council can remember those days and the actions of the then Prime Minister. Despite this lesson of more than 50 years ago, powerful forces today have already gone a long way towards putting us once again at the complete mercy of the international shipping sharks. The

United Nations conference on trade and development promoted in 1972 that a nation's shipping be based on a 40:40:20 formula, which meant that 40 per cent of the trade should be carried by the nation's ships, 40 per cent should be carried by the ships of its major trading partners, and the remaining 20 per cent should be carried by ships of other nations.

Presently, Australian ships carry less than 10 per cent of Australia's trade. Certainly, that is contrary to what was advanced by the conference on trade and development. Doubtless, there were plenty of Liberals at that conference. The Australian shipbuilding industry, even with the most modern equipment may not be directly competitive with that of countries which can exploit economies of scale but the subsidy needed to maintain such an industry would be less than \$50 000 000 annually.

That sum is small when compared to the losses which come from being completely dependent on overseas interests. Last year freights on imports cost \$948 000 000 of which \$819 000 000 was payable to non-resident carriers. Freight on exports added another \$400 000 000, whilst non-conference shipping for bulk cargo would have cost at least another \$400 000 000. About \$180 000 000 is involved altogether and, if we could save 2 per cent or 3 per cent of that, there is more than enough to subsidise Australia as a shipbuilder. However, based on past experience the saving could be 10 times greater than that.

Untold millions of dollars have been added to our freight costs and our exports have been made less competitive. Farmers should be concerned and I know that many of them are concerned about this situation. I refer to a report in yesterday's *Australian*, showing farmers attacking the Liberal Government because it wants to base the economy of Australia on mining. That is the industrial rump of the Liberal Party, and the country people are concerned about this. This afternoon I spoke to a constituent from Millicent. He is a great supporter of the Liberal Party and people like the Hon. Mr. Cameron, but he did not have the same feeling after I spoke to him today.

Farmers have received no encouragement from members opposite. Farmers are concerned about the way the country is being run by Anthony, Lynch and Fraser. Wharfies have been blamed for inefficiency and Australia's high wages, but that was merely to distract attention from the real culprits. Recent sackings on the home-front at Chrysler can be attributed to the private enterprise system directly, and that is the aspect the Hon. Mr. DeGaris criticises whenever there is trouble. We have only to listen to the comments of the Hon. Mr. Hill in regard to my next statement. I refer to the need for profit whereby workers are used like tools to produce a record number of vehicles, work excessive overtime and, when a glut appears on the market and management and capitalists of bigger enterprises are unable to read the market and judge economic circumstances and judge the way in which Fraser, Lynch and Anthony are running the country, they suggest that workers be put on a shorter working week. That is bad management.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Who wrote this speech for you?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I wrote it. I started at 1 o'clock on Tuesday night and finished at 2 o'clock yesterday morning, and I have not changed a word.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No wonder you're tired.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am not tired, and I know Opposition members will not be tired, if they are fair dinkum, after I am finished. This is a serious matter that

I am advancing. I know that the Opposition is concerned and I know that they know that they cannot win an election in this State. In fact, it was put to me by someone well respected in South Australia and a good judge of politics (as he was lurching with three or four heavyweights the other day) who said, "I am concerned; if we have an election now we will win too many seats." He did not say how many, but I agree with him.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: About 30.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He said more than that. Opposition members have much respect for this man's judgment. Mining companies have had a field day along with car companies in South Australia regarding profits. I refer to General Motors-Holden's, which had a loan of \$2 500 000 from the Chifley Government in 1944 (the United States investment in the enterprise was less than \$1 000 000), but that company has taken hundreds of millions of dollars out of this country untaxed to be shared by the wealthy people in America, and I suppose shareholders in other countries; but I know America has most of the shareholders.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: It was recently announced that G.M.H. made \$2 000 000 000 profit in the first three months of this year.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yet not a zack went to the retrenched workers used to make that profit.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: If you don't like them, close them down and let's import our motor cars.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: There are other ways of doing that. I will explain it to you. Canada had the same situation and was being ripped off by the multi-nationals and capitalists, but she stopped it. Canada told those interests that they could not take such funds out of the country, saying, "We want a share of the profits." We can do that here. The Leader would not support that because he is frightened of the interests from whom he gets his election funds. It is supporters of members opposite who keep them in Government, but they stand over Opposition members. The Opposition is dedicated to the capitalist cause, but honourable members know that it is crumbling. However, they cannot jump out: they have nowhere to go. We do not want them: the workers do not want them—the capitalists are ashamed of them because they cannot defend the capitalists.

I do not blame Opposition members, because the capitalists are indefensible. However, I should like to tell honourable members of the workers with whom they have nothing to do. For how long must the workers accept unemployment at the whim of directors?

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: The workers you represent or the majority we represent?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: A worker may make a mistake and vote for the honourable member, but every worker I have met, especially in the past 12 months, is not supporting the honourable member. Many members of the Liberal Party I have met reckon you are rat shit—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will you spell that for us?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: No, and you are not offended by it because you know that it is true. Last Sunday, and it was not by choice, I was in the company of six or seven Liberals who are big industrialists. I have met these people previously. They always attacked the unions and the Labor Government but now they are attacking Fraser and asking how to get rid of him. These are Liberal voters, but honourable members should hear what they are saying about them.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You're not really convincing us.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You will never be convinced because you are paid to represent the rabble in the system. The honourable member cannot get out, he is hemmed in. Your supporters know that you are incapable of putting up good policy, but I do not blame honourable members for that. How long are workers expected to accept unemployment at the whim of multi-nationals to put them off, put them on, with no payment except a few weeks notice or a suggestion that they work reduced hours? This is not the case with American motor car companies. In Detroit, workers are guaranteed employment and, in the event of stand-downs, they receive up to 12 months redundancy pay. As a result, the companies do not make redundancy payments often. The companies watch the market and produce cars according to the demand in the foreseeable future. They do not exploit the workers as the workers have been exploited in Australia.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What do you think should happen here?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: We need a confrontation against the multi-nationals; that is how the situation was improved in Detroit. The workers went on strike for 18 months to get improvements there.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: The wages here are higher than those in Detroit.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: No. The wages in Detroit are \$8 an hour or \$9 an hour, and the workers can work for as long as they like and have as much time off as they like. Honourable members opposite have an ingrained hatred in this connection. Shonky Joh Bjelke-Petersen gets Government in Queensland with 36 per cent of the vote. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris says that he believes in one vote one value, but he never says anything about Shonky Joh, who looks after the Utah Development Company, which took \$137 000 000 (after tax) out of Australia last year. The company has an investment of hundreds of millions, but the company itself has invested only a fraction: the rest came from profits derived from our resources. In Nimboida, New South Wales, miners have shown that they can effectively run a mine. Jamaica, a small, undeveloped country, now charges Kaiser Aluminium \$13.40 a tonne for bauxite mined there.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: How much do you charge the B.H.P. Company in South Australia?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Not enough, but that is a legacy from the Liberal Government. Broken Hill Associated Smelters have cheap water, cheap electricity, and cheap royalties. If the Government charged more, that company would sack workers. The Utah company is now suing the Seamen's Union and getting the full support of the Queensland Government. The Seamen's Union believes that the Utah Company is taking huge profits out of this country, and it ought therefore to use ships manned by Australian seamen.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What sort of car do you drive?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I drive my wife's car—a secondhand Volvo. What sort of car does the Leader drive?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: An Austin.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Don't you like Australian workmanship?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: My car was assembled at Fishermen's Bend. If legislation was introduced providing that we should buy Australian products, I would

support it. I did not have enough money to buy a new Holden. The reactionaries and the right-wing lunatics in the Opposition are looking forward to the dispute between the Utah company and the Seamen's Union. I support the union in its efforts to look after its members' interests and in its demands that, if some of Australia's wealth is to be delivered to other countries, it should be so delivered in Australian ships manned by Australian seamen under the improved conditions that have been fought for over many years of militant struggle; that is the best kind of struggle I know. I realise that the officials of the Seamen's Union will be attacked under the tort laws, which have been mentioned many times here in relation to costs awarded against me some years ago in the Kangaroo Island dispute.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: How much was it?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The honourable member should not let it worry him. I will never pay it.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You will not face up to your responsibilities.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I have faced up to them, and it never cost me a zack. When I visited Kangaroo Island last year the Mayor said, "Let us be friends and let us forget our differences." The Mayor almost shook my hand off, and he gave me a big feed of fish. They are getting unionised there nowadays. A worker said to me, "Thank Christ for what has been done."

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member knows that he should not use that expression. I have spoken to him about it before.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Two days ago there was an attack in the House of Assembly on union officials. I now turn to a report of the youth unemployment working party dated May, 1976, which I think is a message for all members of Parliament. I refer to page 7 of that report, under the heading "Natural Situation, Australia's findings on the effects of unemployment on young people echo those of other countries". In the report on long-term unemployed people under the conditions of full employment, Allan Jordon noted that boredom, depression, and alienation were general among such people. He also found that, of those questioned about criminal activity, one-fifth had convictions, and these were mostly related to offences involving drunkenness and destitution. This figure is for convictions only and not for encounters with police, as in previously mentioned surveys. These findings are supported by a survey conducted by the Commonwealth Employment Service in Victoria. In addition, the survey found that unemployed young people were very aware of the restrictions caused by lack of money and it was noted that they were irritable and withdrawn and often slept in to make the day go faster. The young unemployed at the lower socio-economic levels were particularly lethargic and frequently gaining excessive weight. Many also developed anti-work attitudes which reduced their options in life. I think the message is clear there that, as unemployment goes higher, we can expect the crime rate to grow accordingly and those members on the other side of the Council with great wealth, those supporters of people with great wealth, should be more concerned than anybody else in the community, and I think that is fair warning.

I believe that the Fraser Government has to look to its responsibilities urgently in the matter of unemployment. I think we all know that, because a person is unemployed, his need to meet his commitments at home do not disappear. His rent must be paid. The grocer must be paid, the baker, the chemist, the doctor, and school fees must all be paid.

All the bills that a worker runs up when he is fully employed do not discontinue when he loses his job. A worker should receive a decent social service benefit, social security payments when he is unemployed. I believe it is the responsibility of any Government, whether it be Labor or Liberal, to see that every person who wants a job in the community gets one. Many of us in the Labor Party believed that, when the unemployment figures reached a high proportion when we were in Government, unless we did something about it we would lose Government and, if the Hayden Budget had been allowed to run its course, I felt we would have solved the unemployment problem. This was not allowed to occur by those people opposed to Labor.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What happened to Clyde Cameron?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You read it in the press.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: I thought he was going to resign, at one stage, when the unemployment figure reached 250 000.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I do not have to answer that.

The PRESIDENT: No; ignore the honourable member.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You would be wise to, because there is no answer.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I predict that in the next election those people in the Liberal Party, those members in swinging seats, the State Liberal Parties will wash their hands of Fraser, Anthony and Lynch. I am predicting that: they will drop Fraser like a hot potato. I shall be here after the next election and I think that is what will happen. Lynch has indicated quite clearly, supported by Street, in press statements that there is no end in sight to unemployment and the people should learn to live with it. The only people who can do something about it are those people I have just mentioned, who are prepared to accept unemployment in this country. This is not good enough in a country with such obvious wealth as Australia. Schemes such as the NEAT and RED schemes, which were introduced by Labor (by Clyde Cameron), had the effect of giving people some opportunity to overcome unemployment situations. The State Government's unemployment scheme has helped to some extent to alleviate the problem in South Australia, and all credit must go to the Dunstan Government for these initiatives and the humanitarian attitude to the unemployed in our community.

The State Government unemployment relief scheme has to be paid for by someone; more taxes may have to be raised to get the sort of money to be spent. Since 1975, State Cabinet has approved total funds of \$31 000 000. I know the Hon. Mr. Hill, the Hon. Mr. Burdett and most honourable members opposite do not worry about the unemployed—cut down on stamp duty and the price of building and do not worry about the unemployed! The \$31 000 000 has done away with all that. The Government, on humanitarian grounds, has said, "We must look after the unemployed." It has provided work for some 2 700 people engaged on 350 projects; out of those 2 700 people, about 715 have found permanent employment as a direct result of the initiative of the Dunstan Government. That is to be applauded, but I hear complete silence on the other side, so I know they agree.

The Fraser Government refuses point blank to refund any of the money even though the saving to the Federal Government in non-payment of unemployment benefits is quite considerable. Regardless of Fraser's meanness

(and we all know what that is) the Dunstan Labor Government will continue to fund unemployment relief schemes to provide work for as many people as possible who have lost their jobs because of the inhumane and anti-worker policies of the Fraser Government.

The Liberals' cry, of course, is that when people are displaced in industry it is the result of wage demands. Wage demands in the last 12 months have not kept up with indexation; in fact, in terms of real wages workers have had a wage cut of 7 per cent and, even by the Fraser Government's own submission to the Arbitration Court last year, 95 per cent of unions and their members have accepted the decisions of the court so far as wage indexation is concerned. Only on Tuesday of this week, it was reported that a once thriving Sydney electronics factory employing more than 4 000 people had closed—the latest casualty in the rapidly declining space-age industry. The contributing factors to the closing down of this factory included the Telecom Australia cut-back in expenditure.

In Tuesday's *Advertiser* it was reported that the Federal Government would again argue for wage restraints in the next national wage case on the 2.4 per cent cost of living increase in the June quarter. The article, of course, goes on to indicate that the main factors responsible for the rise were recreation, housing, charges for sporting fixtures, sporting equipment, toys, games, newspapers and magazines, and all areas with local government rates and charges up. In Sydney and Melbourne, household equipment, furniture, floor coverings, household draperies, appliances and services and motor vehicle charges were all up; servicing and repairs in all cities were up; third party insurance charges were up in Adelaide and Canberra; tobacco and alcohol saw a 1.3 per cent increase, and health and personal care saw a 1.2 per cent increase.

If the workers do not receive at least the cost of these increases, where and how are they going to pay for these commodities in the next quarter? The consumer price index items are all necessities of life and people cannot do without them. They cannot do without their roads; they cannot refuse to pay their council rates, water rates and other charges. Children cannot go without clothing, and this accounted for something like 40 per cent of the consumer price index for this June quarter.

Does the Liberal Party suggest that our children go to school in less warm clothes than they should have to protect them against a cold and bleak winter? Certainly Mr. Lynch does not have to worry about the winter. I read only last week that he had purchased a new unit in a new complex at Surfers Paradise for \$165 000. The article mentioned that life was not meant to be easy. This was not Mr. Lynch's permanent home but some place where he could get away to rest and recuperate as a result of his arduous duties in Canberra. It seems to be his job to make it difficult for the rank-and-file citizens of Australia.

Mr. Lynch certainly did not come out and suggest that Parliamentarians ought not to receive the \$4 000 increase in Parliamentary salaries. He never suggested that he ought to restrain himself in the pursuit of his happiness and the good things in life. But, once again, as happens with all true blue Liberals, the workers must pay for any recession that occurs in the community. They have not asked the multi-nationals to pay more tax. The Liberals believe that the workers should bear the brunt of this mismanagement, which has occurred in the 18 months of Liberal dictatorship. The only proper thing that the Liberals did this year was to back off from the Industrial Relations Bill, under which they proposed to

fine unions up to \$250 000 and individual trade unionists up to \$50 000. They were going to charge unionists individual damages and gaol them.

Earlier this year, I attended many lunch-hour meetings, culminating in a public meeting at the Port Adelaide Town Hall, where workers made clear that they would not allow the Liberal Party to take away the basic right of workers to refuse to supply labour under certain conditions. When all is said and done, the only thing that distinguishes the free man from a slave is his right to strike. In all my dealings with employers, which have been extensive, and through all my activities as a rank-and-file unionist, I have observed only few instances where workers have won a decent wage increase or better conditions unless they have been prepared to fight for it.

It seems to me that, if a worker is prepared to ask and accept rejection from an employer, he will not receive wage increases in most situations. That is the history of industrial relations between workers and employers in this country, and the attitude of employers has not changed to any marked degree in the last few years. The shadow Minister for industrial relations for the Liberal Party, Mr. Dean Brown, ought to go back to school. He seems to have drafted a new industrial policy for the Liberal Party. It certainly is not new in intent because it starts off as follows:

Unions taking part in strikes which affect essential services could face deregistration and Government action under a Liberal Party Government in South Australia.

The threat of deregistration, to my way of thinking, merely threatens the conciliation and arbitration process, because workers' organisations cannot, when they are deregistered, operate through the arbitration system to try to settle the disputes. They will go outside the conciliation and arbitration system, as a result of which we will have the law of the jungle.

Certainly, by his performance and attitude, as it has been reported, Mr. Brown will not solve the problem. He seems to be taking the lead from Sir Charles Court in Western Australia and Mr. Bjelke-Petersen in Queensland in suggesting that, by confrontation, deregistration, fines and penalties, he will in some way bring the employers and employees in industry closer together.

The Dunstan Labor Government has the right attitude. Certainly it has been tried, tested and proven overseas that with worker involvement, with workers knowing exactly about and having a say where the companies are going, where they can feel secure in their employment in the knowledge that their jobs are safe, co-operation will be forthcoming from the trade union and its members. Threats and intimidation by the employers will not work. The Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. J. D. Wright) was very close to the mark, and I believe correct, when he said:

The Opposition must be incredibly naive to think it could appoint an industrial ombudsman to control union activities of the companies.

The South Australian Industrial Commission has a long record of handling disputes. The President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. Hawke), supported by Mr. Polites, the employers' national representative, agree that penalties will not solve disputes. Only by conciliation and discussion can disputes be solved. The sooner the Liberal Party realises this, the sooner people will believe that they have a genuine interest in the welfare and the progress of employer-employee relations. I do not believe that the Liberal Party would encourage workers to join and actively participate in their respective unions. Mr. Brown was also quoted in the *Advertiser* of the same month as saying:

For the first time, our Party acknowledges in its policy the need for trade unions and the right of unions running their own affairs.

It is obvious from that that, until that point of time, the Liberal Party did not believe that trade unions ought to run their own affairs; nor did it recognise until then the need for trade unions in society. Mr. Brown went on to say that the policy of his Party called for an industry-based union to reduce the frequency of industrial disputes and for secret ballots in union elections. That is all hypothetical. It has not always been the case, because we already have industrial unions. Demarcation disputes disappear, but other disputes with management do not always disappear because of that. I say that, even though I am completely opposed to the proposition.

It seems to me that Mr. Brown wants to run the unions as a part of the Government establishment run for the Government in the interest of the Government, similar to the Soviet Union. Certainly, no trade unionist would support Mr. Brown's policy in industrial relations for a code of conduct to be written into union awards for penalties and deregistration. It is so far out that it is incredible. Mr. Brown must know that his policies run completely contrary to the wishes of employers in industry and the A.C.T.U.

I refer honourable members opposite to a good publication that has just been made available to members of trade unions, and also to the Australian public, and I believe in the first week of its publication some 80 000 copies were sold; it is headed "Australia Uprooted". It is a very concise, well documented and researched booklet put out by the Amalgamated Metalworkers and Shipwrights Union. It deals with inflation, the unemployed, profits, and the ownership of our resources. For those people who believe in and support the free enterprise system, I refer them to page 4, which has an article on free enterprise. As in Western Europe, Japan, America, England and a number of other so-called free enterprise systems, "free enterprise" simply means private ownership of the companies that carry out the production of goods and services.

There is little or no planning, and the economy is subject to the winds of the market or market forces. The companies and their owners are not accountable to the public for their actions, except for a minimum legal requirement. They certainly are not accountable for the social consequences of their economic actions. Free enterprise does not mean democratic freedom, either, although its supporters would have us believe this. There are many countries with free enterprise economies where little freedom exists; for example, Taiwan, South Korea, Chile, Indonesia, and other countries which are ruled by military dictatorships. "Free enterprise" refers only to the freedom of a minority of people to own the means of production of goods and services. In Australia, less than one person in 10 holds any shares in any company or is an owner or part-owner of a company. The other nine out of every 10 Australians are wage and salary earners who sell their labour to the companies unless they are unemployed or work for the Public Service.

The total amount of goods and services produced in the economy is called the gross national product, the gross domestic product, or the national cake. Although wage and salary earners make up nine-tenths of the population, they always get much less than nine-tenths of the national cake. For instance, in Australia fewer than two companies in every 1 000 (that is .2 per cent) take a half of all profits made. These companies are the very biggest, and they include many foreign-controlled companies. Therefore, this top group of companies has a massive impact on Australia's economy. Decisions made by them, what they invest, etc.,

affect every Australian. They are controlled by fewer than 2 000 people, many of whom are on the controlling boards of more than one company; so, they are linked by a network of directors. There is, therefore, a great deal of co-ordination amongst these big companies when they make decisions.

We always hear the rags-to-riches story about Fred Nerk, who was clever, worked weekends and half the night, and made \$1 000 000 or so by the age of 30. The system does allow for the odd few Fred Nerks, but they are the exception, not the rule. They are either trading very close to illegality with shady deals, robbing consumers, robbing other companies, or they have a hit single in the "top 40". In terms of our economic system, \$1 000 000 or so is peanuts. In any case, one does not start from nothing and get to own a large slab of B.H.P. or the Bank of New South Wales by just working hard on weekends or any other time. Most of the smaller companies have little influence over the direction of the economy. Free enterprise supporters and enthusiasts are fond of talking about competition and how we would all benefit from it.

Competition among all companies may have been part of the economic life a century ago, but it is not the case now. Competition amongst the biggest companies is mainly the fair-floss area of advertising. If we take the four largest companies in practically any industry, they control most of the market. For example, in the pulp and paper field the number of companies in the industry is 13. The markets controlled by the four largest companies amount to 90 per cent. Glass and glass products involve 47 companies. The four largest companies own 97 per cent of the 255 industries involving basic iron and steel. In aluminium, there are 14 companies in the industry, and four companies own 83 per cent. There are 35 companies in the motor vehicle industry, and four major companies own 88 per cent. In the electric, telephone, and cable and wire industries there are 17 companies, and the four largest companies own 88 per cent. In rubber products, there are 112 companies, and the four largest companies own 74 per cent.

There are varying degrees of competition among the many thousands of small companies for what is left over in the market. If the market shrinks, the small companies are the first to go. We all know that the Opposition made a great noise in the course of Labor's Administration, during which many small companies went broke. They forgot to mention that, every year in the course of 23 years of Federal Liberal Government, thousands of companies also went broke.

It has often been said by Opposition members and their supporters that the Australian worker is at fault by claiming too high wages and not working hard enough. I think we ought to get the facts straight. We are made up of many small industries. About 30 000 companies are labour intensive. We are in much worse shape than are countries that will be exporting their manufactured goods to us, and the figures bear this out. Let us look at the facts. The machine tools in industrial plants less than 10-years old in various countries are interesting. Up to 1976 in Japan, 62 per cent of its plant was less than 10 years old, Germany 56 per cent, America 39 per cent, U.K. 38 per cent, Australia 25 per cent. Also, in Australia 25 per cent of plant less than 10 years old is concentrated mainly in big companies. As to the small companies, they have old out-of-date equipment. The rate of expenditure on equipment in Australia has been very low. Expenditure on capital plant and equipment as a percentage of the national cake in 1976 was: Japan 37 per cent, France 28 per cent, West Germany 26 per cent,

Canada 22 per cent, Italy 21 per cent, U.K. 17 per cent, America 16 per cent and Australia 10 per cent.

The big companies in manufacturing, led by Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, are moving off into mining, oil, minerals and natural gas. B.H.P. has already started its big shift of job operations with other foreign multi-nationals (such as Esso and Bass Strait). Huge profits are made in mining, far more than in manufacturing, steel or anything else, so patriotic B.H.P. is tightening up its manufacturing operations, throwing workers out and concentrating on its new investment in mining. B.H.P. is also borrowing overseas. It has borrowed \$200 000 000 this year to move into mining. B.H.P. is getting ample assistance from Fraser. It pays no tax on any of its profits it ploughs into mining, but it pays 40 per cent to 45 per cent on profits it ploughs back into the steel mills. This means, in effect, that taxpayers pay 44 per cent to 45 per cent of the development cost, so that B.H.P. can shift its base away from activities that provide jobs. The decision made by B.H.P. was actually made by about 12 men.

B.H.P. is the pacesetter for the big manufacturers, and those who can are getting in for their chop. If we look at where the big banks and finance companies such as the Bank of New South Wales, A.N.Z. and National Banks, A.M.P., Colonial Mutual and others are putting their money, we find that it is going increasingly into the mining sector. This is taking much needed money away from manufacturing and building. The finance for houses is neglected as far as workers' interests are concerned.

On Tuesday of this week the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Goldsworthy) in another place thought that he could get some kudos by raising the question of costs awarded against me when I was a trade union secretary in the Kangaroo Island dispute, named in court proceedings as *Woolley v. Dunford*. This dispute is about five or six years old now, and I can remember the dispute quite clearly. I offer no apology, as I made quite clear during the whole course of the dispute. I was acting in the interest of the members I was representing on Kangaroo Island at the time, when graziers, including Woolley, were paying less than the award rates of pay. They were breaking down award conditions. They were employing non-union labour and making it impossible for *bona fide* workers of the trade union abiding by the Arbitration Court decisions by way of wages and conditions to gain employment. I believe that people like Mr. Goldsworthy who bring this matter up ought to keep themselves informed about the actual situation of the case. Any trade union official who did not take the action I took should not be prepared to call himself an honest trade union official.

I had the full support of the trade union movement. Every union in the State supported me. In the decision handed down by Mr. Justice Wells, it was made quite clear there was plenty of fault on the side of the graziers in the dispute. I was honest about the ban. I advised the employers about it. I was protecting the conditions for which the workers of the shearing industry had fought for over 50 years. I was threatened previously on the island, going about my duties as an organiser, with being tarred and feathered when I attempted to enrol non-union shearers. This went to court. There was no publicity about it. I always acted legitimately in the interests of the members I represented. I have had no adverse reaction from workers in industry ever since the dispute.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The taxpayers have.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I had a couple of lunatics who rang up and were going to shoot me, but they would not be unionists. On this occasion only a couple did. I

believe the Opposition is trying to bring this dispute to the fore. If they believe they are embarrassing me they are wrong. I would do exactly the same thing again if I were a union secretary. Wherever I found non-union shearers dragging down hard-won union conditions, breaking down minimum standards set by the Arbitration Court—I always worked for maximum standards—I would not feel honest if I did not take some action to stop it.

I know that every trade union official, unionist, and fair-minded person in South Australia supports this point of view. After all, they are the people who are my friends, the people I respect, those who do things for people, the progressive people, the innovators for improved conditions, safety standards, and all the things the employee believes should exist. Some employers and Liberal members of Parliament believe workers should not have the sort of protection I gave against industrial scabs.

I cannot recall any occasion in the history of South Australia where any union official had more support from his comrades in the trade union movement than I had in the Kangaroo Island dispute, and now that this matter has been brought up in Parliament I want to place on record my sincere thanks to the South Australian Trades and Labor Council, the South Australian branch of the Australian Workers Union, the head office of the Australian Workers Union, and all the unions in South Australia which supported me in that dispute in 1972, when this grazier went back to the early days of the century in moving for vengeance through the civil court and used me as his victim.

I do not blame the Supreme Court and the judge involved. They were simply performing their functions according to their rules, but they never should have been involved, and from the way Mr. Justice Wells, in his judgment, recognised a fundamental disharmony between the farmers and the union shearers it was all a legacy of bitterness; he thought the grazier who began the action had shown a most short-sighted and self-deluding attitude towards the interests of the A.W.U. in island shearing conditions.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Is that a direct quote?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Of course. I suggest that members of the Liberal Party, before bringing up this matter in Parliament again, with the idea of embarrassing me, should read the judgment of Mr. Justice Wells.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I hope they read it all.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes. They will see plenty of references to scabbing in it. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said yesterday that he blamed the unions and said that the Premier was in the grip of the unions.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did not say that. I made no such statement.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Leader said the unions were running the Premier and that it was the unions that started the uranium campaign. The unionists have led the fight in the uranium issue. There is plenty about it in *Scope*. This was supported by Dr. Mosely, the Director of the Australian Conservation Foundation. There is

100 tonnes of waste material, including plutonium, buried in the north-west of South Australia at Maralinga. Secret tests were conducted there, and we did not know that that material was buried at Maralinga. I believe that the Liberal Party would conduct tests again if it could get away with it. A man eulogised by the Opposition, Sir Mark Oliphant, atomic scientist and one of Australia's most distinguished Australians, has stated:

I have come to the conclusion mankind can't afford nuclear energy—the risks of deliberate or accidental misuse are simply too great. For the long term, at least, we should be concentrating our research on solar power.

I refer to *Hansard* (March 30), page 3027, and the motion unanimously carried in another place.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Did that include Liberal members?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes, including Mr. Tonkin and Mr. Goldsworthy, and the motion they supported is as follows:

That this House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country and, unless and until it is so demonstrated, no mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: We've had the Fox report since then.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: No, that was in March. Mr. Justice Fox said there should be public and Parliamentary debate, but the honourable member's mate Fraser does not want that: he wants to make a decision now. True, I think he is slowing down on that now. I refer to a report in today's paper concerning Mr. Fraser, as follows:

Mr. Fraser said that the Federal Government would make no decision on uranium mining until it was satisfied that the environment would be fully protected.

As my Leader has told me that officers are wanting to leave (and I have never held up workers in my life) I merely indicate that I agree with the motion carried in another place and agree that no action should be taken in this matter until satisfactory safeguards are obtained and a full debate is conducted in Parliament.

Last evening I saw Professor Butler on television, and he said that America could not control its wastes, that it can merely hold the situation, that it cannot transport its waste to a safe area and that there is no solution to the problem. That is my view, and I know that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris wanted to hear it. I believe that, if he were honest, he would support the same point of view.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.49 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 2, at 2.15 p.m.