

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 19, 1977

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

QUESTIONS

POWER DISTRIBUTION

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in the Council, regarding integrated grid systems for the distribution of electrical power.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Over a number of years Federal and State members of Parliament of both Liberal and Labor persuasion have advocated an integrated grid system between the States for the distribution of electrical power. In view of the possible power blackout in the State of Victoria, emergency services in this State could well be threatened. If an integrated system was available in such an emergency situation, power could be drawn from several States to maintain emergency services in the affected State. The loss of power for emergency services, of course, could occur for reasons other than industrial disputes. As the position is now highlighted by the dispute in Victoria, will the Government raise the question with the Eastern States and the Commonwealth to ascertain whether priority can be given for the construction of power lines with sufficient capacity to allow house lighting to be drawn from State to State?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will raise the matter with the Minister and bring down a report.

DESERTIFICATION

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. Prior to doing so, I seek leave to make a short statement with regard to desertification.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I understand that the United Nations held a conference on the denudation of arid lands, commonly referred to as desertification, in Nairobi in August and September of this year. The conference was called by the United Nations because of the unsound husbandry that many desert areas have experienced over many years. As a result of this unsound husbandry, the deserts are growing in size. Is there any Government authority in this State overseeing the stability of the more arid areas of the State to ensure that the small percentage of arable land available for agricultural pursuits will not be lost to future generations?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I am aware that the United Nations was to hold the conference in Nairobi. Although we were thinking of sending people to it, we received notice of the conference in too short a time to arrange a delegation to attend it. I considered that there would be much expertise there that would be relevant to the South Australian situation. In South Australia, the body that would be most responsible in this area would be the Pastoral Board in ensuring that the ecology of the arid zones is maintained. It has had much experience over many years and its members have indeed done a good job. The Agriculture Department provides some technical support to the Pastoral Board. We have a range of

ecologists working in the department, and there are people in the Soils Branch who are concerned with the soil conservation aspects of the arid zones.

KANGAROO ISLAND SOLDIER SETTLERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask the Minister of Lands: what was the final outcome of the threatened eviction of certain soldier settlers on Kangaroo Island? This matter was investigated by the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee during 1976-77.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: In the first instance, eight farmers were notified that their financial situation was in such a grave state that they had either to sell their properties or get off the island altogether on the termination of their leases.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: They could still stay on the island?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is so. The result of that was that one farmer made the necessary financial arrangements with the War Service Land Settlement administration so that carry-on finance was made available to him. Another farmer elected to contract to sell his farm through stock firms, and the leases of the remaining six farmers were terminated. However, they all elected to stay in the houses that were previously part of the properties concerned, and to retain a small acreage of land that was promised at the time of the survey. That is the situation that exists at present.

URANIUM

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a reply to the question I asked recently regarding uranium?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague reports that the Federal Government has been informed that the South Australian Government adheres to its previously stated position on the development and use of uranium resources. The Federal Government has also been informed that, in reflection of its concern that uranium development should not proceed until adequate safeguards on production, use and waste disposal have been established, the South Australian Government is continuing to gather and analyse information on progress in these fields.

Without implying any acceptance of the Federal Government's recent decisions on uranium policy, or foreshadowing ultimate commitment to any elements of the proposed code of practice for mining activities, the South Australian Government is willing to co-operate in initial work on consideration of issues raised in connection with the development of such a code as part of the question of overall safeguards on the extraction and use of uranium. This view has been communicated to the Federal Government and the possibility of continued participation in developing the code will be reviewed at appropriate times.

LANDS DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Lands a question regarding the Auditor-General's report of weaknesses in the accounting activities in his department.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In his report for the financial year ended June 30, 1977, the Auditor-General states, within that section dealing with the Lands Department, that there were accounting weaknesses in that department's accounting activities. He stated:

During the year it was necessary to draw the department's attention to unsatisfactory aspects of its accounting work in respect of—

- (a) inadequate internal checking procedures relating to the calculation and payments of salaries;
- (b) non-observance of accepted procedures for the payment of accounts;
- (c) cost reporting and budgeting control of the Survey Division; and
- (d) inventory recording of equipment.

Remedial action is being taken by the department.

Will the Minister give the Council his clear assurance that the remedial action being taken by his department is overcoming the weaknesses referred to?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I know that the Director-General was indeed concerned when he read this report. In fact before the report was made available he was taking steps to correct these anomalies within the department. I cannot give an unconditional guarantee that the steps being taken will correct all these anomalies. However, I will obtain a report and bring it down for the honourable member.

WHYALLA CULTURAL CENTRE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask the Minister of Health, representing the Premier and Treasurer, what is the present position regarding plans to establish a cultural centre at Whyalla?

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

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to create and provide penalties for specific offences of taking and distributing or selling photographs of young persons in pornographic circumstances. It is identical with the Bill I introduced in the second and third sessions of the previous Parliament.

The Bill introduced in the second session passed the Council, but private members' time in the House of Assembly had already expired. I asked the Government for time to debate the Bill in the Assembly because of its importance and because of the public interest but this was refused. The Bill was introduced at the first possible opportunity after it came to the notice of the public that pornographic material depicting young persons was being sold in some quantities in South Australia.

In the third session of the last Parliament the Bill would probably have been dealt with in this Council on the day when Parliament was prorogued. On this occasion, I hope that there will be the opportunity for Parliament to deal with the Bill fully, and, as the Bill is a private member's Bill on a social issue, involving very much a matter of conscience, I trust that the Government will declare that it will allow a conscience vote.

As I have dealt with the Bill fully in the two previous debates, I do not intend to speak at any length now but I refer honourable members to my second reading explanations given in the second and third sessions of the last Parliament and to my subsequent speeches on the Bill in the second session.

It has been claimed by the Government that the portion of the Bill dealing with the offences of taking photographs of children in pornographic circumstances are already covered in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and that the offences in question carry heavy penalties. However, the present law provides no offence at all for merely photographing children in pornographic situations.

It is conceivable that a person might surreptitiously photograph children in pornographic circumstances unknown to the children concerned and, at the present time, the photographer would commit no crime at all. It appears quite clear that there is no offence at present of merely taking the photograph but, if there is any doubt in this area, it should be cleared up by passing this Bill.

Where offences already in existence are also committed, in those cases, of course, the penalties provided for those offences are adequate. As I have said, child pornography has become a distinct phenomenon in our permissive society and there is considerable merit in providing, in one section of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, specific offences and penalties to deal with it.

Speakers on both sides in the previous debates seemed to agree that the best way of preventing children from being abused in this way was to prevent the sale of pornographic material depicting children. The penalties provided in this regard in the present law are hopelessly and pathetically inadequate.

The only provision is section 33 of the Police Offences Act, which imposes a maximum penalty of \$200 or imprisonment for not exceeding six months. Two hundred dollars, mark you! The maximum penalty for not wearing a seat belt is \$300. Section 33 has not been changed in this regard since 1953. Of course, not only has inflation made the maximum fine ludicrous but also this kind of perverted and appalling offence was virtually unknown in 1953.

The Government will not seem to recognise that this is a relatively new and a specific offence. It is in a much worse category than other pornography, and the law must provide specific offences and appropriate penalties.

The Government has said recently that it will impose more-severe fines, and that is all it said, for pornography. I welcome this move, but the Government's intention is apparently in regard to pornography generally. In order to make the penalties for distributing child pornography sufficiently severe, it is necessary to provide specific penalties for this kind of pornography, and the penalties must include imprisonment. It would appear from the statements made that the Government does not intend to do this.

When an identical Bill was last before Parliament the Premier made the quite untrue statement that the Bill reduced the age of consent. One example of this statement is the Premier's remarks on channel 10, appearing in a transcript. He said, "This Bill has been so badly drafted that, in fact, he reduces the age of consent in these matters from 17 to 14 years." This, of course, is palpable nonsense. The Bill does nothing to the age of consent and in no way amends or detracts from any existing provision providing offences, whether consent is material or not.

In fact, the question of consent is totally immaterial in this Bill. It creates absolute offences of taking or selling pornographic photographs depicting young people. Consent has nothing to do with it.

I trust that on this occasion the Premier will not stoop to making untrue statements in an attempt to belittle the Bill. However, the Premier is, of course, completely at liberty to amend the Bill by changing the age mentioned from 14 to 17 if he wishes. I would not oppose the amendment. I selected the age of 14 years in regard to pornographic photographs in an attempt to be moderate. However, if the Premier wishes to take a more puritanical view and make the age 17 years, I shall not complain.

The Premier also attacked the draftmanship of the Bill. It will be no surprise to the Premier to learn that the Bill was drafted by one of the Parliamentary Counsel. I consider the draftmanship most appropriate, and I thank and congratulate the counsel concerned for his work. The Premier attacked the draftmanship of the Bill simply in an attempt to belittle the Bill and me in introducing it because he knew that the Bill would otherwise receive wide public support.

In the recent session, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris gave the Council some valuable information about the pornography scene in America. The story they told was quite frightening and included details as to how young people are recruited for pornographic photographs.

The South Australian publications market will slowly but slavishly and inevitably follow the American pattern, and what the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris told us about the American scene will happen here unless the Government does take genuine steps to provide a realistic deterrent.

In the good smear campaign tradition of the Labor Party, I have been called a porn politician. If that were true, I would not be worrying about this Bill. I would let it be quietly defeated and let the Government suffer in the view of the public and the electors. It is abundantly clear that the public is most concerned about this issue and that it does want heavier penalties for distribution imposed.

However, I am concerned that we do have immediately some real deterrents to prevent children from being abused. The Government has unfortunately painted itself into a corner. It has set its face against the legislation *in toto*. It has refused to acknowledge that the penalties under the Police Offences Act are inadequate although they manifestly are.

The Government now finds it embarrassing to admit that it was wrong and to make any move at all to strengthen the law relating to child pornography. Let me assure the Government that, if it does see fit to make any firm and realistic move to strengthen the law, and this is clearly needed, it will have nothing but praise from me.

Several of the American States have found it necessary to introduce specific legislation in regard to child pornography and, as the same problem has arisen here, and will undoubtedly become more severe, it is high time that we followed suit. The Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, speaking in the recent session, made clear that child pornography is available in South Australia.

Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 provides a new section 255a in the principal Act, which creates the offence of: (1) taking a photograph in which a person under or apparently under the age of 14 years appears to be engaged in an act of indecency; and (2) printing, publishing, distributing or selling or offering for sale such photographs. The penalty is not exceeding imprisonment for three years and a fine of \$2 000, or both. Subclause (4) provides that, where a person whether resident within or outside this State or Australia derives any pecuniary benefit from the sale of photographs of the foregoing kind, he shall be liable to the same punishment. Subclause (5) defines acts of indecency

by objective tests (unlike those in the Police Offences Act) and provides other definitions.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The House of Assembly requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on the Legislative Council's amendments to which it had disagreed.

The Legislative Council agreed to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room on Thursday, October 20, at 9.30 a.m., at which it would be represented by the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, J. C. Burdett, Jessie Cooper, C. M. Hill, and Anne Levy.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from October 18. Page 225.)

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I also wish to support the motion to adopt the Address in Reply. In the Opening Speech, His Excellency Mr. Seaman acknowledged the service given to this State by the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Walter Crocker. Other honourable members who have spoken in this debate have referred to his status as a diplomat and an author.

He served Australia overseas in no less than seven ambassadorial postings. Prior to this he was Professor of International Relations at the Australian National University. Less well known is his military record. During six years of Army service from 1940 to 1946 he rose to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel and was decorated by the French with the *Croix de Guerre* and by the Belgians with *Ordre du Lion*. Few, if any, South Australians have had such an eminent and varied career and I join with my colleagues in wishing Mr. Crocker well in his retirement.

I congratulate His Excellency Mr. Seaman on his appointment as Governor. He gave an unusually brief opening speech. I suspect its virtue was its brevity, and I trust that it may set a worthwhile precedent to be followed by some members in this Chamber. His Excellency gave no details of impending legislation and merely said that the Government viewed its victory at the recent election as an endorsement of its policies expounded during the campaign. That being so, I wish to comment on certain aspects of Government policy regarding industrial democracy.

The Premier has been the principal Government advocate for industrial democracy and, in doing so, maintains that a small group of business men with interlocking directorships and cross shareholdings on prominent Adelaide-based public companies exercise an undue influence over the day-to-day services in our community. He refers to them as "technocrats", which I think is a term coined by Galbraith. In the Premier's view their power should be reduced for the sake of the ordinary shareholders and employees of the respective companies. I doubt whether the Premier realises how difficult it is to find people with the necessary qualifications and experience to cope with the complex task of directing companies at present.

Whilst delivering the Chifley Memorial Lecture in Melbourne in July, 1976 the Premier said:

The economic organisations in which people supposedly take equity are in fact run, not by the owners, but by technocrats who are manipulators of money and not owners

of money themselves. . . Their objectives are quite different from those of the traditional capitalist owner, and often work against the interests of the owners of the money which has capitalised the firm. If we look at one area where the technocrats put their own needs first, it is in interlocking directorships and cross-shareholdings.

Later the Premier said:

Through their directorships, and their control of shareholdings in each others' companies these men are able to make a mockery of the free market system without owning very much at all.

The Premier has stressed that these directors or technocrats may own few shares personally in their respective companies. However, he failed to mention, or perhaps did not realise, that a controversy has raged for many years within the business community as to whether a director, whatever the extent of his personal assets, should own as few or as many shares as possible in his company.

One view is that a director should hold only the minimum number of shares to qualify to hold that position. He will therefore not be involved in buying or selling shares in the company and can avoid any accusations of trading as a result of inside knowledge not available to the public. One distinguished Australian who supported this agreement was the late W. S. Robinson. He was the founder of Consolidated Zinc Corporation, which was subsequently incorporated into Conzinc Riotinto or, as it is more commonly called, C.R.A. Mr. Robinson was a man with substantial private means, but in his memoirs, which were edited by Geoffrey Blainey shortly after his death in 1963, he wrote:

From early 1915 until the end of 1920 I concentrated with W. M. Hughes in extending the Australian non-ferrous industries. This made it undesirable for me to have a capital interest in any companies the fortunes of which would or might be favourably affected by the policies I recommended . . . From then on I made it a rule never to operate or hold shares other than for qualification purposes, in any company of which I was director or adviser. The same rule has been strictly applied to all members of my family.

I know that several of the technocrats in Adelaide to whom the Premier refers hold the same view as the late W. S. Robinson.

In contrast other directors maintain that they should have a substantial holding of shares in order to convey to the public that a director has confidence in the company in which he is involved and so that, when he makes a decision at board meetings, his own money is at stake.

Since section 3c (2) of the listing rules of the Associated Stock Exchanges was redrafted in December, 1975, to require each director to disclose in the annual report his personal and non-beneficial ownership of shares, the public can now identify such directors. Admittedly, it is difficult for these directors or their families to buy or sell shares in their companies for fear of being accused of acting with inside information. Needless to say they should not trade but I believe it is generally ethical for them to buy or sell shares soon after the annual results and Directors' report have been distributed to shareholders and the public.

On rare occasions the technocrats may act mainly in the interests of the company, that is, for the employees, shareholders and directors as a group, rather than solely for the traditional owners of capital. I personally have rarely seen directors with minimum holdings act any differently from those with substantial ones, and the latter presumably fall within the Premier's classification of traditional owners.

When the Premier complained that many Adelaide based companies are directed by a small group of

technocrats he must have been aware that he was partly to blame for this. In recent years Federal and State Governments have enacted a spate of legislation and regulations affecting companies, and I refer in particular to trade practices, price control, export incentives, initial depreciation allowance on new plant, industrial awards, State planning, and environmental and consumer protection plus many different types of taxes.

A director, to be effective ought to have a working knowledge of these matters. No wonder the Premier calls them technocrats and, as in all other fields, the most competent are in high demand. In recent years appointments to public company boards have usually been made on grounds of technical competence rather than large shareholding or good fellowship. It is therefore logical, or understandable, that the technocrats in Adelaide should each sit on several boards, and the Premier should have recognised these factors when preparing his Chifley Memorial Lecture.

I refer now to the inadequacy or inaccuracy of public company reports which the Premier believes causes bewilderment to ordinary shareholders and employees. For this he holds the accountancy profession largely to blame. In his speech to the Australian Society of Accountants in Adelaide on October 7, he said:

What chance does the ordinary shareholder have against the massive economic power of directorates, buttressed by the near monopoly of information provided to them by their techno-structures . . . The concerned shareholder who wishes to use his voting power intelligently finds it difficult to obtain the information necessary to make a sound decision . . . Accountants are the main source of information about companies, and control of that information gives them considerable control over their activities. There has been some movement towards the provision of more extensive and more adequate information in company reports . . . No-one comparing today's annual reports with their counterparts of a decade ago could dispute the trend. It is in the right direction but it is occurring with painful slowness.

I am astonished that the Premier believes that the ordinary shareholder of a public company is still not given sufficient information in annual reports. Until a few years ago his criticism was valid and I know that some directors did take pleasure in providing the least possible information.

This situation changed abruptly when the South Australian Companies Act was redrafted in 1972 after the Commonwealth and other State Governments agreed to strive towards uniformity. The ninth schedule of the Companies Act contains 20 pages of instructions regarding the preparation of annual accounts for public, private and proprietary companies. The amount of information to be provided to shareholders was expanded dramatically.

Following this the Australian Associated Stock Exchanges produced in December, 1975, new listing requirements to which public companies have to conform to enable their shares to be quoted and traded on the stock exchanges. These provisions cover no less than 161 pages and are in addition to the information required to be given to shareholders under the ninth schedule of the Act.

As a result of these changes shareholders in public companies in Australia now receive information to an extent comparable to those in North America and the United Kingdom. I peruse the annual accounts of a great many Australian public companies and I suggest to the Premier that, if ordinary shareholders and employees are confused, as he alleges, it is because of the profusion rather than the scarcity of the information now provided.

The Premier blamed the accountancy profession for making or proposing changes in the preparation of annual accounts that have confused ordinary shareholders. What

happened was that the Institute of Chartered Accountants and the Australian Society of Accountants resolved that from January, 1975, income tax should be treated as an expense in the profit and loss statement, whether it is currently payable or has already been paid or will become payable in the future, and should not be treated as an appropriation of profits. This is commonly known as tax effect accounting. It does not carry a legal sanction but, if a company does not conform, the auditor will qualify his certificate of audit.

In addition, many accountants have advocated that companies should adopt a system of current cost rather than historical accounting when presenting their annual report to shareholders. It is agreed that, because of rampant inflation, companies should value their fixed assets and stock at present-day values. After revaluing plant at current cost a company would then make greater provision for depreciation and this could, of course, decrease dramatically the profit shown.

However, accountants are divided as to whether current cost accounting is desirable at present. Many apparently fear that, if formerly stable companies declared reduced profits or even losses as a result of current cost accounting and omitted dividends, a panic situation could occur amongst the investing public. This could well preclude many companies from raising extra funds to finance more costly stock, which is necessary during periods of inflation, or from raising extra capital to expand or modernise plant. As a result of this division of opinion, the proposal to introduce current cost accounting has been deferred.

The Premier was no doubt conscious of the consequences of tax effect and current cost accounting when he suggested that the accountancy profession tended to confuse ordinary shareholders and employees. However, in defence of the accountants, they have merely been trying to institute necessary reforms so that the public can obtain a more accurate picture regarding the stability and profitability of companies in which they invest. I should have expected the Premier, as head of a reforming Party, to applaud rather than attack the efforts of accountants to reform what has been a conservative profession. With those remarks, I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In the most recent issue of the *Sunday Mail*, a consultant for the Uranium Producers Forum was quoted as saying that the Prime Minister said that there is a safe way of disposing of nuclear wastes and further that it was a question of whom one believes: the Prime Minister of the country and the scientists, or does one believe the pediatricians, anthropologists, and left-wing politicians? The consultant said, "Is the Prime Minister of this country going to tell a lie on this matter". I cannot share the consultant's naive faith in the Prime Minister's veracity, particularly in view of the clear statements in two independent reports on the question of nuclear waste. The first is the Ranger Environmental Inquiry's first report (the so-called Fox report) which, at page 110, states:

There is at present no generally accepted means by which high level waste can be permanently isolated from the environment and remain safe for very long periods. Processes for the conversion of high level waste to a relatively inert solid are being developed. Permanent disposal of high-level solid wastes in stable geological formations is regarded as the most likely solution, but has yet to be demonstrated as feasible.

I refer also to the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution's Sixth Report on nuclear power and the environment in the United Kingdom (the so-called Flower

report), at page 202 of which there is the following similar statement:

There should be no commitment to a large programme of nuclear fission power until it has been demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that a method exists to ensure the safe containment of long lived, highly radioactive wastes for the indefinite future.

The report conceded that it might take up to two decades to complete the research on this technology. Presumably, one could conclusively rest one's case on this point on the Prime Minister's deception. Certainly, if this was not enough, a review of the Prime Minister's action over the past two years would indicate a greater capacity to deceive rather than one to be honest with the Australian public.

The Prime Minister's 1975 policy speech included promises to maintain wage indexation, Medibank, and the real value of pensions, spending on education, health and welfare programmes, legal aid and urban programmes. He promised to work in co-operation with trade unionists, to abolish the Prices Justification Tribunal, to defeat inflation and unemployment, and that there would be no more jobs for the boys or international safaris.

However, on top of the repudiation of these promises, the Australian public is currently faced with his crowning glory in cynical deception: that is, the prospect of an election before the Government's normal three-year term has expired. No one can deny that Mr. Fraser is looking for every opportunity to call an early election, despite the fact that his policy speech was predicated on a three-year term to fulfil his promises.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Wasn't the State Labor Government's policy speech predicated on the same term?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. Cameron's interjections are always very pained. I am sure that, if he continues to listen to me, I will successfully put him out of his misery. The Prime Minister has found that today's reality does not accord with his 1975 rhetoric, and wants the earliest opportunity to ensure another three years in office whilst he thinks that it is possible.

The Prime Minister knows that the situation will worsen by the end of 1978: his chances of re-election will be even slimmer than they are now. The ironic part of his current manifest desire for an early election is that he will have to rely on a basic constitutional principle that he denied to the Labor Party in 1975: the principle that the Monarch or her representative should accept the advice of a Prime Minister as Leader of a Government by virtue of his support in the Lower House of Parliament.

That principle was denied by Mr. Fraser in 1975 in his collaboration in blocking Supply and the subsequent dismissal of the Whitlam Government. However, Mr. Fraser will now seek to rely on it in advising the Governor-General to dissolve the House of Representatives before it is constitutionally necessary to do so. The basis of the early election will be simply that the Governor-General should accept that advice of the Prime Minister commanding a majority in the Lower House.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What was the basis of your advice last month?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Honourable members opposite are interjecting. They are nearly as painful as the Hon. Mr. Cameron. As I said to that honourable gentleman, if they will bear with me for a short time I will put them out of their misery. There are no other extraneous constitutional circumstances at present. I accept that as the correct constitutional principle, namely, that the Governor-General should act on the advice on the Prime Minister in this situation. In the State sphere, of course, as honourable members have been quick to point

out, the Australian Labor Party acted on that principle in calling the recent State election.

Whatever limited reserve powers the Governor-General has, they do not extend to refusing a dissolution and an election to the Prime Minister commanding a majority in the Lower House. One may be able to argue a case for a fixed term for Governments but that is not the current position in our Westminster-derived system. In the United Kingdom, Mr. Wilson in 1966, 1970, and 1974 sought early elections, as did Mr. Heath in 1974. Sir Robert Menzies sought an early election in 1963. On each occasion, the Head of State granted the dissolution and the election.

However, the right to ask for a dissolution is based on the premise of the Governor-General's accepting advice tendered by his Ministers. Mr. Fraser repudiated this in 1975 and he now seeks to rely on it. It will be interesting to see whether the present Governor-General grants an election, particularly given his stated views on the active role of the Governor-General. When he was speaking to the Indian Law Society he stated:

Sometimes the situation arises in which a Prime Minister may seek to have Parliament dissolved before its constitutional term has expired. It is, of course, not sufficient for him to seek a dissolution of Parliament simply because he would like to have an election long before it is due. The essential question is whether the Governor-General can be satisfied that Parliament has in fact become unworkable. The country should not be forced to an early election merely to help solve internal Party questions, but only when it is necessary to deal with a situation which Parliament itself cannot solve.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you agree with that viewpoint?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No. I believe that to be an incorrect statement of the constitutional principle but, should the Governor-General grant an election in the face of this statement in view of his acting on it in 1975, Mr. Fraser and Sir John Kerr's cynical use of the constitutional machinery will again be working in tandem.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You are frightened of an election at the moment, are you?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No. We are looking forward to it. Look at the Gallup polls.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Debates across the Chamber between members other than the speaker on his feet are out of order.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That a dissolution and an election should be granted to the Prime Minister is accepted as constitutionally correct, but constitutional correctness does not imply political acceptance. In the face of previous promises and attitudes, the Prime Minister should not tender that advice. The simple fact is that the Liberal Party, after attempting to deny the A.L.P. the right to govern for a full three years on two occasions within three years (and the last successfully), then sought a three-year mandate to carry out its promises. Seeking an early election evades that commitment.

That he will have fallen down on yet another commitment and seek an unwarranted and unnecessary early election solely because of his declining popularity will be a significant issue put by the A.L.P. in any election campaign.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You would say that, if the Prime Minister wanted an election in December, he should be able to have it, would you?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am saying that the Prime Minister is constitutionally able at any time to advise a dissolution to the Governor-General, and the Governor-General is constitutionally obliged to accept that advice. I am saying that there is a clear distinction between what the

Constitution implies and what is politically acceptable and right, and the campaign we would be conducting would be that, in the circumstances of the Fraser Government's specific commitment to carry out its promises in three years (a promise made at the time of or soon after the election campaign of 1975), it ought to carry out that commitment.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You may find that the Governor-General does not accept that advice.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: If he does not, I would be disagreeing with the Governor-General on a constitutional issue, but that will not prevent me from campaigning on the political issue of whether Mr. Fraser ought to have tendered that advice, and certainly in the political sense he should not have, following his commitments made after the dismissal of the Whitlam Government in 1975.

What I have said about Mr. Fraser's political cynicism introduces my main purpose today, namely, to deal in a more general way with the problems our democratic system faces in the light of the current economic, energy and ecological crises and the response, or lack of it, by politicians to them. The cynical actions exemplified by the Prime Minister have important implications for our democratic institutions and the system of Parliamentary democracy as it currently operates in this country. It may be that politicians have always promised more than they can produce, and certainly Australians have always held their politicians in healthy disrespect. I am reminded of the statement that, regardless of how one votes, a politician always wins.

Undoubtedly, during the 1930's and the depression years, politicians promised and failed to produce, but that problem seems to be even greater today, particularly as democratic Governments of the West flounder from one policy to another in an attempt to rise out of the economic recession. The gap between promise and performance widens. Rhetoric and reality rarely coincide. Political campaigns are conducted at the level of soap powder schmaltz or are based on creating fear and uncertainty. Little attempt is made at genuine education and enlightenment about the real and complex issues in society. Politicians go home contented if they have scored a good point for the day. The tailoring of policies to current electoral advantage often avoids the real underlying issues in the community.

In the years immediately after the Second World War, because the capitalist economic system was able to produce an increase in material wealth and there was a certain so-called economic miracle, Governments were generally able to provide greater benefits to the community, although the inequalities within it were rarely affected significantly. There was more of the cake to go around, and workers and the disadvantaged could share in it. "You have never had it so good," a statement made by Super-Mac, Harold MacMillan, in the United Kingdom, may have had a ring of truth about it, albeit only a very temporary one.

Performance could generally match the promise, at least in terms of economic growth. The long periods of generally stable Government in the years immediately after the Second World War in most Western countries probably were indicative of some general satisfaction with the economic stability and growth of the Western economies during that period. However, the dangers for democracy were becoming evident in the 1960's. In 1964, in the United Kingdom, Harold Wilson won on a great wave of reform and promise of a technological miracle to put Britain on a solid economic path.

His failure to live up to his promise resulted in Mr. Heath's election in 1970 on a policy of restoring Britain's

economic health. In 1974, Harold Wilson was elected on the same platform because Heath had failed to produce. If an election were held now in the United Kingdom, the Conservatives would be likely to win, doubtless on the same platform. That experience is to some extent mirrored in this country, although somewhat later in time because the economic issues underlying it undoubtedly came later.

I will quote statements from current leaders of political Parties to indicate what I mean. In 1972, the Leader of the Labor Party, Gough Whitlam, stated in his policy speech:

Will you again entrust the nation's economy to the men who deliberately but needlessly created Australia's worst unemployment for 10 years? Or to the same men who have presided over the worst inflation for 20 years?

In 1975, we heard the old tune again, but this time from Mr. Fraser. In his policy speech, he stated:

We will begin the task of economic management with clearly defined goals . . . a basic long-term programme. Our principal objectives will be to control inflation, to create new jobs, to get confidence back into the private sector and to set the economy on the path to full recovery.

Further, in his policy speech Mr. Whitlam stated:

Labor's first priority will be to restore genuine full employment—without qualification, without hedging.

In 1975 Mr. Fraser stated:

Only under a Liberal-National Country Party Government will there be jobs for all who want to work.

We know what happened in the economic situation following the election of both those Governments. Should Governments be unable to produce on these crucial issues, then the crisis for democracy will deepen. The bind that we find ourselves in is that people will not vote for the Party that does not promise a better future, yet that future in terms of low inflation, full employment and economic growth is becoming harder and harder to fulfil. The promised land is always offered, but the Government never takes anyone there. The continuing cynical simplification of promises and the failure to implement them places a great strain on people's respect for institutions and the political and economic systems.

Often the real issues and underlying problems are masked by the shadow-boxing of political adversaries. The circus diverts the masses but does not give them bread. A long-term honest and straightforward appraisal of the world community's problems becomes confused by the desire to win the political point of the day. What are such problems? Will our democratic system as it presently exists be able to cope with an increasing world population and its demand on resources?

The government of large cities is becoming increasingly difficult, and that applies not only to large cities of the developing world such as Bombay and Calcutta in India. The cities of developed nations are confronted by the same problems, and the governability of such cities as New York and London is becoming extremely difficult. It has become recognised that government and management of Melbourne and Sydney is much more difficult than the government of Adelaide, yet faced with such problems the Opposition harps about Monarto being a waste and an extravagance.

A further problem concerns the average per capita United States consumption of energy, which is vastly more than the Chinese or the Indian consumption, yet attempts by President Carter to develop an energy policy based on the conservation of resources, as well as attempts to find new sources of oil, and other energy sources, is presently being subjected to a rough time in Congress because of the vested interests opposing this programme. I refer to the vested interests of the oil companies and the general opposition toward the policy of conservation of resources.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why do you always put the blame on the small groups who produce such things? The question is much wider than that.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Leader can say that but, from what I gather about the present position in the United States, significant opposition and lobbying against President Carter's conservation programme is coming from these groups.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: They're like a bunch of war profiteers.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: True, and there will be a shortage of oil in the world, and the problems confronting this country will be obvious. Perhaps there should be some form of disincentive to the profligate use of oil-based products. One such disincentive would be a petrol tax, with the revenue raised being used for further research into alternative energy forms, or perhaps spent on increased exploration. However, the removal of the petrol tax when it did exist in the Australian States was a major feather in the political caps of the Premiers. In fact, it was electorally imperative that that tax be removed.

I now turn to further problems that exist. What has Western democracy been able to do about world poverty and world development? Disparities and inequalities now remain as great as, if not greater than, they were immediately after the Second World War. In a recent speech to the United Nations the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary of the United Kingdom (Dr. David Owen) stated:

The human needs of the developing world are an inescapable challenge to us all and a central element in any foreign policy based on human rights.

Such statements have been made throughout the United Nations and in world forums, certainly since the end of the Second World War, and probably by many people before that. However, the inescapable facts remain. Dr. Owen also stated:

Between 1952 and 1972 the gross product of the advanced industrialised nations increased by 1.82 trillion dollars. The aggregate product of the underdeveloped world in 1972 was less than a third of this increase. This statistic is shocking enough. The reality behind it is even more so. It is generally agreed that more than 400 000 000 people have an insufficient protein supply. About 70 000 000 of them are immediately threatened by starvation. In some of the very poorest countries there is a 50 per cent infant mortality rate, and the development of people's brains is literally stunted by protein and calorie insufficiencies. Most of the world's poor only have access to unsafe water.

I now refer to the successor of the British Empire, the Commonwealth of Nations, that organisation committed to fostering world development yet, if one looks at the average income levels of people in the Commonwealth of Nations, one sees that they range from Bangladesh, where the annual per capita income is \$100, to Canada where it is \$6 190.

Despite that organisation's continual support of development it has been unable to produce any satisfactory solution. Further examination of Dr. Owen's comments indicates that he is aware of the same sorts of problem that I have been putting to this Chamber this afternoon. Dr. Owen stated:

The present world recession has hit both developed and developing nations. The developing nations will easily become cynical and despairing if the developed world's actions run counter to its rhetoric.

Cynicism on an international scale will be matched by cynicism internally if we cannot cope with both international and internal economic problems. As a community we talk about world development, co-operation and the

dangers of the gap between the developing and the developed countries, but we do little that is concrete to help.

An increase in purchases from those countries and increased trade with them would do more to provide an economic base for them than would any other action. However, producing such a situation by a reduction of tariffs in Australia is electorally unacceptable. Although that may not be the only means of assistance, it is one avenue whereby Western communities can significantly help developing communities. Such action is electorally unacceptable in our community because of the obvious effects it would have on jobs. In the meantime we assuage our collective consciences by giving to Community Aid Abroad and the Freedom from Hunger Campaign.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What are your views about the restriction on population growth? How do you handle that problem?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I agree that it is not an easy problem to handle. Most developing countries are committed presently to restraints on population growth, whether it be the People's Republic of China or, say, India. Apart from forcing people to restrict the number of children they have, the programmes that are being relied on are largely education programmes and attempts to explain the difficulties of having large families, including the enormous strains placed upon resources. Certainly programmes seeking to convince people of the importance of restricting population growth ought to be continued.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Don't we have to find alternative means of supplying even an existing population with energy? Where do you see the energy coming from?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That opens up another question.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are back where you started.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am not sure what the Leader is getting at. I thought he was trying to make a serious point, but apparently he was engaging in frivolity.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is a very serious point.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Obviously, even if there is a restriction on population growth in the world community, there will still be the problem of distributing resources in that community and the problem of the disproportionate use of those resources, whether energy or raw materials, between the developed communities and the communities of the Third World. One of the problems is that the developed communities have not come to terms with the problems associated with the use of our general resources as well as our energy resources. Governments simply put such problems in the "too hard" basket.

Unless we do something about these things, there will be an acute crisis in our democratic system in the next 10, 15 or 20 years. How can democracy cope with the consumer goods orientation of our economy in the face of the pressure on resources? This question is particularly relevant to South Australia. One of the factors referred to in connection with assisting our economic recovery is the stimulation of car sales; a reduction in sales tax is commonly suggested. The intention is to expand the output of the motor vehicle industry. How is that related to our overall long-term energy needs? Is the stimulation of the production of V8 motors any answer?

I refer, too, to the question of the stimulation of the production of consumer goods. For example, has any assessment been made of the effect of the production of dishwashers and the increased use of water that they require? In connection with the purchase of dishwashers, has there been any calculation of the possible public cost of building new reservoirs? Has any assessment been made

of the effect of the increased water usage on the ecology of the Murray River?

It is also suggested that, to stimulate the economy, we should stimulate the sale of air-conditioners. One of the main absurdities of the current situation is that a greater strain is placed on our power resources in the summer months as a result of the use of air-conditioners.

Capitalism has produced an economy where distribution is based on profit, not on need. The pursuit of self-interest in the form of profit does not necessarily ensure production of goods, nor does it ensure the provision of services that are needed by the community. This is particularly true in a time of pressure on energy resources. The supply and demand mechanism of the market place to fix prices seems to be totally inadequate to cope with the production and distribution of goods made from a non-renewable or non-substitutable resource.

Our economic system does not contain any method of accounting for the effects of economic decisions on the future of energy and resources and their effects on the environment generally. Any stimulus to the economy, whether through an unemployment relief scheme or not, increases the production of non-renewable, built-in obsolescent, consumer goods that are not related to real needs and whose effects on energy and resource use have not been accounted for.

The politician who cannot produce looks for scapegoats or he attempts to divert people's attention by international escapades. Sir Robert Menzies used the latter device to get himself into power and maintain himself in power. The former device will no doubt be used by Mr. Fraser in the present power dispute. No doubt he will blame the communists for all the troubles that will flow from that dispute. Mr. Halfpenny was condemned by the men on the job for his attempt to resolve the issue and get the men back to work.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Mr. Halfpenny was described by the men as a "sell-out merchant".

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. Yet this is supposed to be a communist-inspired plot to bring the country to its knees. Thankfully, in this State the Dunstan Government has performed capably. I suppose one can say that a State Government does not deal with the fundamental economic decisions needed to cope with the sorts of problem that I have outlined. Generally, the Dunstan Government has based its approach to reform and change on the education and enlightenment of the people and on putting the issues to them clearly. The change in the State Constitution has been a clear example of the way in which the Dunstan Government has gone about getting an educated and informed view of change and reform.

There was a recent example in the State election where the Liberal Party did not raise its political tactics to such a standard. One only has to refer to its exploitation of the law and order issue. I refer particularly to the Liberal Party's candidate for the Norwood District, Dr. Zacharia, who in advertisements leading up to the election tried to blame the Premier for the stabbings that had occurred in that district. That form of politics was practised not only against the Premier but also against other Government candidates.

In using such tactics for short-term political advantage, they failed to come to grips with the problems of crime in the community and the reasons for crime in the community. Their proposals were completely cynical and totally mistaken. They tried to say that all prisoners should serve the full sentences laid down by the courts. On the day after Mr. Tonkin made such a statement he repudiated it when it was pointed out to him that the courts already had power to set a minimum term before parole. Liberal

candidates tried to exploit this issue to play on people's feelings, without really trying to come to grips with the basic problems in the community, which are probably more related to unemployment and social conditions than to the sentencing policies of courts.

Increasing cynicism towards politicians and Governments that cannot fulfil their promises to restore economic prosperity, and a tendency to avoid the difficult issues in the nature of our capitalist economic system, distribution of resources in the world community, and effect on the environment, provide a growing threat to our democratic system. If an answer is to be found, it must lie in the solutions based on the main tenets of the democratic socialist tradition. The motivation will have to be international, collective and co-operative, based on society's real needs; a philosophy based solely on the individual pursuit of profit seems to be as outdated and inappropriate as the politicians who continue to espouse it. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I support this motion, the adoption of the Address in Reply, because it is traditional to do so. In doing so, I join with His Excellency in offering my congratulations to Mr. Walter Crocker on the way in which he fulfilled the role of Acting Governor in a very capable way. He brings to the office a dignity which rightly earns him the respect and thanks of all South Australians. Unfortunately, the Speech with which His Excellency opened Parliament was an insult to the institution of Parliament. In saying this, I mean no disrespect to His Excellency. As everybody knows, the Speech with which the Governor opens Parliament is written for him by the Government. I have no doubt that the Governor was ashamed to have such a Speech presented to him to open his first Parliament since assuming office.

This Speech was a deliberate, calculated insult, and it shows the arrogance of the Premier and the members of his Government. We warned the public of South Australia that, if a Labor Government was returned, we would see more of the arrogance and contempt of Parliament which has been increasing over the last seven years. The people of South Australia, by a significant majority, elected to take more of the same medicine. This was their choice, and all I can say about it is that I hope they do not complain too much if they find the medicine a little unpleasant to swallow. The Hon. Mr. Blevins referred to the Premier's policy speech and said that that was sufficient, that that is all that was necessary to take the place of the opening Speech. He had that speech incorporated in *Hansard*. At the time of the election, alternative policies were put forward by the Liberal Party. The people chose to accept the policies of the Labor Party. As I have said, it will not be long before they come to regret that action and so that they can make a proper comparison, I seek leave to have the policy speech of the Leader of the Opposition incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Liberal Party's Policy Speech

Fellow South Australians: The vote you cast on the 17th September will shape the future of South Australia for the rest of this century. The Liberal Party presents to you a clear and positive vision of the future; a vision based on a faith about what this State and its people can achieve if they are given a chance and if they are allowed to make decisions for themselves about their own futures and that of their families. Devoid of positive ideas, the Labor Party offers you nothing but more of the rot of the last seven years—more broken

promises, more waste, more neglect, more unemployment, more and higher State taxes, and more Trades Hall tyranny.

The Liberal Party presents you with a comprehensive range of progressive, responsible policies. The measures which I shall outline tonight, together with those already announced, will restore confidence and create jobs. Our promises will be kept! My Liberal team and I offer you a chance to get South Australia out of the mess Labor has made, a chance to get our State back on the road to renewed prosperity, security, personal freedom, employment and development, with concern for our young and care for our aged. This election will determine whether or not you will again have the freedom to manage your own affairs. This election is about who really governs the State of South Australia—your elected representatives in Parliament, or the militant union dictators of Trades Hall who are the real masters of the Labor Government.

The Labor Party and their militant masters have failed South Australia. Beneath a superficial facade of general concern, Labor has betrayed the hopes and aspirations of all South Australians. When you think about it—the record of what Labor has done, not for South Australia, but to South Australia, is appalling—they've been getting away with blue murder. Because of Labor we were all over-taxed by some \$8 000 000 last year. Because of Labor we now pay more than 5½ times as much in taxes as we did in 1970. Because of Labor we pay twice as much pay-roll tax as we used to. Because of Labor, in Adelaide we pay more for our water than in any other capital. Because of Labor, the Consumer Price Index in Adelaide has risen at a faster rate than any other State capital, over the last six years. Because of Labor our food and clothing costs are the highest of any capital. Because of Labor our building costs are the highest of any mainland capital. Because of Labor, our Public Service has continued to grow at the highest rate of any in Australia. Because of Labor it costs more to put a car on the road in this State than in any other.

Labor cannot be trusted with anything, let alone something as precious as your future. Do we need to be reminded of the 200 broken promises? Do we need to be reminded that at the last election Labor told you that because of the railways sellout South Australians would be protected from increasing charges? Where are those promises now? Why will Labor not debate them? Where has the money gone? Why have our taxes increased? Why does Labor still persist with its monumental Monarto muddle, its ever growing bureaucracy, and its endless schemes of waste and extravagance?

The Liberal Party does not believe this is the future you want for South Australia. A Liberal South Australian Government will be a Government by and for all the people; a Government of lower taxes; a Government of jobs; a Government of incentive and development; a Government of responsibility; a Government which will spend your money wisely and give you real value for that money; and a Government which will put an end to compulsory unionism.

I am proud to present to you the Liberal Party's blueprint for the future. Many of our policies have already been announced, including a detailed and realistic programme for rural affairs. Nothing is more vital to the future development of our society and our State than support for the family unit. Our social stability and our progress has been built upon the concept of the family and few institutions are so much under threat today.

The Labor Party has, belatedly and grudgingly accepted the Liberal Party's policies on community security.

A Liberal Government will establish a permanent law reform commission, and will review all penalties for criminal offences. We will further legislate to allow the Crown to appeal against the leniency of sentences and will cover claims for property damage caused by absconders. We will support

the members of the Police Force in maintaining community security. We will take immediate steps to amend the present Juvenile Courts Act to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. This will allow time to bring down considered legislation that will more effectively deal with young offenders, and protect the community.

We will protect and strengthen the quality of family life in South Australia by measures already announced. To remove the crippling burden placed particularly on small family enterprises we will start to implement our policy of the total abolition of succession duties and gift duties during the life of the next Parliament.

I turn now to the major issue of home ownership. Labor as a Party has always opposed home ownership, and Labor policies in South Australia have consistently discouraged it. We will provide a rebate of stamp duty to a limit of \$500 on the purchase of any first home, such that it will be available on any one transaction for any one individual.

Land tax has also been used by Labor to discourage home ownership—to make it almost impossible for young people to own their homes, and increasingly difficult for the elderly to remain in them. During the normal life of this Parliament, a Liberal Government will legislate to exempt from land tax all properties of half a hectare or less used as the principal place of residence by the owner.

There will be no more hidden rates and taxes on property. Valuations will be made on current land use and not on the assessed potential use of property. Adjustments will be made only at the time of sale and will be based upon the actual purposes for which the property is sold. There is an urgent need for the total updating of planning legislation. The failure of the Labor Party to plan adequately and to review planning has led to the costly waste at Monarto, and the sprawl of the Adelaide metropolitan area.

A Liberal Government will usher in a new deal for local government in South Australia. We believe local government plays a fundamental role in government and needs greater autonomy. A Liberal Government will do this and free local councils from the centralist bureaucracy which has strangled them under Labor. Our policies include the formation of a separate Department of Local Government with its own Director; a complete rewrite of the Local Government Act; greater freedom for local government to administer its own town planning and continuation of the Local Government Grants Commission. Those areas of the State outside local government will under a Liberal Government qualify for grants through the Local Grants Commission.

Our health policy states that we will abolish the compulsory local government hospital levy over a 3-year period; this will allow local government to retain considerable funds and to use its own initiative to provide health delivery and supplementary services at the local level. The Corporation of the City of Adelaide will remain the local governing body for the area known as the City of Adelaide.

A Liberal Government will plan efficiently for inner urban renewal, and stop the drift away from those areas. Local government will be encouraged and assisted to take a more positive role in planning. A Liberal Government will put an end to Labor's unjust practices of compulsory acquisition of land and property. We will ensure that realistic and fair compensation is paid whenever such acquisitions are necessary.

A close rein will be kept on expenditure by a Liberal Government, and wasteful extravagance will not be tolerated. Planning for all expenditure must be conducted so as to get the best possible value for the taxpayer's dollar. A Liberal Government will pay special attention to the status of women. After all, we were the sponsors of the first legislation to be introduced in this State on sex discrimination. A Liberal Government will provide for women in distress; there

will be adequate shelters, to assist them when their need is acute. For those who are temporarily unable to cope we will provide emergency welfare assistance both with domiciliary care, and domestic help.

For those parents who wish to give their children adequate care, love and attention, but who are obliged to obtain employment to do so, we will encourage schemes of job-sharing so that time can be appropriately divided between home and employment. We have already announced a comprehensive policy on youth matters based upon a special concern for their particular problems and seeking to consult with them so that in partnership we can help shape a brighter future for all.

Labor has ignored the real needs of the young, and distrusts their idealism and their desire for freedom. But we welcome their concern. We will build upon it. Our exciting policy on youth is a clear recognition of the contribution young people can make in shaping our future. Labor has also ignored the elderly, those who have already given so much and are entitled to a secure retirement. I pledge an immediate review of the whole operation of the State superannuation system to ensure that those who retired before 1973 are not unfairly treated. The system of rebates for rates and taxes paid by elderly citizens will be continued.

Nothing is more vital to individual dignity and self-respect than the ability to find a job—in particular a job which is satisfying and self-fulfilling. We have initiatives which will provide jobs, better jobs, real jobs, and most important, permanent jobs. To get a job no-one will ever be forced to join a trade union. Labor has brought many businesses to the verge of collapse. A Liberal Government will assist them by raising the level of exemption from payroll tax to a flat level of \$72 000. Further, for those companies continuing to be liable for payroll tax, contributions will be frozen at real levels indexed on last year's figures, initially for 12 months, and reviewed thereafter regardless of how many additions there are to the workforce.

In effect for 12 months we will be remitting payroll tax for all additional employees. This will be a major contribution to increasing employment throughout the State. Special arrangements will be made to cover the position of new industries which we will attract to South Australia. To encourage trade training and employment there will also be a rebate of payroll tax for all apprentices. These three measures, which we know are urgently needed to help the private sector, and so create new jobs, will be financed by diverting funds from the present make-shift unemployment relief scheme.

Our plans for unemployment relief works in the future will be limited to projects of State significance; more importantly, we will replace more "make-work" programmes with incentives to employers to take on more workers or retrain workers, for permanent jobs. Jobs will be created because a Liberal Government will actively promote the growth of South Australian industry and the development of South Australian resources. South Australia depends for its prosperity on the skills of its people. To provide incentive and to upgrade standards we will support margins for skill.

The potential of the rich natural resources available in the Far North of this State has been compared with that of Mount Isa. Instead of the present \$2 000 000 we receive from mining royalties, we would be enjoying annual royalties of up to \$50 000 000 like Western Australia. These resources present a most exciting prospect of a new prosperity for South Australia—more money for State projects, lower State taxes paid by the people, and above all, more jobs. The unlimited potential that lies on the land, under the ground, and in the initiative and enterprise of South Australian workers and companies will be harnessed and developed. The further development of our natural resources of copper,

oil, coal and gas will be given high priority and we will proceed immediately to explore and define, and to initiate environmental impact studies on all proposed projects. When these studies are completed, we will be able to make decisions about the exploitation of our uranium reserves, too. Any development will be required to proceed within the strict guidelines I have already announced.

Commercial considerations alone will never be allowed to take a higher priority than safeguarding our children, and future generations. We will provide a fixed percentage of mineral royalties to help finance research into alternative forms of energy. A comprehensive policy for energy conservation has already been announced.

Under previous Liberal Governments, South Australia attracted industry because of its cost advantage. After seven years, Labor has destroyed that cost advantage. The plans I have announced tonight for pay-roll tax exemptions will be only one part of a vigorous drive to attract business and industry back to this State. Industry, business, investment and therefore jobs are presently going elsewhere—Labor's negative policies are keeping them away, policies devised and imposed upon the Labor Government by its Trades Hall masters. Labor Party policies, inspired by militant union leaders, are actually costing South Australians jobs. This will continue as long as Labor governs. In Government, the Liberal Party will not allow militant trade unionists to frustrate the wishes of the people of South Australia for more jobs and restored prosperity.

The Liberal Party has a special and unique commitment to small business. We will protect and enhance small businesses in this State. Our plans to establish a small business advisory council and a small business bureau were belatedly adopted by the Labor Party. Our plans for pay-roll tax remissions, and the expansion of the State's economy, will further strengthen the position of small businesses. There are specific pledges already made in our policies but I wish to emphasise some of them.

In community welfare, a Liberal Government will assist those in need and restore a sense of dignity, and personal control over their lives. Work on the Christies Beach Hospital should commence as a matter of urgency, and the hospital will have adequate emergency and casualty facilities. Our programme provides for expanded child care facilities, better services to care for our aged, the provision of community health centres and mobile casualty units.

A South Australian Liberal Government will take effective steps to combat the increasing drug menace in this State and a council on drug abuse will be established. As I announced more than three years ago, there will be an ethnics affairs commission directly responsible to me as Premier. We will support adequate facilities to help both children and adults take their rightful places as part of the total Australian community. Among other things, our policy outlines the need for adequate counselling and interpreter/translator services, ethnic broadcasting, and cultural festivals. South Australia's environment will be protected. Our approach will be sensible and realistic. As an example, we will see to it that while action is taken to prevent cans from despoiling the natural environment those cans sold and consumed on closed industrial or commercial premises will be exempted from deposit requirements. Other anomalies will be similarly treated with common sense, not with Labor's hysteria and constant resort to more and more legislation.

The Liberal Party's policy on off-road vehicles will balance the need to protect the natural environment, with the interests of responsible enthusiasts. Similarly the problems of Adelaide's transport can be solved with common sense. Bus routes will be extended where necessary. A circular bus route will be established and express buses introduced to and from the city. Our various transport systems will be properly

integrated, with community feeder bus services serving each local area. We will allow the experts within the Transport Authority to put forward proposals on the best ways of meeting the neglected needs of our north-eastern and southern suburbs. This will include plans for a possible tram service.

We cannot go on blaming the motor car for all our ills, or imposing ever greater burdens on individual motorists. We will provide common sense solutions to the problems of congestion, pollution and parking. The Labor Party has given the travelling public seven years of broken promises. They've given you Virgo—we'll give you a fair go. There are many areas where sport and recreation facilities are needed, and a Liberal Government will take immediate steps to help meet these needs. We have already announced our long-term plans for a large, covered sports centre.

A programme will be developed to provide more boat ramps, mooring facilities and youth training courses in seamanship. A Liberal Government will co-operate with the City of Adelaide to build a municipal ice skating rink. The Liberal Party's policy on the arts has been widely publicised and commended. A Liberal Government will continue and where necessary expand support for the arts. In Government we will allay the fears of those South Australian families holding shack sites threatened under Labor, by offering a twenty-year lease. A Liberal Government will establish a separate Department of Fisheries. We are concerned at the state of the fishing industry has fallen into under Labor. We will in consultation with fishermen and other branches of the industry undertake an immediate review of the licence and permit system. We will support managed fisheries.

Where it is appropriate a Liberal Government will convert Crown leases into freehold titles. A Liberal Government was the first to promise filtration of Adelaide's water supplies. That was in 1970 when the cost was \$35 000 000. Later that year Labor promised that this job would be completed by 1978. They repeated that in 1972. They repeated it again in 1974. The cost has reached \$150 000 000. We've almost reached 1978 but there are still 600 000 people without filtered water. We will complete this process and extend it to country areas. All the water resources of this State will be properly conserved and managed and a high priority will be given to control the levels of salinity in the Murray. Our plans for immediate drought relief have already been announced.

A Liberal Government will curb the practice of appointing outsiders to top Public Service positions, where there is already a suitable and competent applicant existing within the service. Such appointments seriously affect the morale of the loyal and dedicated officers who have made the Public Service their career. Suitable training opportunities will be offered appropriate officers to enable them to fill special positions. The Liberal Party believes in freedom of choice for the individual. The financial burdens for those who choose to educate their children at non-State schools have become too high. A Liberal Government will urgently examine the possibility of introducing subsidies to cover the interest on money for capital works in non-State schools, something already done in every other Australian State.

Nowhere is the freedom to choose more under threat by Labor than in the area of industrial relations. Compulsory unionism has been supported by the Labor Party at the same time as it subscribes to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights condemning such action. The fact is, the Labor Party is completely under the control of the militant trade unions.

Militant unionists demand compulsory union membership—the Labor Party promises to legislate for it. Militant unionists demand exemption from legal responsibility at common law—the Labor Party promises to legislate for it. Militant unionists demand the right ultimately to control the affairs of their industries, and thus of companies—the Labor

Party promises to legislate for "industrial democracy" to achieve just that. In fact it has already sent one of its militant trade unionists to investigate how "industrial democracy" works under the communists. Industry can benefit from proper schemes of worker involvement on a voluntary basis, and at appropriate levels, as agreed by employers and employees. But the people of this State should know that at its national conference in Perth the Labor Party adopted policies absolutely binding on the State Labor Party to enforce what they call "industrial democracy", by legislation covering private enterprises picked out by the Government and the unions. This election gives you the only chance you'll get to prevent these things being forced upon the people and the workers of South Australia.

A Liberal Government will immediately withdraw all directives insisting on compulsory unionism in Government departments and in companies engaged on Government contracts and for sub-contractors. We will legislate to give people back the right to choose to join, or not to join a union. Trade union officials will not be given any special privileges which put them above the law. They must be held responsible for their actions just as any other members of the community are. We have already announced our industrial relations policy. It provides for a code of behaviour on the part of unions for full protection of all people and for an independent and impartial industrial Ombudsman.

In consultation with the South Australian Consumers Association we will establish a consumer council to advise the Government where further measures for consumer protection should be introduced. We will examine the need to protect persons taking out various insurance contracts. New legislation is needed to define the relationship between landlords and tenants, the rights of both must be clearly outlined and an independent tribunal will be established to adjudicate in disputes.

This election has been brought on ahead of time because the Labor Party knows it cannot go on much longer, hiding its incompetence from the people. This election is not, as Labor seeks to make it, an election about Canberra. Money has been squandered in South Australia—and the waste of the railways money, the Monarto scandal, the effects of workers' compensation and other extravagances are clearly the responsibilities of the State Labor Government. South Australians are sick and tired of the Labor Party trying to blame someone else for its failures. The waste, the extravagance and the incompetence and weakness in the face of militant unions are the Labor Party's responsibility alone.

On September 17th the Labor Party must be called to account for its actions. The policies we put forward recognise that the development and progress of South Australia can only be brought about through our own efforts. The policies of the Liberal Party are progressive and above all responsible. Ours will be a Government which gives you value for money so that taxes can be lowered but services improved. The known future revenues of this State, together with revenues which will be generated by our expansion of jobs and investment will allow our policies to be financed without increasing the burden on individuals. Our policies balance the need for immediate action to be taken on pressing matters, with the development of policies looking to the long term needs of South Australia.

But this is not simply an election about various promises and undertakings. It is not an election about the past, it is an election about the future—South Australia's future—your future! The Liberal Party has a blueprint for the future—it is here for every South Australian to scrutinise and to endorse. The Labor Party has pursued a deliberate policy to penalise excellence, to discourage effort and to crush initiative. In its place the Liberal Party offers you a chance and a choice. A chance to demand the freedom to have control over your own

affairs. A chance to put an end to the tyranny of Trades Hall.

On September 17th, give us your charter to stop Labor's rot and bring the Liberal vision for South Australia to a reality. We present you with immediate solutions, and visionary plans for the future prosperity of the State: a South Australia with jobs for all; a South Australia where housing, transport and recreation are matters of pride not constant worry; a South Australia where prices and State taxes are held to lower not higher levels; a South Australia where a Liberal Government guarantees freedom of the individual; a South Australia where the quality of life of the family, the young and the elderly is constantly being bettered; and a happy healthy South Australia where tolerance, justice, equality, and personal safety are the rights of all.

We will put an end to Labor's rot, we will ring down the curtain on their tired old show! We will put South Australia itself back in the spotlight. We will put Government back in your hands. Share with us our vision; join with us in an exciting partnership; build with us the South Australia of tomorrow; look forward with us to the 21st century in confidence, pride, purpose and in hope.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It is not sufficient for the Government to say that it was elected on certain policies and that it would now proceed to have those policies implemented. It is not sufficient simply to refer to the Speech with which the last session of Parliament was opened just a few short weeks ago; Parliament deserves more courtesy than this. We deserve to have spelt out to us in some detail what legislative programme is to be brought before us. While I am complaining that the opening Speech does not give sufficient detail—

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: While I am complaining that the opening Speech of the Governor did not give sufficient detail, it does spell out all too clearly what we can expect from this present Government. We can expect an arrogance and a disregard for convention and propriety and, yes, decency, in a serious attempt to break down the institution of Parliament and, in particular, this Chamber. We have just had an election, in which a majority of people voted for the present Government. I do not like the situation, but I accept it. As this Council knows, I am one of those who think that an electorate should contain as near to an equal number of voters as possible. The election just held was conducted under that principle, which I support. What I do complain about in the election just held was the timing of it. I listened in some amazement to the Hon. Mr. Sumner, who attempted to justify both sides of this argument. He proved in some detail, or to his own satisfaction, that it is quite wrong for Mr. Fraser to go to the Governor-General and ask for an early election, but it is quite right for Mr. Dunstan to go to the Governor and do that same thing. There is no doubt whatever in my mind of what the correct situation should be.

I do not believe that any Party in Government should have the right to call an election before its proper time. In July, 1975, this Government was elected for a three-year term and the people had every right to expect that Government to govern for three years. Instead, because it seemed politically advantageous to the Government, an election was called early. The Government was not unworkable in the Lower House; this Council had not defeated any legislation which the Government considered vital.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What happened in 1963 with Sir Robert Menzies?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am speaking about the election which has just been held. For the Hon. Mr.

Sumner, I will make it quite clear that I do not approve of any Government of any Party calling an early election. There was no reason on this occasion to call an election except that the Government decided that the political climate was right and that it could gain an advantage. In my view, a Government here should do what it has to do in America; it should run its full term unless it is defeated on the floor of the Lower House; or unless the deadlock provision applies. Neither of those things occurred on this occasion. I hold this view, irrespective of which Party calls the election.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I hold the contrary view as to the actual constitutional position.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You are a lawyer.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The Hon. Mr. Cameron has taken the words out of my mouth. We have just listened to a pedantic lecture from the Hon. Mr. Sumner, but I disagree with him. We went from Norwood to London in one paragraph. I have not done any actual checking but it seems to be many years in State and Federal Parliaments since a Parliament ran its full term. I speak for all voters when I say that I am sick and tired of elections, particularly elections held without genuine reasons. Despite the fact that this Government continues to take South Australia down the road to disaster, I hope that it will run its full term until March, 1981, which I believe is the constitutional time that it can run. That is the only way in which we can have any stability in our Parliamentary system.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I thought the Liberal Party's slogan was, "Victory in 1980".

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I do not know where the Hon. Mr. Blevins saw that, but I certainly did not see it. I am giving my own views on this matter, not necessarily those of my Party. I hope that the Government runs its full term, so that some stability can return to South Australia.

As I have said, I believe in a democratically elected Parliament. One could say that we have that at the moment, in that we have a Government elected by the majority of people in this State. But what is becoming more and more apparent is that this State is not ruled by the people who sit on the benches opposite: people outside this place decide what will be done. There is example after example of this. The shopping hours question was one, when the Minister of Labour and Industry refused to face up to his responsibilities because of union pressure. It was not until pressure was exerted from this side that the Minister was finally forced to take action. He then appointed a Royal Commission. He said at the time that the Royal Commission brought down its findings that the people of South Australia would have late night shopping before Christmas.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What a waste of time that Royal Commission was.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes, it was unnecessary. If the Government really wanted it, it could, by accepting my Bill, have had late-night shopping before last Christmas. The report headed "Night shopping in city may be delayed", in the stop press of today's *News*, states:

The introduction of night shopping in Adelaide may be delayed beyond the December 1 introduction planned by the State Government. Night shopping legislation will be introduced into State Parliament tomorrow. However, industrial and retail observers said today it would be "almost physically impossible" to have satisfactory industrial legislation introduced in time.

This is despite the promise given by the Minister of Labour and Industry at the time of the Royal Commission that Adelaide would have late-night shopping before Christmas. I appeal to the Government, if for any reason

legislation cannot be passed in time, to allow shops that so desire to open one night a week for the three weeks leading up to Christmas.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Will you support the legislation?

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I believe in late night shopping.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Will you support the Bill?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I have not yet seen the Bill.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: If it was based on the recommendations made by the Royal Commission, would you support it?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am letting myself be sidetracked on this matter. I believe that the Royal Commission was a complete and utter waste of time and public money.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What are you condemning the Government for: what was in the press and in the television news? It says, "Industrial and retail observers"—nothing to do with the Government.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The point is that the Minister of Labour and Industry promised that Adelaide would have late-night shopping before Christmas, but it now seems that we will not have it by then. I am asking the Government, if it wants late-night shopping implemented before Christmas, to allow shops that so desire to open one night a week for the three weeks leading up to Christmas.

I now refer to yet another matter that involves the Minister of Labour and Industry. Last year, the Minister wanted to extend bread baking hours. Indeed he called a press conference to announce that fact. Five hours later he had to say that, although he wanted to extend baking hours, pressure from outside had prevented him from doing so. I ask who is really governing this State.

The example with which I should like to deal is that which was dealt with to some extent by the Hon. Mr. Sumner, that is, the matter of uranium. In this respect, I refer to a report headed "Uranium sale is inevitable" in the *News* of June 27, 1975, as follows:

It was quite inevitable Australia would have to provide enriched uranium to Japan, the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said today. He said it might well be possible that a uranium enrichment plant would be established in the northern Spencer Gulf region. "If we are to maintain employment in this country we must maintain Japan's purchase of our goods," the Premier said.

As a result of that, the Government instituted a feasibility study into the establishment of a plant. In July, 1976, the results thereof were released. I now refer to another report in the *News* headed "Redcliff best site for \$1 400 000 uranium complex", as follows:

A State Government report says Redcliff, south of Port Augusta, is the best site in Australia for a \$1 400 000 000 uranium processing and enrichment complex. If the project went ahead it would be Australia's largest single industrial complex. It would be bigger than BHP's steel plants or any car factory or oil refinery in Australia.

The report says the plant would generate an income of \$426 500 000 a year when fully operational and employ up to 800 workers during the eight years it would take to build.

It would also provide direct factory employment for 1 550 people, support a \$50 000 000 a year centrifuge manufacturing industry in Adelaide and support a town with a population of 4 650.

Later, the report continued:

The report gives more than a dozen reasons why Redcliff is Australia's best site for the project. These include its closeness to Port Pirie, its central location in relation to uranium deposits in Queensland, the Northern Territory and Western Australia, its isolation from violent weather and naval attack, the nearby power and transport infra-structure, its closeness to heavy chemicals and metals produced in the iron triangle, and the need for diversification of South Australia's industries.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What's wrong with that?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Nothing. If the honourable member would be a little patient, he would see what I was leading up to. On July 27, 1976, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. Hugh Hudson) returned from a European trip, when he gave a press conference. A report in the *News* of July 27, 1976, relating thereto was as follows:

Mines and Energy Minister, Mr. Hudson, on his overseas tour, found every country in Western Europe interested in Australia's uranium. He said today if a decision were made to go ahead with the uranium enrichment plant in Australia the financing of it would not be a particular problem.

Mr. Hudson made this statement in his first press conference since returning from overseas. He visited Britain, Norway, France, Switzerland, West Germany, Austria and Italy. Mr. Hudson said: "If we wish to have a uranium enrichment plant in this country it is clear we would have to negotiate that arrangement as part of our overall arrangements for the selling of uranium."

It seems clear from that report that both the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy were at that time fully in accord with the mining and export of Australia's uranium.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: In the future.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Obviously, it would be in the future; it could not have been done straight away. The Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy both saw the advantages of mining, processing and exporting uranium, provided that adequate safeguards were ensured. Everybody agrees with that; no-one is arguing that point.

However, they are not the one with the say in this matter. There was pressure from outside. The Minister of Mines and Energy is a strong man, and he held and still holds the view that we should mine and export uranium, although he also has to do as he is told. What about the Premier? That is a different matter. A report in the *Advertiser* of July 8 this year, dealing with the A.L.P. conference in Perth on July 7, states:

The A.L.P. yesterday declared a total and indefinite moratorium on the mining and treatment of Australia's vast uranium resources.

Remembering that two years previously the Premier had been approving the setting up of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia and would not wait and sell our uranium to Japan, I point out that this was stated in the report to which I have referred:

The long-awaited decision on Labor's uranium policy came in a motion by the Victorian A.L.P. president and former State Labor leader, Mr. C. Holding, and the South Australian Premier (Mr. Dunstan) . . . Mr. Dunstan said the moratorium would not be a short one despite the risk of "quite grave economic damage to our country." . . . It said it was imperative that no commitment of Australia's uranium deposits to this cycle should be made until a reasonable time had elapsed for full public debate.

I ask the Council what sort of full public debate the Australian Labor Party wants. The Whitlam Government set up the Ranger Inquiry Commission, under Mr. Justice Fox. That commission sat for a long time (it may have been years), going all over Australia calling for the public

to offer views and opinions. What more public debate do members opposite want? Surely, the debate could go on for ever.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: He wanted a full inquiry.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I fail to see how he would consider that his own inquiry was not a full one.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Do you agree with the Prime Minister on the disposal of high-level wastes?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: There has been full and complete public debate. The democratically-elected Government of this country, seeking the best possible advice, has decided, but the decision is not being accepted by a minority group (as the Hon. Mr. Sumner knows full well it is). What are we going to come back to? Will we come back to the days of demonstrations and violence in the streets because people will not accept what has been decided? If the Hon. Mr. Sumner is correct and there is an early election, there will be opportunity for the people to disapprove of the Government's policy and to throw it out, but I venture to say that the Fraser Government will not be thrown out. The report of the A.L.P. conference on July 7 also states:

The conference also instructed any future Labor Government to "repudiate" any commitments by a Liberal-National Country Party Government to mine, process, or export uranium.

The key word there is "instructed" and it underlines the main difference between the two sides of the Council. Members opposite are elected, but they are not elected to make decisions: the decisions are made for them by people outside this Parliament. The Liberal Party also has conferences at which motions are put and carried concerning policies, but these are recommendations or suggestions to members, not instructions. What is the point of having a Government if that Government cannot make its own decision? I must admit that it must make life easy for members opposite. They can come here and never have to think again. Then, the unions come into the act on uranium. Irrespective of what the Government decides, the Transport Workers Union proposes a uranium ban. On July 27 a report about that matter stated:

The Federal council of the Transport Workers Union will recommend to its 66 000 members a virtual total ban on the handling of uranium. After long discussions the 21-man council, meeting in Melbourne, decided unanimously on a policy of total opposition to the mining and export of uranium, except where it could be established the uranium was intended for physical and biomedical research, or for medical purposes.

On August 26, another group of unions came into the act and decided that they would ban the mining and export of uranium. A report in the newspaper of that date states:

The Northern Territory's Trades and Labor Council has recommended all its unions to completely ban uranium mining until the dangers are overcome. Secretary of the council, Mr. Terry Kincaid, said the ban would operate until it could be proved workers would not be affected and that waste products could be safely disposed of.

It is well known that uranium mining has a safer record than has coal mining and much other mining.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is a stupid statement.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: We have become used to the antics of the Hon. Mr. Foster in the two years that he has been here, and he must be astonished when he reads in *Hansard* what he has said. I repeat that there has been too much delay in the mining and export of Australian uranium. It is essential for Australia's economy that we mine and export it: we cannot afford to leave it in the ground. The A.L.P. policy would spell the death-knell of a major industry in this State.

I am speaking not only of the uranium enrichment plant. There must always be doubt about that project being built. Private industry does not seem to be in a hurry to come to South Australia. It is likely that a plant, when one is set up in Australia, will not be set up in this State, because of the repressive policies of this State Government. What I am speaking of now are the giant ore reserves at Roxby Downs. At that site there is potential for a town the size of Mount Isa and for the provision of both income for the State and employment opportunities. However, Labor's claim that Roxby Downs could go ahead without uranium mining was nonsense.

The Premier has said that the uranium could be stockpiled, but he knows perfectly well that uranium makes up half the potential financial return and that the mine would not be economic under these conditions. The A.L.P.'s attitude is completely shortsighted. There is constant talk of an energy crisis, and doubtless the world faces such a thing. Many countries, notably Japan, have geared themselves to a nuclear technology because of this.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is your attitude to the disposal of nuclear waste?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Experts who support both sides can be found.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I quoted the independent reports and the two recommendations.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: There are other independent reports showing that this matter is being researched and that the problem will be overcome. In Australia, we have to capitalise on the energy crisis. For example, we do not have an electricity crisis: South Australia has known coal resources to last it almost to the end of the century, and Australia has coal to last it several hundred years.

This means that factories could operate because machinery presently running on natural gas or oil could be powered by electricity. However, we will be soon faced with what can best be described as a transport crisis. The oil to run our transport will eventually dry up but, before it does, it will become prohibitively expensive. You, Mr. Acting President, when speaking in this debate yesterday, referred to the fact that by the late 1980's the luxury of owning a car might not be in respect of the purchase price but in respect of the cost of the petrol to run it. Indeed, in the "Odd Spot" in today's newspaper one comment referred to the fact that Australia will need soon an alternative use for parking meters because, by the late 1980's, people will not be able to afford to run their cars.

It has been estimated that by the late 1980's Australia will have an oil import bill of \$2 500 000 000. However, if uranium is exported that bill will be offset by \$1 200 000 000. We have heard many half-truths and much emotionalism about uranium. The waste from nuclear reactors is dangerous, but because the danger is recognised it means that the most stringent safeguards will be taken. The result will be that nuclear power from mining, through processing to the generation of electricity, will have a much higher safety record than any other means of generating power.

Even if this were not so, as I have said Australia has no need of nuclear reactors, but we do need the income which will result from the mining and export of uranium. I support the motion.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In support of the motion I should also like to pay tribute to the Lieutenant-Governor. I do so because he has been administering this State in respect of Vice-Regal necessities for a long period. Also I congratulate Keith Seaman (as he would like to be known) on his appointment to the State Governorship. Keith Seaman has been identified and known for the work

he has undertaken in South Australia in the post-war years for unfortunate people in the community.

He has not sought any honours, imperial or otherwise, as a result of the sterling work he has undertaken, unlike some people who have entered the area of charity work only to acquire honours here and there. Those people have been disappointed because honours are not as forthcoming as they used to be in days of old.

I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has returned to the Chamber. Although enough has been said regarding the so-called gerrymander, perhaps we have responded too much to a fellow who is not worth a candle. However, for the Leader's benefit I refer to the definition of a gerrymander, as follows:

A method of arranging election districts so that the political Party making the arrangement will be enabled to elect a greater number of representatives than they could on a fair system.

That completely explodes and lays bare the fallacy and falsehoods advanced by that great democrat DeGaris, who has never been elected in his life to Parliament by a democratic vote. Indeed, from the way he is carrying on in this Chamber and judging by his lack of support from his Party members, it is unlikely that he will be re-elected to this place.

Let us tear aside this posturing in respect of equal districts. Honourable members know that we colour ourselves by our actions within the Party to which we belong, sometimes denying ourselves preselection as some members opposite did just a couple of years ago, and none of us can be returned to this Chamber in such circumstances. Let us not be so righteous about it, let us not be so false about it. The Party machine determines who comes into these Chambers. I believe the Leader should take the first available opportunity to apologise—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What for?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: —because if there is any skerrick of principle in him he should apologise to the State Electoral Commissioners for using the term "gerrymander" in respect of the last election.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will you answer a question?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I will not answer any question. I do not hold the Leader in any high regard or as an authority in respect of mathematics or honesty. I read the Leader's speech in *Hansard* recently, and it was the greatest load of codswallop that has ever been produced by a member. I intend to refer to a speech by a previous colleague of the Leader's, and I will ensure that it is included in *Hansard*. Indeed, if members opposite will not permit me to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without reading it, I will read it to the Chamber. The Leader's colleague, Steele Hall, argued against Mr. Staley, the then Minister for Capital Territories, who holds a degree in political science from a Victorian university. However, on March 23, 1977, Steele Hall rose late at night and made the following statement:

I offer some defence for the integrity of three prominent and worthy South Australians whose character has been deliberately and systematically defamed in a speech by a member of the Ministry. I am sorry that this has happened and that I have to rise in this manner tonight. The people involved are Mr. Justice Bright, of the Supreme Court of South Australia, Mr. George Kennedy, the Surveyor-General in the South Australian Government and Mr. Norman Douglass, the State Electoral Officer. Those three people comprise the State Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission. In a strange and yet deliberate speech the Minister for the Capital Territory, Mr. Staley, last week utterly defamed those three gentlemen. He did so in a speech which he gave in the House of Representatives last Thursday.

He did not make just a passing remark. Near the beginning of his speech he mentioned the situation in South Australia and said that he would return to it. He subsequently did so. I shall quote what he said to make clear to the Senate the basis of my protest in defence of these men. Mr. Staley said:

"I have mentioned the electoral system in South Australia. Let us go back and look at the 'Donnymander' that has taken place in that State. I have put the proposition, which has been carefully worked out, that with 46 per cent of the vote the Don Dunstan Government could be returned in South Australia. What the Dunstan Government has done in South Australia illustrates the real nature of gerrymander. There is the question of the definition of the word 'gerrymander'. There are many ways that one can describe a gerrymander. But the traditional way is to explain that gerrymander is derived from the word 'salamander', Governor Gerry and all that. The original approach takes account of the fact that boundaries can be so drawn as to totally distort an electoral situation. That has nothing to do with criteria but relates to the precise way in which boundaries have been drawn. That is what has been done in South Australia."

In quite explicit terms the Minister said that the boundaries in the recent electoral redistribution in South Australia had been precisely drawn by the Electoral Commissioners to favour the Labor Party. He went on to say:

"Boundaries had been drawn so as to bring about a result which is good for Labor, which enshrines that Party in office and which makes it extraordinarily difficult for non-Labor to defeat Labor in future elections."

I repeat that the kernel of that statement is: "That has nothing to do with criteria but relates to the precise way in which boundaries have been drawn." He used the term gerrymander. It is a well known term in electoral discussions and is defined in one of the major dictionaries in the library. The Minister, therefore, made no pretence of his attack. It was deliberate and explicit and in terms that everyone could understand. I took the trouble today to obtain a copy of the Constitution Act Amendment Act (No. 5) of 1975. This is the parent Bill establishing the Commission as a perpetual commission to be charged continually with the responsibility of electoral redistribution in South Australia. I quote from page 569 of the relevant statute the section which sets out the fairness of the system which has been established. Section 77 (2), which appears in Part V, states:

" 'electoral quota' means the nearest integral number obtained by dividing the total number of electors for the House of Assembly . . . by the number of electoral districts into which the State is to be divided as at the first polling day for which the order is to be effective:

'permissible tolerance' means a tolerance of ten per centum."

A subsequent passage sets out the responsibilities and the constitution of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission. Section 78 (1) (a) states:

"(a) the Chairman of the Commission who shall be a Judge of the Supreme Court appointed by the Chief Justice to be Chairman of the Commission;

(b) the Electoral Commissioner or a person appointed pursuant to subsection (3) of this section; and

(c) the Surveyor-General or a person appointed pursuant to subsection (4) of this section."

All three members of the Boundaries Commission are appointed by a provision of the State Constitution. They are not selected at random at any particular time by any particular politician or government.

I refer the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to the definition of the term that he so loosely and viciously used in this Chamber last week. The whole of his argument falls to the ground, because he had one supportive word—"gerrymander". A

gerrymander is a tool of a corrupt politician.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Agreed.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: That is the tool that the Leader used for years. He belongs to a Party that blatantly used that tool for years. Further, he belongs to a Party that is currently using it in Queensland. He came here with a false concept and he bungled his figures. He has prostituted Dr. Jaensch's figures. The Leader made inferences from American judgments, but he lost sight of the true meaning of those judgments. He grossly misled this Council, and I point out that his previous Leader was a man of far more substance than he will ever be.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I have more ability with figures.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No. The Leader has the ability only to be cunning, and he is cunning to the extent that he may be able to confuse some of the people some of the time but not all of the time. He was not given the opportunity during the recent election campaign to confuse the people, because he was not allowed to go on to the hustings. He was virtually locked in the Parliamentary toilet; that is the only place I ever saw him. An old cocky at Caltowie said, "What have they done with DeGaris?" I replied, "The last time I saw him he was in the Parliamentary toilet." The speech in the Senate continues (referring to the Electoral Boundaries Commissioners):

They have been selected as set out in the following section to be a continuous commission. That section states:

"The commission—

(a) shall be a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal; . . ."

The commission is charged with automatically ensuring that there is a redistribution at particular periods of time in the State electoral situation and the statute says:

"82. (2) The commission is required to commence proceedings for the purpose of making an electoral redistribution—

(a) Within three months after the commencement of the Constitution Act Amendment Act (No. 5), 1975;

(b) as soon as practicable after the enactment of an Act that alters presently or prospectively the number of members of the House of Assembly;

(c) within three months after a polling day if five years or more has intervened between a previous polling day on which the last electoral redistribution made by the commission was effective and that polling day."

The Leader ignored all this in his diatribe last week, and he should be put in his place because of that. The speech in the Senate continues:

The commission therefore is named by position in the State. It is a commission of perpetual succession and it has the duty to perform an electoral redistribution every 5 years. It has, as a matter of interest, the powers of a Royal Commission. I believe that the Minister should have thought seriously about this matter before he made his despicable statement reflecting so much against members of the commission. Section 84 of the Act provides:

"The Royal Commissions Act, 1917, shall, so far as its provisions are applicable, apply to and in relation to the commission, the secretary to the commission, the members of the commission and the proceedings of or conducted before the commission . . ."

That section goes on to outline some further conditions, but the commission has the power and authority of a Royal Commission. Had the Minister for the Capital Territory made his statement outside the privilege of Parliament I believe he would be held in contempt of the commission and would be called before it to explain his actions and words.

The Leader repeated what Mr. Staley said.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Leader hinged his whole argument on one word—"gerrymander".

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Leader is a liar.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did not accuse the commission.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Leader said it was a gerrymander, and he reflected on the commission.

The former Leader of the Liberal Party in South Australia (Mr. Steele Hall) went on to say:

It is interesting to note that when this Bill passed the South Australian Parliament it represented the culmination of many years of argument about the electoral distribution in my State. It is interesting to note that in this Bill electoral distribution reached the apex of fairness of any distribution in the Commonwealth and the Bill passed both Houses of the State Parliament without a call for a division. On that basis one can expect this Act to be well and widely supported in the South Australian community. In fact it has been entrenched in the Constitution and cannot be altered in any matter of substance except by a referendum of the people to approve that alteration—

this, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris ignores—

It sets out a number of criteria and these are the only factors which are binding on the commission when it makes its distribution according to the equality of votes with a 10 per cent tolerance.

Honourable members know the criteria. They are set out as (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) and include the desirability of effecting "redistribution in such a manner that there will exist, as far as reasonably possible, amongst the population of each electoral district, a community of interest," and so on. I will not quote the criteria: they have already been quoted in the Council. The speech continues:

These criteria are the only criteria which govern the deliberations of three honest men and they have produced a redistribution on that basis. The Minister has charged them with gerrymandering the boundaries in South Australia—in the same way as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris did in this Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did not.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Leader comes into this Council purporting to be an honest person, yet he sits there and has the hide to say, "I didn't accuse those three men of gerrymandering. I made no reflection upon them. I did not name them. At no time did I mention them as a commission." From the look on his face, I can see that this is getting through to the Leader. He knows full well that he was dishonest. He now attempts to defend himself and wishes I had not mentioned the commission. He cannot do that. Even the Hon. Mr. Burdett would not be prepared to defend him in such a way as that. The Leader says, "All right; I'll tell everybody they're criminals but I won't mention their names." Everybody knows to whom he is referring. There are only three Commissioners, and the boundaries were not drawn by anyone else. The Leader cannot stand in this Chamber and say someone had any influence on them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is except for the terms of reference.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Liberal Party, under the terms of reference, fought tooth and nail to express their own particularly narrow Party point of view, every submission they made being on the basis of clinging to office or gaining office quite unfairly. They initiated an appeal that took months and months to finalise, playing politics all the way, but not being honest enough to identify themselves in connection with that appeal.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris was behind them.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: He is almost the next-door neighbour of the person who took the matter as far as the Privy Council. That was another cunning move. The Leader was quite dishonest, and so was Mr. Staley, whose remarks the Leader read before he made his contribution.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did not.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You know what he said.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Leader has referred to this previously. The fact is that it is not figures that necessarily count: it is a matter of seats, and it does not matter whether one is looking at single member electorates or multiple electorates. The Labor Party could easily have won the seat of Eyre if it had drawn more of Whyalla into it, could it not? It is only necessary to move the boundaries.

The ex-Leader of the Liberal Party is contesting Hawker for that reason, is he not? No-one can tell me that the Leader put forward a valid and justifiable argument on the basis that a percentage of votes that goes to a particular Party should resolve an election. He completely overlooks the Federal election of 1961, when Jim Killen won by a handful of votes coming from Communist party preferences. Does anyone say that in those circumstances, when Menzies had a majority of one Australia was governed from 1961 to 1963 by the Communist Party?

The Leader has already said that he cannot win the next election for the Liberal Party. How many seats would his Party have to pick up? At a Party meeting he would not be talking about obtaining an increased percentage of votes: he would be talking about the probability of winning seats, for instance, Morphett. The Liberal Party's percentage of the vote is not going to increase in any of the seats it holds. The Leader knows that that is a dishonest argument. He is going to be saying, "We have to get four seats to win government." The speech given in the Senate continues:

In case I am wrong let me again quote his words. He said:

"That has nothing to do with criteria but relates to the precise way in which boundaries have been drawn. This is what has been done in South Australia."

I repeat, that is a despicable charge and one which I refute, I, like every other South Australian, hold these 3 gentlemen who are members of the commission in the highest regard. They are honourable hard working South Australian citizens. They would turn their back on every and any dishonest practice which would be suggested of them. They have drawn boundaries which are eminently fair according to everyone's ability to have an equal say in his or her government. For their pains the Minister in his gratuitous remarks in the House has, I believe, offensively and dramatically offended and impugned their honour. I resent that. I telephoned the office of the Minister this afternoon to tell him so. He was not there. I passed that message on for when he arrives later this evening. I suggest that he should apologise. I could suggest that he do other things. This is not a Ministerial standard. It is not what one would expect of any Minister of the Crown of any Party.

It is the back alley of politics for a Minister of the Crown to assault the honour of a judge, a surveyor general and a state electoral officer. It is beyond the dignity of Parliament to listen to that sort of offence. I can understand that the constrictions of the debate may have prevented the Minister from using examples from his own side of politics, such as Queensland, which would have given an example of improper electoral boundary drawing. But to use South Australia which has produced the fairest system that Australia has seen and which is only one short step better than the admirable legislation which was put through recently in this Parliament, to hold up the best as the worst in Australia, as the Minister has done, is great disservice,

especially to himself. It is by this sort of remark that the Minister will be known.

He stands unworthy of his position by that assault on these people. Without using wilder language or calling for other things, I call on the Minister to apologise unreservedly to those South Australian citizens whom I have mentioned in this protest.

There is little more one can offer. I mentioned some of the detail of the Bill this evening to assure the Senate that, in the Electoral Distribution Bill which appointed the commissioners, there is little which prevents them from giving the fairest results. No direction is given by Parliament in South Australia which would direct them to give any biased or unfair result. There is no result which is well published and which is the subject now of Court challenge which can prove one tittle of the Minister's charges against these people.

I would like to see the Minister rise in the House of Representatives as soon as he possibly can to offer his personal apologies for the fact that he has so insulted these people. In this long search for equality in voting rights in Australia we have reached an advanced stage with the admirable situation in the Federal scheme—we have just passed what I believe is a magnificent redistribution proposal—and we have reached that state in South Australia.

Yet we should look beyond at several other States which need to come up to this standard. But if in the midst of this programme we are to have a Minister set the matter back by saying that the best is the worst, we will prolong the day when all Australians will have an equal chance of say in their government. I say again that I rose in protest. I resist the back alley politics into which the Minister for the Capital Territory has entered. I ask that he apologise to the men whose character he has so impugned.

Everything that Hall said regarding Staley applies equally, but in a more damning manner, to the Leader of the Opposition in this place, because his statements were made after the event, not beforehand as were Mr. Hall's. The Leader should stand up and apologise.

I should like now to talk about the Opposition. It comprises the weakest, lousiest lot of people that I have ever seen in any Opposition. I know, because I have served in an Opposition. The only person with an honest, direct approach in this Parliament is a member of another place: Millhouse. He has more brains, capabilities and know-how than the whole lot of you put together, and that is why you hate his guts so much. That is why you run a rotten campaign against him.

One has merely to read yesterday's *Hansard* report regarding the debate on the magistracy to see that Millhouse has more understanding and knowledge of that matter than anyone else in that place and, if the Opposition had any brains, it would take him back tomorrow. However, it will not do so. Either that, or he has too much self-respect to gang up with a bunch of hooligans like you. You, as politicians, have abdicated your responsibilities to the people in this State whom you purport to represent.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I must leave the Chamber, because I cannot listen to rubbish like this.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Well, for goodness sake leave! Go, Sir, and never come back! Members opposite cannot deny that in the recent election in some unexpected quarters, that is, country areas, a percentage of votes was taken from the Liberal Party. This happened because the Opposition completely ignored the people in the country, who are in more dire straits than other sections of the community, barring the unemployed. I spoke to an old cocky at Wilmington, who put forward the old idea that one always hears in the country. He said, "We are the backbone of the country." I do not dispute that, although I

think it is damn near time that primary producers found their own backbone. They are being bled dry by every organisation and financial institution.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Including the Potato Board?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I was referring to the position farther out in the country than that. However, from the growers' point of view, that may well be so. I think the position is more serious than that. Although the Opposition has purported to represent them, it has for decades hoodwinked and conned people in the rural community.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What's your record in that regard?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I will come to that. The Federal Labor Government was unable to break the barrier in relation to those who had been riding on the backs of rural producers. When it was in office, that Government was unable to convince the rural community what was good for it. I should like to see members opposite convince the rural community in this respect after those concerned have listened for 30 years or 40 years to people like them. They would find that the barrier would be hard to break, just as the barrier is hard to break regarding industrial workers and what members opposite consider to be their ills. This is a great problem, to which there is no easy solution. We still have the situation in the country that the only person who works his bloody guts out—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I thought you would have to say something to that, Sir. Rural producers toil, market their products and get nothing for them until year's end. On the other hand, C.S.R., B.H.P. and the shipping interests get paid. Unfortunately, however, the rural producers must wait years. This matter should not be dealt with on the basis of petty Party politics. I refer to the situation regarding wheat pools. It was the Labor Primary Industry Minister, Mr. Ken Wriedt, who stepped up payments in this regard. There ought to be a better system and, rather than the Liberal Party's criticising what the Labor Party has done, it should have come down on the side—

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What about live sheep exports?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am pleased that the honourable member has mentioned that matter. The first such export, in Sir Thomas Playford's time, was in about 1963. The first shipment of live sheep occurred on, I think, about the Queen's birthday holiday in the early 1960's. It was intended that other than waterside workers would be engaged in loading that stock. Indeed, we were told, in a dictatorial fashion, that this would be done by stock agents, such as Elder Smith-Goldsbrough Mort. During our discussions we wondered where the farmers were. They bred the sheep and took the risks, but where were they? They were not there.

They were getting a pittance for sheep. The rip-off was going to the many middlemen. The Hon. Mr. Cameron has asked about live sheep; what about live sheep exports from Western Australia? The grower gets a bigger return. One of the inhibitions in the 1960's was that farmers did not have the expertise, as they told me. They did not have the rollingstock, the holding paddocks, and so on, adjacent to the wharf to carry out a direct operation. They could have negotiated direct sales with the Middle East, but they were inhibited. I do not know whether the Government here did not have sympathy for the farmers, but the Hon. Mr. Hill was a Minister then.

A few months ago, the idea was conceived that Wallaroo was an admirable port for the export of sheep.

One reason for that was that holding paddocks owned by other people were not needed. The farmers could walk the sheep. However, stock companies from other States came to bleed off the profits. Members opposite cannot say complacently that the position in rural industry will be corrected next year if we have a normal year, because the industry is in too much trouble. The cattlemen have told Sinclair and Fraser to get the hell out of it. They have carried motions of no confidence, and they have scared hell out of Anthony. Now the politicians in Canberra are falling over backwards trying to do something for the cattlemen.

Instead of accusing Hawke and a few others, it is time the Fraser Government took a leaf out of their book and got militant organisations to cut out the false middlemen. Why should a pig breeder get about 25c a pound for the meat he produces? I ask members to take note of the profits made by G. J. Coles and other big stores. The housewife pays more than \$1 a pound for that meat. That is not because of the charges made by Samcor, and members opposite should have regard to the problems of those people to whom they refer as their constituents. People should not have a false hope that they will get more from a Liberal Party Government.

I refer now to some of the attacks that have been made by Federal Ministers about trade in this country because of the attitude correctly taken by the Seamen's union. That union wants the right to man certain ships, and the statements that have been made by Nixon (Federal Minister for Transport) about the rates paid to seamen on vessels run by Utah are false. Australian seamen were given the right to man the *P. J. Adams* in 1964, and will anyone suggest that any component part of the price we have paid for petroleum products after 1964 has been because of the manning of the vessels by Australian seamen at Australian rates?

About 12 or more ships of the Australian National Line are manned by Australian seamen. They are going to Japan, across the Pacific to the American market, across the Atlantic, and to the United Kingdom. Will anyone say that, if the rate on those vessels could be reduced to the rate on convenience vessels, the farmer would get any more for his products? It is nothing more than a political attitude taken by Peter Nixon. He publicly states, "See a head and kick it." He is not bad at kicking, and that is a terrible and atrocious way for anyone to carry on. A press report prepared by Captain Vic Sanderson in July this year, when Mr. Nixon was speaking in Darwin, states:

Last week it was widely reported in the media that the Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon, on July 25 addressed a gathering in Darwin, defending Utah's stance against the Seamen's Union of Australia. This in itself would probably have passed unnoticed in shipping circles. However, he reportedly stated that the cost of employing an Australian able seaman (AB) is about \$23 000 a year—233 per cent higher than the cost faced by a British shipowner. Consequently, the result of Utah employing Australian seamen would be that Utah has to increase its freight rate from \$9 to \$18 a tonne, an untenable situation indeed.

I refer to that report to show the stupid and false argument advanced by the Minister. By coincidence, another report in the same newspaper, printed beside the one to which I have referred, states:

The U.S. House of Representatives Merchant Marine Committee has approved an increase in the amount of imported oil to be carried by U.S. flag ships. The bill, approved on a 31.5 vote, would require that 4.5 per cent of the slightly more than 8 000 000 barrels of oil coming into the country each day be carried on U.S. ships.

Utah is largely an American company. In similar

circumstances, if Utah was an Australian company picking up American bauxite and exporting it to Jamaica or a similar destination there is no way in hell or heaven that the ships would not be American ships carrying American flags aided by the American Trade Department, where necessary, to the tune of absolute and total subsidy.

That subsidy would mean that such an American company would be given absolute preference. If any company could prove to the department that it needed finance and credit to build a ship or a fleet of ships, in the interests of American trade, it would be provided with such a loan. That explodes the false argument advanced by Mr. Fraser, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Anthony and Mr. Lynch (the remainder of the false five now that Mr. Ellicott is out).

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What would be the cost of such transport?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It does not matter what the cost would be but, if the honourable member accepted the argument advanced by the false five and then he assumed office tomorrow, he would take m.v. *Troubridge* out of service on the Kangaroo Island run.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That's not relevant.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is if the honourable member is considering the cost factor. The Seamen's Union in Australia has every right to have its view in respect of multi-national companies advanced here. Indeed, I refer to a recent edition of the *Financial Review*, which indicates the rip-off Utah gets from Australia. Fancy honourable members opposite falling for the advertisements shown on commercial television saying what a good company it is.

Today we heard about uranium from the Hon. Mr. Carnie, who said that coal mining has been a much greater disaster than has been uranium mining. However, we cannot debate the matter in respect of the mining and enrichment process of uranium. If there is a catastrophe in a mine, whether it causes atmospheric pollution from burning coal in power stations or pollution of rivers and streams through the emission of water, unlimited research is available in respect of that situation. However, in respect of uranium mining, I point out to the Hon. Mr. Carnie that the dire consequences resulting from such mining, especially in respect of arms, is not yet known. Destruction caused by fall-out and the poisoning of the atmosphere must rest squarely on the shoulders of the Liberal Party because it was party to having brought secretly to Australia, and almost to the edge of the metropolitan area, bombs that were exploded at Maralinga. I refer to the following press report:

Australia should generate power at its coalfields and pipe it to the main centres of population, Prof. Marcus Oliphant said in Adelaide today. Prof. Oliphant, who is director of the School of Research and Physical Sciences at the Australian National University, Canberra, is on a three-day visit. The date of that press report—March 17, 1952. I refer to another report:

The idea of trying to harness the power of the sun was as old as the hills, the University's Elder professor of physics (Prof. L. G. H. Huxley) said today.

That report was published in the *News* of March 17, 1952. That information has been around for years. I refer to the comments of the Premier last year or the year before regarding enrichment plants and our responsibilities regarding Japan. That can all proceed and be brought into reality because, when adequate safeguards exist, such development can be implemented. That is the Premier's view. It is false for the Hon. Mr. Carnie to say that technology is now available to overcome any anxieties regarding waste.

I refer to a recent paper from West Germany. That team

is a leader in the field but is adamant that what it is writing today touches only the threshold of giving any guarantees in respect of safeguards on mining and processing of uranium for nuclear-powered generators.

Finally, I believe that this Council should be abolished. It has no role. Honourable members opposite have been excited recently by suggestions concerning the abolition of this Chamber and they asked one another how they could defend their right to live forever. True, the Labor Party will probably find it more difficult to convince a majority of electors to get rid of the Council. Had its membership been left with a bias of 16:4 forever and a day, we would have found it easy to convince the electorate that this Chamber should go. However, having now given this Council a cloak of some respectability, it may be harder to convince the people that the Council should be knocked on the head and barred forever and a day.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I often find it difficult to speak in this Chamber, as I seem always to be landed with speaking after the Hon. Mr. Foster. He speaks in a very confused way and he confuses everyone, including me. He raves and wanders all over the place. If his last statement is correct (that he does not believe in this Council) why does he not get to hell out of it and let someone else come in? He is a disgrace to this Council.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I have not yet spat on the floor.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is the only thing that the honourable member has not done. He swears and does all the things that one would think would cause even his own Party to repudiate him, but the Labor Party seems to continue to support him. I can only suppose that he controls the numbers in connection with preselection ballots.

The result of the recent election is well known. I repeat what other honourable members on this side have said: the Government has treated this Council with absolute contempt not only by the way it set about the recent election but also by the Governor's Speech. How can the Labor Government expect this Council or the people to have any respect for it when it does not set out what it intends to do during this session? It was only in July or August that we were present at the opening of Parliament, when the Lieutenant-Governor in his Speech said what the Government intended to do.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It was the opening of a session, not of Parliament.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. We had an Address in Reply debate following that Speech by the Lieutenant-Governor, and we replied to what was set out in that Speech. However, the Government did not proceed with a single measure. It trampled on the Speech, and, in the most hypocritical action ever seen, took the House of Assembly to the people. It is clear that the Government had no intention of proceeding with what it set out in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech at the opening of the previous session. It went through the charade of opening the session and then closing it. Now, the Government refuses to say anything about its programme. The Labor Party's election policy speech was disgraceful, because it contained absolutely nothing. The press made the following point about the policy speech:

There was much that was imprecise in the Premier's speech.

Nothing could be more correct. The Government is now very similar to the Hare Krishna people who parade along Rundle Mall: Government members stand up, beat a few drums, and say, "For Don's a jolly good fellow." It is a personality cult, and it has nothing at all to present. The moment the Labor Party loses the person who has been wrapped in a cocoon, there will be nothing left. It is a

damn shame that people who perhaps had something to offer the State have allowed themselves to be turned into a personality cult. The Labor Party has abused the media of this State in a way that has never been seen before. The Labor Government has far too many press secretaries. Another press secretary was appointed last week.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: To whom?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Minister of Transport.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Government pays them well when it retrenches them.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. The golden handshake has been given to all sorts of people; one realises this when one reads today's press.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The pay-off.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Of course, if a person loses his job and does not resign, he is entitled to three months pay. Was Kevin Crease sacked? Was Peter Ward sacked? Was Adele Koh sacked? I do not think so. She met another fate! Each of these people got three months pay. Indeed, Adele Koh got a wedding present from the taxpayers. Was she a press secretary? Was she under the journalists' award? Of course not! This afternoon the Hon. Mr. Sumner implied that, if a Federal election is held before the end of this year, it will be improper, because the present Federal Parliament has not had its full life of three years. The Hon. Mr. Sumner's statement is the most hypocritical statement I have ever heard, particularly in view of the way his Party treated this Council after the opening of the previous session. The Labor Party has treated this Parliament with contempt.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They did it in 1975, too.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. If the Hon. Mr. Sumner wants to cast slurs on the Federal Liberal Party, he should check his facts. During the recent election campaign, as I watched the various policies unfold, I hoped the Labor Party would have the common sense not to allow the Minister of Transport to start again on his charades, but away he went. He could not contain himself. When the Liberal Party said it would introduce all-night bus services, which are urgently needed, the Minister immediately said it was an idea that would not have public support, was not necessary and would cost \$300 000 a year to implement. Yet in 1973 the Minister himself suggested that very policy. A little map was headed "Bus route to circle city." When I saw this map I thought, "Hullo! That is familiar." I compared the map with the map issued in 1974, and I came across the following media release:

A 12-mile route is planned for a new bus service circling Adelaide which will begin operating by October next year. It was exactly the same route and with the same names of roads.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It has probably gone back into the drawer for October, 1980.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I said before the recent election that, if we had an election, the Minister would surely come out with this again. Sure enough, he did. I think this is the fourth time it has been produced. I will await with great interest to see whether it is produced again in October this year and October next year. I suggest that if the Minister follows his usual line on this matter he will be having it promised again in October, 1981. That is, of course, if the Government does not take us back to the people again because Gallup polls happen to show a little public favour its way.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Why are you looking at Murray Hill all the time?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Otherwise I will have to look at you.

The next matter I wish to raise in relation to the Minister of Transport is the rather long, weary process he went through to get around to saying he was not going to turn certain roads in Adelaide into all-day clearways. It took a bit of pressure on the part of the Liberal Party to stop him doing just that to Unley Road and Goodwood Road. It was rather significant, just before the election, that he finally got round to that point. I trust that the Minister meant what he said, that it had been stopped indefinitely. I also trust that the Minister is not going to carry out his threat to do that because the end result is the destruction of the inner city yet further, the destruction of the inner city that has gone on incessantly under this Government. It has allowed the metropolitan area to run down, to decline to an extent that is quite alarming.

The Labor Party has been so totally obsessed with projects like Monarto that Adelaide has been left to decline. One only has to look at the figures contained in a map put out in recent years showing the decline from 1971 to 1976 where it says that there are many areas in the metropolitan area, and in the inner city, where the population drop has been quite staggering. I quote: "In the Kensington and Norwood area the population has dropped by 13 per cent; in Adelaide by 16 per cent; in Unley by 7 per cent," and so on. I suggest the reason for this is that the Government is not terribly interested in maintaining population in the inner metropolitan area. It is more concerned with building up numbers in the outer suburbs where it can obtain more seats, where a population can be built up in order to maintain the Government's hold on this Parliament.

It is shameful that the Government has allowed this to happen, knowing full well the problems of forcing people, particularly the younger marrieds, into the outer metropolitan areas, and the difficulties it causes for younger families. These people are forced to live in areas where there is no development that suits young families; where there are no schools available within the immediate vicinity; where shopping facilities are still being built and where transport problems, particularly for the young married women, are enormous. They have virtually no contact with the inner city area; the entertainment areas are there, as are the work facilities. The net result is that families, husbands and wives, are forced to travel enormous distances to work and the valuable time they could be spending with their young families is spent sitting on buses and trains, getting to and from work. It is a very serious trend indeed.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What is your solution?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It is one that this Government should have done something about instead of being obsessed with places like Monarto where it is trying to force people to live; instead of being obsessed with trying to build up numbers in the outer metropolitan areas, it should be trying to build up numbers in those areas. It should be concentrating on building up the transport systems. It should be looking towards this particular problem. It is ridiculous for Governments to ignore this trend when transport, water works—

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Who wrote that speech?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: What speech has been written for me? It is incredible that a Government has allowed this to occur when the transport facilities, shopping facilities, schooling facilities, water facilities, sewerage facilities are all there and available in the inner areas. Instead of that, it is more concerned with spending the taxpayers' money and with making sure that the population is transferred out to where these facilities are not available and where the taxpayers' funds are going to be required in enormous amounts to set them up. It is an

indictment of the Government that it is has not recognised this problem and it has not started to do something about it. Every now and then it comes up with a little show piece.

There was one it tried to sell to the press during the election campaign—Kent Town. The only problem was that at least the press of this town woke up to it and realised that it had all been said before. It has promised something on the corner of Wakefield Street and Frome Road. That has not happened. The Government is only interested in the developments that give the public the impression of great action whereas, in fact, nothing is done. It has no set policy and no real attitude on what it wants to do.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: It is doing pretty well so far. Who wrote your speech?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Why don't you go outside or shut up? This problem is critical now for the inner suburbs of Adelaide and threatens to extend beyond them to the middle suburbs of Adelaide, such as Enfield, Woodville, Campbelltown, West Croydon, Unley, and Marion. These suburbs have experienced a massive growth in the number of vacant houses in the last five years without an accompanying population growth. All these areas, except Woodville and Campbelltown, have had declining populations in this period. Woodville's population has been boosted somewhat by West Lakes, but the decline in population is Campbelltown 103 per cent, Enfield 77 per cent, Prospect 53 per cent, West Torrens 65 per cent, Marion 65 per cent, Thebarton 73 per cent, Unley 56 per cent, Woodville 45 per cent, and Walkerville 45 per cent.

One of the real problems, I believe, in the Government's attitude in this matter, is that it is obsessed with such things as the Land Commission; it feels it has to make the Land Commission bigger and better and it has to get out and buy huge amounts of land. It has become so obsessed with this that it has forgotten that there are areas in the city that the people could use without the huge expenditure of Government funds that the new areas require.

I was interested to hear the Hon. Mr. Sumner talking about the express bus routes and the necessity for them. I remind the honourable member that in 1973 this Government promised to introduce express bus routes. Where are they? They are nowhere. All that has happened in this matter in providing reasonable and fast public transport in this State is about 300 yards of bus lane marked on the road at Hackney. I have said that before. Everybody ignores it. It is just a joke; it has no legislation backing it. It just stays there and makes the Minister feel better. I am sure he drives up there often to convince himself that he has done it.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Can I raise a point of order? We have to listen to the rubbish of the honourable member talking about nothing at all. My point of order is that we are on the brink of disaster and on the brink of a union dispute which concerns many people. Here is Mr. Cameron trying to promote himself as a person who represents people. My point of order is that he is talking a lot of rubbish.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: I thank the honourable member for his comment. However, as it is not a point of order, I ask the Hon. Mr. Cameron to continue.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Minister has had ample opportunity, if he so desires, to introduce express bus lanes. He could have done so for the people living in the north-eastern suburbs who suffer every morning and evening from the transport problems created by the inactivity of this Government and of the Minister of

Transport. That Minister has neglected the problems that those people experience.

It is amazing that throughout this State's history the one thing given to a new suburb has been a decent transport system. However, the Labor Government has been in office since 1970, and what has it done regarding the transport problems experienced in new areas? It has done absolutely nothing. It has merely tried to curb the problem by destroying the residential qualities of every traffic route in Adelaide. It has widened roads, thereby causing enormous problems. The Labor Party gave the impression that it would curb the use of motor cars, whereas every action it has taken has encouraged that use. It is a shame that the Government has been allowed to stay in office and to do this. The great problem is that this has been a creeping process. The Government would have done this in relation to Unley Road; it would have created all-day clearways had it not been for the Liberal Party.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They would have turned Unley Road into a freeway.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is so. It is disgraceful that the Labor Government has been permitted to continue with its policy of destroying our roads. Every now and again the Minister comes out with some amazing proposal regarding what he will do for public transport in the city. They have all been airy-fairy schemes, and all of them have been shown for the past seven years to be utterly false.

In 1973, the Minister said that he would fit M.T.T. trams and buses with automatic devices to give them priority over other vehicles at traffic lights. Why has he not done so, and why is the Labor Party allowed to continue with these furbies?

In the *Advertiser* of February 19, 1975, a report stated that the South Australian Government appeared almost certain to buy seven electric buses for the free Bee-line service in Adelaide. What nonsense! That was yet another of the Minister's little creations. During the election campaign, the Minister came out with a brand new proposal. We were going to have trains with bubbles on them within 18 months. I will believe that when I see it.

In 1973, the Minister said that we would have double-decker trains. One of the problems was that the trains would not fit under his bridges. Of course, that was just a fundamental problem! Nevertheless, it was certainly one about which the Minister should have thought previously. Also in 1973, the Minister said that he had funds to complete the electrification of the Christie Downs railway line within two years.

Every time that the Minister says something about transport, he blames the Federal Liberal Government. How on earth the Liberal Party could have stopped him electrifying this line, when the Labor Government was in office in the Federal sphere, no-one knows. Regarding electrification, the Minister has made statement after statement. He has said that he was going to buy new trains that would be running in 18 months. Will they be electrified? No, they will be diesel trains capable of conversion later to electric trains. What a load of rubbish! I will be interested to see how those trains can be converted from diesel to electric without huge costs being incurred. Why has not the Minister honoured his promises regarding electrification?

Also, I ask what has happened regarding the underground railway line. I suppose we should all be grateful that the Minister has not proceeded with that scheme, which was yet another of his furbies. What about the Government's proposal for a helicopter? I shall wait with interest to see that when it arrives. There was even a

photograph of the helicopter in the *Advertiser* when that scheme was promoted in the recent campaign.

The worst thing I saw in the whole Labor Party campaign was its announcement regarding libraries. If ever there was an indictment of the Government, that was it. In its 1970 policy speech, the following appeared:

In South Australia our library services are inadequate. Information channels are as important as irrigation channels. Information is power in a technical age. Labor will establish an inquiry immediately—

and I hope honourable members will take note of "immediately"—

to recommend a planned expansion of all library and information services to ensure we are in advance of other comparable communities, instead of trailing them as now.

Let us now look at what was said by one of the top library experts from New South Wales. In the March 25 issue of the *Advertiser*, this gentleman was reported as saying:

South Australia has one of the worst systems of public libraries in Australia.

During the election campaign, the Premier had the audacity to say that he was giving a \$7 200 000 boost to South Australia's libraries. Why was that not done after the 1970 election? Why has it taken until now for the Government to wake up to the problem that it has ignored for the past seven years, despite all its promises?

I refer now to the filtration of Adelaide's water supply. What an incredible situation exists regarding this matter. In 1970, the Minister of Works slammed the Liberal Party for suggesting that Adelaide's water supply be filtered. He said that we could not afford it. However, at the end of 1970 he was going to proceed with the scheme. It was all right then, because the Labor Government had got into office. In 1972, the Minister said that Adelaide's water would be filtered at a cost of \$35 000 000, and that the scheme would be completed within five years, that is, by 1977. However, the scheme was not commenced until 1974, when the cost had risen to \$55 000 000. The latest estimate is well over \$100 000 000. Indeed, I believe it is \$150 000 000. This happened not because the Federal Liberal Government would not give the South Australian Government money but because this Government would not get on with the job. It sat back, as it did regarding libraries, and did nothing. It waited for four years after making the first announcement before taking action, and then complained that the cost was too great.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Meanwhile, the people of Adelaide have had to put up with filthy water.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. Even worse, it has created a two-class society: there are those with filtered water and those without it. Those with filtered water will get a little more for their properties.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What class do you represent?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: All classes. The Hon. Mr. Carnie has dealt with uranium mining. If ever I have seen a Party jumping backwards and forwards on a matter, it has been the Labor Party on that issue.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: But you have been in the Liberal Movement, the League of Rights, and the Liberal Party.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Hon. Mr. Foster is tied hand and foot to every decision of the Party to which he belongs. That Party decided to enrich uranium and export it from South Australia, and it then decided not to do it. If we get another Labor Government in Canberra, we will see the situation change again.

There has been pressure on people in the Labor Party. What do Dr. Hopgood and Mr. Hudson believe? The split will come when we get a Federal Labor Government that wants to mine and export uranium. I support the motion.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, when speaking in this debate, obviously was extremely concerned. I understand why, because during the recent State election campaign the very good swing to the A.L.P. in the city was more than doubled in the country areas. It is obvious that country people have a growing awareness of the effectiveness of A.L.P. policies.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins was unable intelligently to criticise the A.L.P. rural policies, and he merely tried to rubbish them by misquoting a report in the *Gawler Bunyip* of a statement by Mr. Jim Reese. That report was an inaccurate account of what Mr. Reese had said and it was the only basis the Hon. Mr. Dawkins could use to try to overcome a problem that was of much concern to him. The Government's rural policies obviously are receiving much attention and support in the country areas. Some major items that have received much support are the abolition of rural land tax, the relief provided in respect of succession duties, and the decentralisation of many Government services. Most of those matters are the responsibility of other Ministers, and I intend to speak on another matter that is receiving much attention in the country areas.

The *Stock Journal* editorial in the week before the election stated that not the least of the Dunstan Government's achievements was the revitalised and more purposeful Agriculture Department. I think the major achievement in this area is the more relevant information now being provided by the department. This information is being distributed to the farming community in a much better way.

I commissioned a report on the extension and information services of the department, and one thing about that report is the succinct way it put the situation in the past, stating that much of the information in the past was intended to impress rather than express. The department is now much more involved in marketing, which I think the farming community has been aware of for a long time as being the major problem in the rural industry. A marketing branch has been established and several marketing economists have been appointed.

We have seen, in the quality of submissions that the department has been putting to the I.A.C., increased purposefulness and that revitalisation that the *Stock Journal* spoke about. The Liberal Party, during the election campaign, failed to recognise the changes taking place in the department regarding regionalisation. Unfortunately, that Party seemed to listen to reactionaries who wished to revert to the specialised and remote system of the past and revert to that situation. It seemed not to understand that regionalisation of the department's services was much more than a relocation of people and a physical change in placing the services. It is a completely new concept in trying to improve the services, providing a whole farm approach to the department's advice.

I think that anyone who has been associated with practical agriculture realises that the really tough decisions are those where you have to integrate enterprises. It is the competition between the sheep enterprise, the wheat enterprise, and others on the farm which is the hard part of farm management, not the specialised skills in each enterprise. In the past, by providing a specialised service, the department was not helping in connection with the tough decisions concerning the integration of enterprises. By regionalisation and a whole farm approach to advisory services, we will rectify that situation. The only other rural policy put in the election campaign by the Liberal Party was a revival of the old hay and chaff Act as a drought measure.

I have spoken of this previously and I have said that I

have been surprised at the policy, because it has not seemed to meet the present situation. I am also surprised at the lack of confidence that this policy seemed to express in the ability of farmers to manage their own enterprise and the lack of confidence in the market place. I think the Hon. Mr. Whyte recognised the changes in attitude and commented favourably on them in his speech. I refer to the attitude where we treat farmers as responsible managers and give them financial flexibility.

The election figures in the District of Chaffey were more interesting than was the general swing to the A.L.P. throughout the rural areas. In Chaffey the swing was about 11 per cent. Several rural policies were particularly applicable to that district. The State Government was able to come quickly to the assistance of the citrus industry by providing an emergency pool for orange juice. A similar thing was done regarding the grape surplus, when an emergency pool was created there.

It was in great contrast to the sort of prevarication that is currently taking place in the Commonwealth's attitude to the grape industry. At one moment we have assistance to be provided through a duty on imported brandy and whisky, and then we find that in this morning's paper the Commonwealth has changed its mind and is not going to apply that duty on imported whisky. That is in great contrast to the swift and effective action that this State took on behalf of those two industries.

In the long term the State Government's policies, which have obviously been influential in the Riverland, include the decision not only to convert the loan to a grant for the Riverland cannery but also to become involved in the management of that cannery. I have had many discussions with people in the Riverland, and this decision has received wide support. The decisions coming from the cannery, the cost-saving programmes and improved management all result from the decision to become involved in the cannery management.

Obviously, the simple conversion of the loan to a grant will have many long-term benefits for Riverland fruit-growers. Also, the decision to use pay-roll tax remissions in the Riverland Development Fund is a positive measure to improve the efficiency and the rationalisation of the packing and processing side of the industry. It is paying off in terms of people understanding that this decision will produce many more long-term benefits for the area than will a mere straight-out conversion of that pay-roll tax to each individual packer and processor.

The Hon. Mr. Whyte raised specific questions about an article which I wrote and which appeared in an issue of *Politics*. I am surprised that the message, which I thought was fairly simple in that article, has eluded him.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Not only me.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The message was that farmers deserve support because they are part of the whole Australian community. That is the simple situation which has eluded the honourable member and perhaps others as well. The argument often advanced concerning why farmers should be supported is their contribution to exports or to the balance of payments, etc., but these points are not receiving community support as in previous years.

I refer to surveys undertaken which show the extensive poverty in rural communities. It is serious poverty, which was demonstrated forcefully in the Henderson report. Rural communities suffer many other disadvantages, and I am sure that the people concerned will receive support from the rest of Australia on the basis that all the citizens of this country should have equal opportunity.

The Hon. Mr. Whyte was also confused about remarks I made about hobby farmers. Although I do not particularly

support hobby farmers, I am not against them either. We need to accept that they are a reality and that they will not go away if we ignore them. They need to be advised on proper land use and management: they need to be integrated within our rural communities.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: They may be of assistance as well.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: True, they may be of assistance, but there are certain disadvantages involved as well. We must integrate them within our total rural policy. The honourable member also referred to the rural policy of the Australian Woolgrowers' and Graziers' Council. I said by way of interjection that some of the statements in that policy should receive much support, and I refer to a paragraph which expresses a good point of view, as follows:

In general, adjustment policies should aim to "oil the wheels of change", to assist rather than impede market forces. For those remaining in agriculture, the objective should be to ensure the long-term viability of production units. Impediments to reorganisation of inputs, expansion of farm size and access to credit, should be removed. The farm build-up and debt reconstruction facilities of the Rural Adjustment Scheme make a most useful contribution to the process of structural adjustment. There would be considerable benefits, however, from widening the scheme to

promote greater efficiency in production and marketing by encouraging the formation of machinery and property syndication and co-operative marketing enterprises. For those leaving agriculture, enormous personal difficulties, costs and dislocation are frequently involved. Adjustment policies should aim to minimise these difficulties for the people concerned, through greater guidance and more emphasis than in the past on rehabilitation, relocation and retraining programmes.

I support that view strongly. In fact, I have advocated it over the past 2½ years, although I have received much criticism from colleagues of members opposite in another place. In the past Governments have handed out anodynes to try to solve rural problems. The Labor Party has shown its preparedness to make tough decisions and to produce both short-term and long-term benefits for the rural industry. While we continue to do so, I am sure that we will continue to receive support from the rural electorate.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 20, at 2.15 p.m.