

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 23 October 1979

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

DR. DUNCAN

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Attorney-General say whether, before the recent State election, a Liberal Opposition spokesman called for the release of the report by Scotland Yard detectives on the death of Dr. Duncan some years ago? Secondly, has the Attorney-General had an opportunity to reconsider this matter, as he promised he would do several days after the election? If so, has he made any determination on whether the report will be released?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: After the election, I did not promise to review the question of the release of the report. In reply to a question asked by the media on whether the Government would do anything about it, I indicated that, if the matter had to be reviewed, it would be reviewed by Cabinet. I gave no undertaking that I would do that. As far as the report is concerned, the matter does not fall within my jurisdiction. It is within the jurisdiction of the Chief Secretary. I will refer the question to him and bring back a reply in due course.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, with reference to Roseworthy Agricultural College of Advanced Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the financial problems that have arisen as a result of the escalation at the college in the number of courses, the number of staff, and the costs which are an aftermath of the Whitlam years, when almost unlimited money was, so to speak, thrown around for education. I refer to the very good leading article in the *Advertiser* last Thursday and also to the statement by the Minister of Education that he had no intention of seeing Roseworthy collapse, which statement I was very pleased to read. I should like to quote a few lines from the *Advertiser* article, as follows:

The basic courses offered at Roseworthy have for most of its history been its diplomas of agriculture and oenology. A diploma of agricultural technology was introduced in 1969. Then, in swift succession, came several other courses. . .

The leading article goes on to indicate the courses that were introduced, and the paragraph concludes:

The college records show, for instance, that the ratio of academic staff and other employees has reached roughly one for every two students.

Is the Minister planning to solve the problems of this valuable institution, having regard to the pertinent comments in the *Advertiser* and the reference to basic courses at that college, and also having reference to the invaluable activities of the college over many years as a plant breeding facility? Does the Minister agree, having regard to the great value of Roseworthy to the State over many years, that it is reasonable to expect the State to accept responsibility for significant funding towards the

costs of this institution?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer the question to the Minister of Education and bring down a reply.

FARM COSTS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about farm costs and returns.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: For a number of years now the Department of Agriculture's economics and marketing branch has produced a bulletin on farm costs and returns. This bulletin has been a useful aid to farmers in the preparation of their farm budgets. It has, in the past, been published as a supplement to the *Stock Journal* and, because the cost of the material to the *Stock Journal* is nil, it has proved to be a very profitable venture for that rural newspaper. Not only has it attracted considerable advertising revenue but also it has added to the prestige of the newspaper. Earlier this year it was decided (in the interests of fair play and free competition) that other newspapers should be allowed to compete for the right to publish farm costs and returns.

Would the Minister of Agriculture reassure the Council that the *Stock Journal* will not be awarded an exclusive right to publish farm costs and returns because of its consistent support for the Liberal Party during its period in Opposition, and that a genuine competitive assessment will be made of the various offers?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

MINISTERIAL MEMO

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Minister of Local Government, since assuming office, issued any memo to staff which made any reference to standards of dress, behaviour or performance expected from them? If so, will he table that memo in order to establish the truth or otherwise of rumours which are in general circulation in the community and which prompted me to ask questions regarding the memo last week?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No memo of any kind has been issued by me to staff.

WATER RESOURCES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In view of the report in this morning's *Advertiser* regarding the three-State conference held on a matter so vital to the quality of South Australia's water supply, will the Minister of Local Government ask the Minister of Water Resources to refer this matter to South Australia's Senators, requesting them to ensure that as much pressure as possible is brought to bear on Victorian Senators in the interests of this State?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

VENEREAL DISEASE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Health say whether any statistics are kept as to the incidence of herpes simplex

virus type 2 infections? If so, can the Minister inform the Council whether the same alarming increase in this type of venereal infection is occurring in South Australia as is occurring elsewhere? Has the Minister considered making this type of infection a notifiable disease?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

AID TO KAMPUCHEA

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing to the Attorney-General a question on aid to Kampuchea.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I was heartened to hear last week that the Government intended granting aid to Kampuchea. However, I was disappointed that only \$10 000 was intended for this purpose. On a per capita basis this is well below the amount which the New South Wales Government has granted to that country. In view of the continuing reports coming from Kampuchea of intolerable hardships, sickness and starvation, I ask the Attorney-General whether he will take steps to ensure that the South Australian Government increases the amount of aid it intends providing for the people of Kampuchea and, if not, why not?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I read the newspapers and hear the alarming reports regarding the disaster in Kampuchea.

The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Government responded promptly to those reports with its donation of \$10 000. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and Cabinet with a view to bringing back a reply in the light of the information of which not only the honourable member but everyone in South Australia is aware.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Before asking my question, I see that there is someone in the public gallery with a piece of paper, pencil and tape recorder. What is his business? He might be a member of the C.I.A.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to that fact. Persons in the gallery are not allowed to take notes or record proceedings.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a question about Government employees.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: How many daily-paid workers receiving weekly or fortnightly pay are employed in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Highways Department, State Transport Authority, Woods and Forests Department, National Parks and Wildlife Division, Monarto Development Commission, Government hospitals, and any other Government departments where blue collar workers are employed? Secondly, which Government departments have a surplus of labour, and will the Minister say how many people are surplus in each department? Thirdly, will employees who are leaving the aforementioned departments or being seconded to private enterprise jobs have their positions filled by new employees?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the abolition of the Department of Community Development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The Minister has stated recently in the daily press that he intends to curtail the activities of the Department of Community Development. In fact, I believe the Minister said that he intended to abolish it. He said that he intends to give more power to local government in South Australia and to make local government responsible for its own community development. The previous Labor Government made untold thousands of dollars available to councils and other community groups through the Department of Community Development. Will the Minister say, first, how much money was made available by the previous Government to local councils and other community groups for community development projects?

Secondly, what amount of matching money was provided by local councils and other community groups to help with these projects? Thirdly, when the Minister makes community development the responsibility of local government, will he subsidise local government to help with projects? Fourthly, if the Minister intends to subsidise or make grants, will he tell the Council how he will arrive at an amount and on what basis it will be distributed? Finally, if he does not intend to make grants, will the Minister please explain where the community will get the necessary finance?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The question involves statistics and sums of money, details of which I must obtain for the honourable member. I will therefore bring back a full reply as soon as possible.

WAITRESSES

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about topless hostesses.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I draw the Minister's attention to two advertisements that appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser*, the first stating:

Attractive topless hostess required for new club, excellent wages for experienced persons, please phone Mr. Carr— It then gives the telephone number. I do not know how one gets experience in that field, but the second advertisement states:

Complete see-through waitresses/waiters \$10 per hour plus bonuses—

It then gives a number for applicants to telephone. Following the publishing of those advertisements, there appears in today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Job for the boys—the naked truth", the following report:

Jobs must be hard to get, judging by the response to an advertisement in the *Advertiser* yesterday. The advertisement offered \$10 an hour plus bonuses for "complete see-through waitresses and waiters" for lunches at Nelson's Wine Tavern, Croydon Park. The reference to waiters was only because of South Australia's anti-discrimination laws. But three men turned up anyway, with high hopes of a job.

It continues:

I needed four girls, neat, pretty, well-groomed, and of course well-built.

The report goes on to give more details, but I will leave my explanation at that. First, does the Minister consider "see-through" to be legitimate wearing apparel, or lack of it, for waiting on tables in public eating places? Secondly, does he consider that workers in these areas are subject to moral exploitation? Thirdly, in light of the spread of such activity, does the Government consider that any action is necessary?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I do not think that what I consider to be suitable or not really matters.

The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster must cease interjecting when he is called to order.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: What is important is whether the matters raised by the honourable member do offend against the discrimination laws in South Australia. I will consult with the officers in my department and bring down a detailed reply.

UNEMPLOYED YOUTH

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about aid to unemployment programmes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In the Port Adelaide area unemployment is well above average for this State. I understand that, on the latest figures, unemployment is reaching levels such as 11 per cent of the working population in Port Adelaide, and that more than one-third of the unemployed are young people; to be accurate, 36 per cent of the unemployed in that area are young people.

The Port Adelaide Central Mission has been attempting to help the unemployed in that area, in particular, the young unemployed, and through the CYSS programme has received a grant from the Federal Government to enable it to carry out this work. As most members would be aware, the CYSS programme was considerably cut in the recent Federal Budget, and the work that the mission can do to help young unemployed people has been greatly reduced. I understand that this reduction has caused great problems for the mission and that it has had to cut back on its youth unemployment programme, largely by cutting staff or by cutting the hours worked by staff; in fact, it has already cut the hours worked by 15 per cent, although the need for such work has been increasing. Therefore, will the Government consider making good the deficit for the mission if it makes application, so that the large number of young unemployed people in Port Adelaide are not further disadvantaged by the reduction in finance from Canberra?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and bring down a reply.

COOBER PEDY

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Is the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, aware of the commitment given by the previous Minister of Transport to the residents of Coober Pedy about the resurfacing of the main street of Coober Pedy? Was the commitment one stating that the road would be completely sealed during this summer? Further, was it indicated that the Highways Department would base a maintenance gang in Coober Pedy in the near future? Will the Minister of Transport

now honour those commitments given by the previous Minister?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring down a reply.

ROAD GRANTS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about road grants?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Angle Vale Road and Heaslip Road are minor urban arterial roads under the care, control and management of local government. These roads are not eligible for grant assistance allocated from the specific Commonwealth Government provision for urban local roads. Accordingly, if grants are sought, they must be considered in relation to all other urban arterial road needs. In the circumstances, the Highways Department is at present unable to assist local government in improving the condition of these two roads.

BUILDERS' INDEMNITY FUND

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Minister of Consumer Affairs intend to implement the provisions of the Builders' Licensing Act relating to the establishment of a builders' indemnity fund to cover the cost of faulty workmanship carried out by builders? If so, how much will that add to the cost of building an average house?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The question of implementing Part III C of the Builders' Licensing Act, which relates to the indemnity fund, is being investigated at the present time, as was stated in the press. That is one option available to ensure that home builders who have their houses erected by a builder do not suffer if they have a legitimate complaint or a legitimate cause of action against a builder who disappears or becomes insolvent. Other options are also being considered as to indemnity funds established by the building industry itself and also regarding special insurance provisions. The matter is being considered, and I hope to have a complete report by the end of the year.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It has taken since 1974.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, the amendment to provide this was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Hill.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are still not sure whether you're going on with it?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No, having just come to Government and the previous Government having completely delayed and set the matter aside altogether—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Wasn't a report prepared by the previous Government?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have not received a complete report on the subject.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: One was done.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not aware of it; a report is being prepared now.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about Highways Department properties.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: The Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1979, referring to the

Highways Department, stated that as at June 1979 the number of properties acquired for road purposes and leases was as follows: houses and flats, 820; shops and commercial properties, 277; and parcels of vacant land, 204. Will the Minister ascertain whether there are any houses, flats, shops, commercial properties or parcels of vacant land that would properly be regarded as surplus to the requirements of the Highways Department? If so, what steps have been, or will be taken, to expedite the sale thereof?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring down a reply.

LIQUID FUEL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about liquid fuel storage on farms.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: During the recent election campaign, the Liberal Party promised to provide assistance to farmers for storage of liquid fuel on farms. If this promise is to be honoured, can the Minister say whether the assistance will be in the form of cash grants or loans? When will the assistance be available to farmers?

If the assistance is to be in the form of a loan, what will be the terms and conditions? What is the estimated cost of such assistance for 1979-80? What is the estimated cost of such assistance for a full year? To what level of stock will the Government encourage individual farmers to hold fuel? What safety standards will apply to on-farm storage, and how will these standards be policed? What will be the cost of setting such standards and policing them?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

OPEN GOVERNMENT

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in this place, a question about open government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Now that the game has changed, it is interesting to reflect on the opinions of the present Government *vis-a-vis* what those opinions were a few short months ago when they were in Opposition. I refer particularly to an article in the *Advertiser* of 12 May 1979, at page 22, by Greg Kelton. The article, headed "Opening up the Government", states:

Last year, the Government came in for a great deal of criticism from the Opposition for the secrecy surrounding Parliamentary select and standing committees. The Opposition contended that hearings of the committees—especially the Public Accounts Committee—should be open to the public and the media. The Opposition tried to change the standing orders last year and failed, due to the Government's majority in the Assembly. Mr. Becker, a member of the P.A.C., plans to try again in the coming session by introducing a private members Bill to amend the Public Accounts Committee Act, 1972. One of the major provisions of the amending legislation will be that all hearings of the PAC should be in public, except where the committee decides that evidence in certain instances be held in camera. Another provision will make it mandatory for the committee

to present reports, or progress, half yearly to the House of Assembly. The Bill also seeks to increase the size of the committee to six members in a bid to negate the Government control of the PAC. Liberal M.P.'s feel that many people see Government majorities on these Parliamentary committees as little more than a device to control the committees and thus obtain reports from those committees which favour the Government's policy.

At that time Mr. Becker was a member of the shadow Cabinet, so we can take it that when he made those statements they reflected the attitude of the Opposition, particularly of the Leader of the Opposition and his senior colleagues. Is it necessary to amend the Public Accounts Committee Act, 1972, to increase the membership of the Public Accounts Committee to provide equal numbers from both sides of the House of Assembly? Is legislation necessary to open hearings to the public and the media? If so, how soon will the necessary legislation be introduced? When and how will the Government take action to ensure that there are equal numbers from both sides of the House of Assembly on the Public Accounts Committee? When will the first public hearings be held? When will legislation be introduced to require the Public Accounts Committee to present reports or progress reports twice yearly to the House of Assembly, as proposed when the Government was in Opposition?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have not studied the Act that establishes the Public Accounts Committee, so I cannot indicate to the honourable member whether it is necessary to enact legislation to achieve the amendments to which he has referred. The Government's view is that the status of the Public Accounts Committee should be enhanced and that it should have the opportunity to be able to perform its responsibilities actively and responsibly. The matters to which the honourable member has referred are at present under review and, when a decision has been made, undoubtedly the Council will be informed.

GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking the Minister representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs a question on the matters of the transfer of the Public Works Committee and the allocation of Government cars.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I recall that, early in the recent election campaign, Tonkin, sitting in front of the television cameras one night—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he must not refer to a member as "Tonkin".

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You have assumed that I am referring to Dr. Tonkin.

The PRESIDENT: I have assumed that.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: On this occasion, I think, it would be fair to refer to the present Premier as Mr. Tonkin. He likes to have that title, and perhaps that has escaped your knowledge or memory. He was sitting in front of television cameras saying "No more big white cars". However, he has given himself a big white car. He also said during the course of electioneering that he would remove big bums from seats, and so on. I will say more about the electioneering when I speak again during the next two or three weeks.

Am I correct in assuming that this Government, which has been in office for a short time, has increased the number of cars and has allocated a car now to one person that the Government refused to put in the Ministry,

namely, Becker, the member for Hanson? He was critical of the former Government's role regarding expenditure, wastage, increased facilities, and additional creature comforts. The Hon. Mr. Burdett may give some advice to his fellow Minister. May I deal with the history of the matter?

The PRESIDENT: That depends on how relevant it is to the question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am speaking about cars. The original decision to provide a car for the Chairman of the Public Works Committee was made because at the time the occupant of that position was being pinched so often by the coppers for drink driving that the Government said it had better provide him with a car.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What Party was he from?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: He was a Liberal. That would have been a matter of the Government's quickly providing for its own and denying others. I now refer to the privilege granted to me by the Council and will explain regarding the Public Works Committee. That is a Parliamentary committee and has met in this building for many years. It has been removed in haste recently. One would not mind if the huge office space was being allocated equitably amongst members of this Council, but at present a huge area is being occupied by one person and another huge office by one person. Where there would be space for two officers—

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. The explanation is not pertinent to the question.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You don't know what the question is.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster can resume his explanation. Will he get on to his question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I know that it is annoying some people, but I have sought leave of the Council to explain. That huge office space is occupied by few people. That does not concern me at this stage. Regarding cars, I ask the Minister how many additional cars have been allocated by the present Government, despite its policy statement during the election, to members of the Government Party whom the Government has considered to be ill-fitted to meet the requirements to become a Minister? Further, which Minister, if any, was responsible for the indecent haste with which the Public Works Committee was chased from this building, apparently to the satisfaction of few people?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I should have thought that at least some part of the question should have been directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport. However, it has been directed to me, the Minister representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, so I will refer the question to him and bring back a reply.

URANIUM MINING

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: My question is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, regarding health risks to uranium miners, and I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: An article written by John Hallam in *Habitat* in April 1979 pointed out that the proposals by mining companies in Australia to protect miners from radon gas emitted by uranium will not protect the miners and will increase the dangers to health. Will the Minister ask his colleague to read this article and, further, will he ask her to state what action will be taken to avoid

the grave health risks outlined by Mr. Hallam if uranium mining is to proceed in South Australia?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

SUNDAY HOTEL TRADING

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I wish to direct a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs about Sunday trading. I should like to make a short statement prior to asking the question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In a report in the *Advertiser* of October, headed "231 say 'No' to Sundays", there seems to be conflict between two groups. One is run by Mr. George, of the Hotel Hanson, who conducted a poll and found that 231 hotelkeepers in the country, city and suburban areas did not want to open on Sunday. In the same article, the President of the South Australian branch of the Australian Hotels Association (Mr. Peter Whallin) is reported as having stated on the previous night that he doubted the result of the poll.

He also stated that 400 members met in 1974 and asked the association to pursue the matter of Sunday trading. I believe that opening on Sunday should not be a matter for hotelkeepers only to decide. The question has wider implications and there is the matter of much more support from the community. Will the Minister seek the following information from the Minister of Industrial Affairs—

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Who is the Minister?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You are representing him.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I am directly responsible for the Licensing Act.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will ask the Minister. I may get a reply straight away.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member may do that.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Will the Minister inquire as to the *bona fides* of a ballot that concluded that 231 hotelkeepers were against opening on Sunday? Further, will the Minister also confer with the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union before making any move to open hotels on Sunday? Will he also consider holding a referendum before opening hotels for Sunday trade?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I thank the honourable member for this question. The matter of Sunday trading is most important, and at present I am seeking a report on the whole issue. First, regarding the ballot conducted by Mr. George, I have seen what was sent out in the survey. I am having this investigated at present. Certainly, a large number of publicans expressed themselves as being opposed to Sunday trading. I also have spoken to representatives of the A.H.A. and I will consult the association further and in greater detail before the investigation is complete. I agree entirely with the honourable member that it is by no means a matter for hotelkeepers only. It is also a matter for many other members of the community, and I intend to consult the union, as the body representing workers in the field. It is most important to find out what they feel. It is also important for many other sections of the community. It is a matter for the community at large, for the whole tourist industry, and for various groups that are concerned that there may be social consequences of Sunday trading.

I regard the matter seriously, and at present I am undertaking an investigation into it through my officers. I would not like to give a final answer on the question of a referendum at present. It is a matter for the Government

of the day to introduce as it sees fit or for any member of Parliament to raise the matter in a Bill. I am not sure that this is an appropriate matter for a referendum, but I will give further consideration to that suggestion. I thank the honourable member for suggesting it, because it is a matter that has been concerning me.

WAITRESSES

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question on waitresses.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: An article in today's *Advertiser* refers to a restaurant which advertised for "complete see-through waitresses/waiters". Because of anti-discrimination laws in South Australia, the proprietors had to go through the formality of interviewing men, but there is no way that they would employ a waiter. Does the Minister concerned believe that the actions of Nelson's Wine Tavern make a mockery of the South Australian anti-discrimination laws? Does his Government consider that any further action is necessary to prevent the exploitation of working waitresses and waiters in the industry of catering?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have already told the honourable member that I will consult with officers of my department to ascertain the effect which the discrimination laws have on the matter and whether or not those laws have been breached. I cannot give an answer as to what the Government will do until I have had advice on whether or not there is a breach of the anti-discrimination laws. Obviously, if the advice given to me by my officers is that there is such a breach, I will consider doing something about it.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing to the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question on daylight saving.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Last week the Premier indicated that the Government was intending to hold a referendum on daylight saving at the next election in this State. Currently South Australia, New South Wales, Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory and Tasmania have daylight saving for four months beginning on the last Sunday in October. We are about to lose an hour's sleep next Saturday night when daylight saving is introduced.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: You can sleep in on Sunday.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Some people can. At various times there have been suggestions that the period of daylight saving should be extended from the current four months to five months to include March in daylight saving, in view of the pleasant warm summery evenings which often occur in March. I am sure that other honourable members can recall some of the balmy evenings during the last Festival of Arts, which always falls in March. I ask the Minister whether, when planning his referendum, consideration could be given to framing the questions in such a way that people could indicate whether or not they would like daylight saving extended to include March, as well as the four months to which it currently applies.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and bring down a reply.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my question of 16 October?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Persons in severe financial hardship may apply to the Department for Community Welfare for emergency assistance. People not eligible for unemployment benefits because they, or their unions, are involved directly or indirectly in a strike can fall into this category. The cost to the State of providing emergency assistance to people in these circumstances will obviously depend on the frequency of strikes and the numbers involved. In July this year, Australian National Railways workers who were involved in, or stood down because of, strike action at Port Augusta were paid emergency assistance totalling \$1 300. The department's Standard Procedure No. 13, which deals with this matter, provides:

Cases which are generally considered in this category are those where an applicant has been unemployed or sick for a lengthy period, or has been involved in a strike, and, because of necessitous circumstances, requires financial assistance for his family until receipt of his first wage.

Financial assistance is not paid to persons because they are on strike. It may be paid to persons who are experiencing severe financial hardship because of such a strike and who meet the department's normal eligibility criteria. This is in line with the normal principle of need as followed by the department in determining eligibility for financial assistance. The Standard Procedure was approved by the previous Government, and it has not been altered.

PUBLIC GALLERY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. I take strong exception to a Ministerial adviser, a candidate for the Liberal Party in the recent State election, sitting in the gallery and taking notes of everything said in this Chamber. Boot him out!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am grateful that the Hon. Mr. Foster has drawn my attention to the matter. I suggest and demand that people in the gallery do not take notes, as it is against Standing Orders of this Council.

FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I direct my question to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries announced, during an interview on A.B.C. television on 24 September, the formation of a new series of advisory committees or councils for managed fisheries in South Australia. He repeated this announcement at the annual meeting of the Australian Fishing Industry Council, South Australian Branch, on 12 October.

Will the Minister tell the Council whether the new advisory committees will be in addition to the committees that already exist for all major fisheries except tuna? Also, will the new committees replace the existing advisory committees, or will they be in addition to the existing advisory committees?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Mr. Foster to cease talking in a voice which is quite audible and which is making it most difficult for *Hansard* to hear the question being asked.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: If the new committees are established, will their membership be significantly changed? What will be the substantive changes in the terms of reference of the new committees, and will the

new committees work through A.F.I.C., or will they advise the Minister direct?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister of Fisheries and bring back a reply.

RAILWAY GOODS SHEDS

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question regarding railway goods sheds under the control of the State Transport Authority.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Now that our country railway system is in the hands of Australian National Railways, and a rationalisation of our suburban parcel deliveries has occurred, I am led to believe that very little use is made of suburban goods sheds, some of which, I am told, are very spacious. Taking into account the needs of youth in the community, I ask the Minister how many suburban goods sheds there are and where they are. Also, what use is made of the goods sheds, and in what state of repair are they? Finally, will the Minister consider offering these goods sheds for community use and, if not, why not?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring back a reply.

NORMANVILLE SAND DUNES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question regarding the Normanville sand dunes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I make no secret of the fact that I have raised this matter before. My question concerns the only remaining sector of sand dunes on the southern end of St. Vincent Gulf. The Normanville sand dunes, which are reputed to be unique and which are double-crested, have been built up over a period of 5 000 years. Indeed, archaeological interest in them dates back between 1 000 years and 4 000 years. I understand that these sandhills, which are invaluable educationally, were purchased many years ago and that a town plan exists in relation to the area, although that aspect does not relate directly to my question. I am greatly concerned that the Coast Protection Board is possibly considering using the sand at Normanville as filling on other metropolitan beaches, which would be a disaster. Even more disturbing is the fact that some claims have been made by Consolidated Industries—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the time.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I thought that one would at least be able to finish one's question. We can become slaves to the clock.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will make that decision.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Very well. I will ask the question tomorrow. You, Sir, can have your way with the clock.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LAW REFORM COMMITTEE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice): What has been the expenditure on the South Australian Law Reform

Committee in each of the three financial years 1976-77 to 1978-79 respectively?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The reply is as follows:

	Expenditure		
	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79
	\$	\$	\$
Salaries and related payments	4 962	19 995	18 034
Contingencies: costs of printing, stationery, etc.	740	3 544	2 761
Total expenditure	<u>5 702</u>	<u>22 549</u>	<u>20 795</u>

BEER PRICES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice):

1. Did the increase in the price of beer announced recently differ in any way from the recommendations made by the Prices Commissioner to the Government prior to the election on 15 September, and, if so, how did it differ?

2. If the amount approved since the election was greater than the amount recommended by the Prices Commissioner prior to 15 September—

(a) Why was the initial recommendation of the Prices Commissioner rejected; and

(b) Was it rejected after representations from any person either to the Minister or to the Premier or to any other member of the Government, and, if such representations were received, who made them?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The increases approved to operate on and after 8 October did differ from those recommended by the Acting Prices Commissioner in August.

	Increases	
	Recommended in August	Approved in October
170 ml Butcher	1	1
255 ml Schooner	1	2
425 ml Pint	1	3
375 ml Bottles	2	2
740 ml Bottles	3	4
370 ml Cans	2	2

2. (a) In making his initial recommendation, the Acting Prices Commissioner had rejected certain cost elements claimed. The effect would have been to reduce substantially the appropriate margins of the breweries and licensed resellers. The margins requested did not appear unreasonable to the Government, so the initial recommendation was reviewed.

(b) As is the normal practice when price increase applications are being considered, the Government received representations from a number of people associated with the industry.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS EXPENDITURE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice): What has been the expenditure on the administration of the Ethnic Affairs Unit of the Premier's Department, the Ethnic Affairs Branch of the Premier's Department and the Ethnic Affairs Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs in each of the financial years 1977-78 and 1978-79, respectively?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The reply is as follows:

Expenditure	
1977-78 (for 3 months only):	
	\$
Salaries and related payments	51 473
Operating expenses	14 744
	66 217
1978-79 (full year):	
Salaries and related payments	190 216
Operating expenses	58 577
	248 793

The above figures do not include any public buildings charges. The above information is available in the Auditor-General's Report for 1978-79, page 150.

PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice):

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

- (a) have been transferred, or
- (b) been told they are to be transferred, or
- (c) been requested to transfer, from the positions they held at that date?

2. What is the position with respect to each such officer in relation to the following matters:

- (a) Name;
- (b) Position and salary in the Public Service as at 15/9/79;
- (c) In the case of those officers already transferred the positions now occupied and salary;
- (d) In the case of those officers ordered or requested to be transferred—
 - (i) to what positions are the transfers to be made; and
 - (ii) have any conditions been placed on the transfers;
- (e) Was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments, and, if so, what departments; and
- (f) The reason for the transfer or proposed transfer?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Apart from one public servant, who was seconded to the Attorney-General's Office as a Ministerial Officer and who has now returned to his substantive position, there are no public servants under my administration who have been transferred, told they are to be transferred, or requested to transfer from the positions they held at 15 September 1979.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice):

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

- (a) have been transferred, or
- (b) been told they are to be transferred, or
- (c) been requested to transfer, from the positions they held at that date?

2. What is the position with respect to each such officer in relation to the following matters:

- (a) Name;
- (b) Position and salary in the Public Service as at 15 September 1979;
- (c) In the case of those officers already transferred the positions now occupied, and salary;
- (d) In the case of those officers ordered or requested to be transferred—
 - (i) to what positions are the transfers to be made; and

(ii) have any conditions been placed on the transfers;

(e) Was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments, and, if so, what departments; and

(f) The reason for the transfer or proposed transfer?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Ms. V. M. Drapac, Mr. N. Marovich, Ms. G. Velardo, Mr. F. Velarto.

(b) Mr. J. P. Kunst.

(c) Nil.

2. Appendix I outlines the responses for each officer transferred.

APPENDIX I

SCHEDULE OF TRANSFERS

1. (a) Name: Ms. V. M. Drapac.

(b) Position: Ethnic Information Officer. Salary: \$10 688 p.a.

(c) Transferred to position: Ethnic Information Officer, State Libraries Division, Department of Local Government. Salary: \$10 688 p.a.

(d) Not applicable.

(e) Advice of transfer to certain departments: No restrictions.

(f) Reason for transfer: For the more efficient operation of the Ethnic Affairs Branch prior to the transfer to the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission.

2. (a) Name: Mr. J. P. Kunst.

(b) Position: Project Officer, Ethnic Affairs Division. Salary: \$16 927 p.a.

(c) Transferred to position: Not applicable

(d) (i) It is proposed to transfer Mr. Kunst to a Project Officer, A.O.1 classification (Salary \$16 927 p.a.) in either the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs or the South Australian Health Commission.

(e) Advice on transfer to certain departments: This officer was advised that he could not be transferred to "core" Public Service Departments, namely, Treasury, Auditor-General's Department, Public Service Board or Premier's Department.

(f) Reason for transfer: For the more efficient operation of the Ethnic Affairs Branch prior to the transfer to the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission.

3. (a) Name: Mr. N. Marovich

(b) Position: Ethnic Information Officer, Salary: \$10 688 p.a.

(c) Transferred to position: Ethnic Information Officer, Department of Further Education. Salary: \$10 688 p.a.

(d) Not applicable.

(e) Advice on transfer to certain departments: No restrictions.

(f) Reason for transfer: For the more efficient operation of the Ethnic Affairs Branch prior to the transfer to the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission.

4. (a) Name: Ms. G. Velardo

(b) Position: Office Assistant—Qualified. Salary: \$7 174 p.a.

(c) Transferred to position: Office Assistant—Qualified, State Libraries Division, Department of Local Government. Salary \$7 174 p.a.

(d) Not applicable

(e) Advice on transfer to certain departments: No restrictions.

(f) Reason for transfer: For the more efficient operation of the Ethnic Affairs Branch prior to the transfer to the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission.

5. (a) Name: Mr. F. Velarto

(b) Position: Ethnic Information Officer. Salary: \$10 688 p.a.

(c) Transferred to position: Ethnic Information Officer, Legal Services Commission. Salary: \$10 688

(d) Not applicable

(e) Advice on transfer to certain departments: This officer was advised that he could not be transferred to "core" Public Service Departments, namely, Treasury, Auditor-General's Department, Public Service Board or Premier's Department.

(f) Reason for transfer: For the more efficient operation of the Ethnic Affairs Branch prior to the transfer to the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice):

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration:

(a) have been transferred, or

(b) been told they are to be transferred, or

(c) been requested to transfer, from the positions they held at that date?

2. What is the position with respect to each such officer in relation to the following matters:

(a) Name;

(b) Position and salary in the Public Service as at 15 September 1979;

(c) In the case of those officers already transferred the positions now occupied and salary;

(d) In the case of those officers ordered or requested to be transferred—

(i) to what positions are the transfers to be made; and

(ii) have any conditions been placed on the transfers;

(e) Was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(f) The reason for the transfer or proposed transfer?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Mr. S. R. Wright; Miss E. M. Lawson. (b) None. (c) Mr. A. Economou.

2. (a) Mr. S. R. Wright. (b) Executive Assistant to the Minister of Community Welfare; salary \$28 728 per annum. (c) Undertaking special project work at existing salary. Classification to be reviewed. (d) Not applicable.

(a) Miss E. M. Lawson. (b) Acting as Steno-Secretary to the Minister of Community Welfare; salary \$10 400 per annum. (c) Residential Care Worker; salary \$10 301 per annum plus shift allowances. (d) Not applicable.

(a) Mr. A. Economou. (b) Seconded to Premier's Department as Ministerial Inquiry Officer at Berri; salary \$15 209 per annum. (c) Not applicable. (d) (i) Community Welfare Worker, Thebarton. (ii) No.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Minister's replies are as long as those of the Minister of Local Government, he could ask for leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No; they are not so long. The replies continue:

(e) No. (f) The Minister's Executive Assistant should be chosen by the Minister.

(e) No. (f) Miss Lawson had previously applied for transfer to a Residential Care Worker position and was undertaking training for such a position.

(e) No. (f) The Inquiry Unit in the Premier's Department has been restructured.

(The Minister of Local Government will answer in respect of any officers employed in the former Ethnic Affairs Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.)

ETHNIC AFFAIRS DIVISION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice): What were the names, positions and salaries of all persons appointed to positions in the Ethnic Affairs Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs as at 15 September 1979, whether permanent or temporary appointments, and whether on secondment from the division or not?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The personnel matters appertaining to the Ethnic Affairs Branch are as follows:

Name	Position	Salary p.a. \$	Status
Brewster, T.	Ethnic Information Officer	10 688	On Probation
Cooper, S.	Clerk	12 441	Permanent
Corelli, F.	Ethnic Information Officer	10 688	On Probation
Drapac, V.	Ethnic Information Officer	10 688	Temporary
Gardini, A.	Ethnic Affairs Adviser	22 521	Permanent
Giannopoulos, G.	Project Officer	17 392	Permanent
Hall, M.	Office Assistant	9 542	Permanent
Ioakimidis, D.	Senior Ethnic Information Officer	13 431	On Probation
Kunst, J.	Project Officer	16 927	Permanent
Lambiris, P.	Office Assistant	8 953	Permanent
Marovich, N.	Ethnic Information Officer	10 688	On Probation
Milloss, S.	Interpreter/Translator	13 431	On Probation
Paraschos, J.	Interpreter/Translator	13 431	On Probation
Radjenovic, S.	Senior Interpreter/Translator	15 209	Permanent
Rudzinski, C.	Ethnic Information Officer	10 688	On Probation
Spacca, M.	Interpreter/Translator	13 431	Permanent
Stenos, A.	Interpreter/Translator	13 431	On Probation
Timpano, L.	Senior Interpreter/Translator	15 209	Permanent
Velardo, G.	Office Assistant	7 174	Permanent
Velarto, F.	Ethnic Information Officer	10 688	On Probation
Wilson, P.	Project Officer (Seconded to Local Government Office 11.6.79).	16 927	Permanent

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

8. The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL (on notice):

1. Does the Minister hold, or has he ever held as an individual, a land agents licence?

2. Did the Minister operate as the principal or governing director in the firm of Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd. without a land agents licence and, if so, for how long?

3. When was the holding company, to which the Minister referred in the Legislative Council on 11 October 1979, formed and for what purpose and who were the shareholders in this holding company?

4. What are the financial arrangements between the holding company and Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd.?

5. Did the Minister sell his interest in the holding company prior to his appointment to his present portfolio and, if so, on what date?

6. Did the Minister sell his interest in Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd. prior to his appointment to his present portfolio and, if so, on what date?

7. Was any device used in the sale of Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd. or the holding company to evade gift duty?

8. What are the Minister's interests in the eleven family companies in which he still participates and will the Minister provide details of those interests?

9. What are the addresses and details of the flats, shops and other real estate in which the eleven companies have an interest?

10. Are there any building or change of purpose applications in which the Minister has a direct or indirect financial interest currently before the State Planning Authority, the Planning Appeal Board or any local government body or council in South Australia?

11. In how many family trusts does the Minister participate and what are the details of the Minister's interests in these trusts?

12. Since 18 September 1979, has the Minister used his Ministerial office to transact business related to his real estate holdings and, if so, on what dates and the periods of time during which he has used his office?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The replies are as follows:

1. I have held but do not now hold a land agents licence as an individual.

2. The requirements of the law with respect to licensing have varied from time to time. In so far as I operated as either the principal or governing director of Murray Hill & Co. Proprietary Limited and was required by law to hold a land agent's licence, I did so.

3. The holding company was formed on 14 April 1961 for the purpose of rearranging my family affairs. The subscribing shareholders were myself and my wife.

4. There are no financial arrangements between the holding company and Murray Hill & Co. Proprietary Limited.

5. No.

6. Yes, soon after the incorporation of the holding company in 1961. The holding company finally divested itself of its shares in Murray Hill & Co. Proprietary Limited on 31 October 1977, when such shares were transferred to my son.

7. No.

8. I am a director of each of the 11 private family companies. Seven of these companies are dormant and own no real estate. The other four companies own the properties to which I refer in my answer to question 9. I own 55.3 per cent of the issued capital of one and 69.2 per cent of the issued capital of another.

9. In accordance with my intimations in the Council, details of the properties are as follows:

(a) 248 Kensington Road, Leabrook, comprising five

shops and doctors rooms.

(b) 163 Fletcher Road, Largs Bay, comprising three shops and a dwelling.

(c) 26 Commercial Road, Hyde Park, comprising 10 home-units let as flats.

(d) 133 Franklin Street, Adelaide, being an office building.

(e) Lot 191 Warland Avenue, Encounter Bay, being a vacant building allotment.

10. No.

11. Eight formed in 1962 and 1963 for my children. I am a co-trustee, with my wife, but we are not beneficiaries, nor do we receive any remuneration. The gross income of those eight trusts aggregated over a period of 13 years (to 30 June 1979) is \$1 374.28 approximately. The trusts hold no real estate. Steps are in train to wind up these trusts.

12. No.

BUDGET PAPERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K. T. Griffin:

That the Council take note of the papers relating to the Estimates of Expenditure, 1979-80, and the Loan Estimates, 1979-80.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 116.)

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition):

This debate is a departure from normal practice, in that the Budget has not been passed in another place. Nevertheless, the Opposition agrees to a debate on noting the Budget papers, which in effect will be treated as the second reading debate on the Budget. The Opposition reserves the right, however, to look more carefully and closely at the Budget in the Committee stage.

We have facilitated this course of action because of the peculiar situation that has developed this year where the Budget has been introduced later than usual because of the intervening election. We would have agreed to having a greater amount appropriated in the special Supply Bill passed last week to enable the Budget to be fully considered in the normal way. However, it is important that the Budget be passed as soon as possible, because departments have to plan for the coming year, and a degree of certainty is necessary in their operation. For that reason, on this occasion, the Opposition has decided to facilitate the passage of the Budget by adopting this procedure. However, it is my view that generally the Address in Reply debate should immediately follow the Governor's Speech in opening Parliament, because it is an important debate that gives members the opportunity for a general response to the Governor as a first part of the Parliamentary programme. Occasionally, some Bills have been introduced before the Address in Reply debate, and members opposite, when in Opposition, did agree to that procedure on some occasions. However, as a general rule, the Address in Reply should be completed immediately following the Governor's Speech.

The Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in this place, in his speech introducing this motion, mentioned that this method of dealing with the Budget could lead to an earlier date of rising. I hope that in its desire to complete its business in this Council there will be no attempt by the Government to cut down on the sittings of the Council or the opportunities available to honourable members. In fact, I would certainly not like to see the situation that pertains in some other States, particularly in Queensland, where Parliament hardly sits at all. I certainly expect the Government to sit at least as often as the previous Government sat. I also believe that this Council should sit at the same time as the House of

Assembly. When talking of an earlier date of rising, I hope that that does not mean that the Government intends to sit this Council less than occurred under the previous Government. If there is an attempt to do that, the Opposition will protest.

I do not intend to go into a detailed analysis of the Budget papers. Clearly, the Government, which has just been elected, must be given a chance to govern, and therefore it would not be appropriate for me to go into the specifics of the Budget at this stage, but I do wish to make some general comments. When introducing the Budget papers, the Premier referred to what he termed the enormous task of economic reconstruction, and referred to certain statistics. Those statistics appear in the Premier's Budget statement in another place, which has now been tabled in this Chamber. I draw attention to the superficial nature of those statistics, which indicate a position of doom and gloom on South Australia's economic front. When he spoke about the rate of population growth, the Premier used a figure of two years. When he spoke about the private sector employment growth, he used a period of eight years. When he spoke about a fall in private employment, he used a period of from September 1977 to June 1979. When he spoke about unemployment and said that South Australia's rate was the highest of any State in Australia, he used a period of 16 months. When he spoke about the State's share in job vacancies falling, he used a period of five years; growth in retail sales, two years; new dwelling commencements, three years; and new business written by finance companies, three years.

Given that this is supposed to be a serious Budget document, I am very surprised that the Premier has given such an extraordinarily superficial analysis of the figures; he has clearly been selective. The Premier has cited periods ranging from eight years to 16 months in order to justify his case, which is that South Australia's economy is in a substantially worse position than that of the other States. Those figures might be all right for election campaigns, if one wants to talk in political terms, but I find it distasteful that selective statistics are used in election campaigns under the guise of good politics. Even if it is good politics for an election campaign, it is not fitting that those selective figures be used in a serious Budget document.

There are no interstate comparisons, and that seems odd. There is no reference in the speech to details of Commonwealth or national economic factors. There is no reference to international factors and how they impinge on the economy. As during the election campaign, it has been a simplistic attempt to lay the whole of the blame at the feet of the Labor Government of the previous 10 years. My first prediction is that next year much more will be said about international factors, Federal Government policies, and how the State's ability to manage its economy depends much on external factors. It is indicated later in the Budget papers, once one gets beyond the Premier's speech, that there is a recognition of the importance of national considerations. At page 33, the paper states:

Among other things, State officers pointed out that the Commonwealth Government carries the prime responsibility for influencing the economic climate of the country and it is an advantage to it to have freedom to make budgetary changes (including changes which affect the collection of personal income tax) in order to give effect to its economic policies.

Whilst in the Premier's speech there is no mention of Commonwealth factors, it is clear later. It is hidden in the documents, and was no doubt written by the Under Treasurer before this Government came to office. It

indicates that Commonwealth factors are important. I believe that those factors are important. As I have said, there is no mention of the national situation, particularly the fact that the cash that will be spent from Loan Account this year is down substantially because of Commonwealth policies.

There is no mention of international matters, or that there is evidence that the United States is entering another period of recession, and that this may have an impact on the world economic situation, particularly in South Australia. When 17 000 jobs remain unfilled, we can rest assured that next year scapegoats will be found at national and international levels. In previous Budget debates, I have stressed the complexities of this, the importance of the international recession that began in 1974, and the importance of the Federal Government's role in stimulating the economy.

I think those statements are still valid. At the Commonwealth level, the total Budget for South Australia is still about \$1 500 000 000, whereas recently the Federal Government has had a deficit of more than twice that amount. Doubtless, in 12 months time the Premier will continue to blame the Labor Government, just as Mr. Fraser is still trying to condemn the Whitlam Government, although that is wearing thin. I do not believe that that accusation made in 12 months time will work, nor do I think the search for scapegoats will work, either. There is no mention in the major speech of the fact that there are hopeful signs for the South Australian economy. The document is all a statistical one to indicate the doom and gloom, which is what the Government, when in Opposition, was pushing in talking down the economy over the past few years. There are some indications later in the Budget papers that the Premier either did not read or did not take much notice, because he did not put them alongside the pessimistic signs at the beginning of his speech. Other factors are indicated later in the document. At page 11 he states:

... there have been some signs recently that economic activity is beginning to pick up.

At page 27 he states:

The improvement in port activity in terms of gross tonnage of vessels and cargo through-put at Port Adelaide contributed to higher revenue in 1978-79.

At page 26 he states:

Property transactions showed signs of slight improvement towards the end of the financial year 1978-79.

Included in the Budget papers are some signs that the economy in South Australia is picking up. I will not quote other figures but they can be found in the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition in another place, and they indicate that private employment, overtime, and job vacancies have improved and that unemployment has been falling. It was not a matter of doom and gloom before the election, nor is it now. There are some optimistic signs regarding the economy.

David Tonkin stated that, in State Government, he would improve the situation dramatically. The Government has been elected, and it must be given a reasonable chance to implement its policy. However, if by this time next year there is no significant improvement, the Premier and the Government certainly will have something to answer. I predict that the Premier will then be looking for scapegoats in the areas of national and international factors and that he will try to blame the A.L.P. He has made a claim about the capacity of the South Australian Government to improve the economy, and by this time next year we will be wanting him to show some evidence that he can fulfil that claim.

The next general question that I wish to deal with is the

new federalism of the Fraser Government. This was a much heralded new deal for the States prior to the 1975 Federal election. However, there is no question but that at present the crunch is about to come. The mechanisms outlined by the Liberal Party before the 1975 election have now been established, even if in a modified form. There is a system for a fixed share of income tax going to the States and there is legislation giving the States the ability to impose a surcharge or to grant a rebate of income tax.

The interesting thing about the new federalism, despite the fact that on the face of it those two things have happened, is that nothing in practical terms has happened, because the Prime Minister agreed in 1976 that the States, at least until the end of the financial year 1979-80, would be guaranteed general purpose funds not less than the 1975 formula that the Whitlam Government operated under the financial assistance grants formula. The fact that the new federalism has had no practical effect is confirmed by this statement on page 32 of the Budget document:

In practice these tax-sharing entitlements have proved to be of little significance. With the exception of 1977-78, when the Commonwealth Government proposed a fixed all-States entitlement at the beginning of the year, the amounts which South Australia has received have been determined by the formula guarantee.

That is the old pre-1975 formula. The performance of the new federalism is far from the theory outlined by the Liberal Party before 1975 in its federalism policy document, where the following things were emphasised:

Responsible government: If government is to be effective, it must be accountable for its actions. It should raise the moneys which it spends. . . The Liberal and National Country Parties propose to ensure the States permanent access to revenue-raising through personal income tax. . . . The new system is intended to ensure that the States will have substantially the financial capacity to meet their responsibilities.

Despite those promises and high-sounding ideals, effectively nothing has happened, except that in our tax assessment formula each year we have shown the amount going to the States. Except for one year since 1975, the States have had to rely on the guarantee.

If they had not had the guarantee based on the pre-1975 formula, under the proposed scheme which was supposed to give great benefits to the States, the States would have been worse off. There have been more problems than solutions. Indeed, in trying to implement this policy, the Federal Government has had to make a number of changes. Initially, the proposal was for there to be 33.6 per cent of income tax receipts of the current year paid to the States. The present position is that 39.87 per cent of the previous year's income tax receipts are paid to the States. Rather than give the States greater flexibility, the new federalism has created greater uncertainty.

The situation occurred with the Medibank levy where, instead of imposing an income tax which would have increased the States' share, given that that is a percentage of the total income tax collected by the Federal Government, instead of making the Medibank levy an increase in income tax and thereby an increase in the amount of money that would come to the States, a separate levy was imposed. In effect, it is a tax, but it was not money that was to come to the States. That, in effect, was cheating the States of money that they could otherwise have expected. In other words, there are means for the Federal Government to get around the percentage of payments by imposing a levy or making other adjustments to income tax.

The Federal Government is committed to a reduction in income tax, and that will have an adverse effect on the

money that will come to the State. The States, rather than being given a more secure financial base under this system, are very much more in the hands of the Federal Government, particularly in relation to its policy on income tax. The Budget papers indicate the importance to the States of getting the guarantee extended. It must be extended beyond the end of this financial year. In previous Budget papers, the then Premier, Mr. Dunstan, referred to the importance of this and, indeed, Mr. Corcoran, rather unsuccessfully, tried to make it an election issue. Perhaps we will rue the day that it was not a much greater election issue when the time for renegotiation of this guarantee comes up in November. The estimate is that in 1979-80 there could be a \$46 500 000 shortfall between what will be available to the State under the pre-1975 guarantee and what is available under the tax-sharing arrangements of the new federalism. There is a critical passage in the Budget papers that points to the problems with which we may be faced. It states:

As long as the guarantee is in operation, of course, there is no likelihood of such a shortfall occurring. I point out, however, that the arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States provide for the formula to cease to have effect at the end of this financial year. In the absence of indexation and in the light of the very substantial increase in primary producer incomes in 1978-79, Commonwealth personal income tax receipts are expected to grow by some 18.2 per cent in 1979-80. Provided this growth is achieved, the entitlements of the States under tax sharing should be sufficient to enable them to sustain a reasonable level of activity into 1980-81. Beyond that year, however, it is not possible to make firm predictions. Should the Commonwealth not restore indexation, State entitlements might grow more rapidly than would grants derived from the operation of the formula.

We have to remember that the Federal Government is committed to the introduction of tax indexation. The document continues:

On the other hand, should indexation be restored and should the Commonwealth follow a policy of placing emphasis on indirect rather than direct taxation, State entitlements would be unlikely to expand at a rate sufficient to permit services to be maintained.

Two problems exist: the shortfall, and the uncertainty which the States have in planning for the future. The situation was very uncertain when it was 33.6 per cent of the current year's income tax receipts, because the State Government had no idea how much it was getting until the end of the financial year and until the Federal Government had completed its tax collection. That has, to some extent, been overcome by making it a percentage of the previous year's income tax. However, if there is no guarantee, the State from year to year will not have any firm basis or any certainty upon which to operate, and this is where the difficulty arises. A conflict exists between the policy statements of 1975 and the reality now. The philosophical justification for the new federalism was that Government should be decentralised, that it should be accountable for its actions, and that it should raise the money it spends. Without any guarantee, there will be in the future much greater uncertainty than under the previous system. Mr. Tonkin suggested that the guarantee provision can remain, but there can also be the option to impose the income tax surcharge in addition to having the guarantee. In other words, he is suggesting that it is not an all-or-nothing position. He stated:

Several commentators have expressed the view that the ultimate aim of the new federalism is to force the States into a position where they have no choice but to impose an income tax surcharge. A different view is that the policy is not so

much designed to force the imposition of a surcharge as to oblige the States to choose between a surcharge and a reduced level of public sector activity.

In either case, it does not appear to me that the availability of a surcharge and the likelihood of its use depend upon linking State entitlements to income tax, with all the attendant disadvantages for the planning of State Budgets. A situation in which the States' basic entitlements were determined by a formula similar in some respects to that currently in operation as a guarantee would not be irreconcilable with a Commonwealth policy of encouraging the States to make their own choices between a reduced level of public sector activity and the imposition of additional revenue-raising measures (including a surcharge, if thought appropriate).

So, it seems that Mr. Tonkin is looking for a compromise position, given that he is now caught between what he would consider the best interests of his State—that is, the continuation of the guarantee and the new federalism initiated and espoused by him and his Party in the past, whereby there is no guarantee and any short-fall is made up by the imposition of a State surcharge.

I do not believe that compromise will be accepted by the Federal Government. However, even if it is, it destroys the original concept of the new federalism. That brings us to the next question, namely, whether Mr. Fraser will back down. If he does, the new federalism will have been aborted. If he does not, double taxation, or the surcharge, is inevitable. I believe that the latter is a certainty.

I believe that Mr. Fraser wants the Federal Government to withdraw more and more from revenue raising on behalf of the States. That is the initial concept of the new federalism. His carrot is a growth tax to the States in the form of an income tax surcharge. If the guarantee remains in its old form, the surcharge will not be necessary and the position will be exactly the same as it was before 1975. The new federalism will have come to nought, even though the possibility will exist for a surcharge to be imposed.

If the guarantee is in the same terms as it was before 1975, the surcharge will not be necessary. I therefore believe that Mr. Fraser will not allow the guarantee to continue, so that there will be something remaining of his new federalism policy. In this case, the income tax surcharge or double taxation is a certainty. It is made more certain in this case because of the need to make up revenue caused by the implementation of the election promises and the reduction in other areas of taxation that the Liberals promised in the election campaign and now intend to implement through this Budget.

One thing that concerns me is that there does not seem to be any mention in the Budget papers of whether this Government will impose a surcharge. Mr. Tonkin said during the election campaign that it would not be imposed, but why has he not repeated this in the Budget papers? It seems to me that the option has been left open. He merely said, on page 7 of the Budget papers:

I assure all members and the people of South Australia that, at the proposed Premiers' Conference in November, I intend to fight vigorously for the retention of a guarantee and for an adequate proportion of income tax collections.

He has not said what will happen if, having fought vigorously for the retention of the guarantee, the Commonwealth Government does not agree to its continuation. I suggest to the Council that it is clear that there will be double taxation and the income tax surcharge.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is not double taxation. That's political nonsense.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: This brings me to my second prediction. Before long, I believe that all States will be

forced into an income tax surcharge. That may not happen this year because, as we know, there is an election next year. Mr. Fraser may well decide not to enforce the new federalism immediately. He may continue the guarantee for a short time. However, in the ultimate analysis, once the political problems such as elections are disposed of, I predict that Mr. Fraser will force the States into imposing an income tax surcharge.

It is important in any event to query the philosophical justification of the new federalism policy compared to the position obtaining before 1975. I believe that we are primarily a nation rather than a collection of States and that there ought to be national initiatives to ensure proper, even development of Australia. I believe, too, that the Federal Government has the prime responsibility in Australia for economic management. As I have said, this is admitted in the Budget papers.

There seems in principle to be an inherent conflict between the Federal Government's national responsibility and the policy that gives to the States greater taxation powers, particularly those income tax powers that can have a profound effect on economic factors in Australia. In fact, the Liberal Party's original new federalism policy document recognised this fact when it said:

It must maintain the authority of the Commonwealth over economic management.

But, having said that, it still does not provide any practical way whereby the conflict between the Federal Government in relation to national economic management and the new federalism policy of increased income tax powers for the States can be resolved. At one level, the paramountcy of national economic management is in conflict with the States' rights to impose income tax. At the other level, the States are at the mercy of the Federal Government in changing their income tax rates or introducing tax indexation. Therefore, the States' stable financial base, which exists under the guarantee, is eroded.

There is also a further philosophical problem. The States' role in the Australian Federation is important, and will continue to be so. On the other hand, we all feel the problems of not viewing things nationally. Historically, the most obvious example is the various railway gauges that we have had and continue to have in this country. That was caused by a great concentration on a States' rights type of philosophy. Indeed, today, as the Hon. Mr. Griffin would know, we run into the same problem in the area of law reform. How much better it would be if we had one defamation law in Australia and not seven such laws as we have at present.

If we do not do things nationally, there is a problem of obtaining uniformity in law. The Hon. Mr. Griffin will no doubt find out over the next few months how difficult it is to get agreement on uniform laws or on other changes to be made on a uniform basis throughout Australia.

The new federalism was designed to reverse the accretion of powers to the Commonwealth that has occurred over the decades since Federation, which is, I hope, a greater recognition of Australia's nationhood rather than of States' rights parochialism. It is a recognition of the need for national solutions to the economy, development and generally in relation to administering the country. So, generally, while the philosophical arguments of the new federalism are in some ways attractive, I believe that they run counter to the greater feeling that Australia is a nation. Certainly, at a practical level, the new federalism, with its tax-sharing proposal, has run into considerable practical difficulties.

I now summarise the options that I believe are available under the new federalism and its tax-sharing proposals.

First, Mr. Fraser has the option to agree to the States' request for a continuing guarantee similar to that which operated previously and, thereby, abort his initial pre-1975 policy of the new federalism. The second option is that Mr. Fraser agree to modify the guarantee and force the States to impose a tax surcharge, because the uncertainties of revenue to be received over and above the guarantee and through the tax-sharing arrangement would still exist. The other option is that Mr. Fraser does not agree to continue with the guarantee and insists that the States raise any short-fall by imposing a taxation surcharge.

Mr. Fraser may in the short term continue the guarantee to overcome next year's election problems, but ultimately I believe that the third option, namely, of the States being forced into a surcharge position, will occur. I should like the Attorney-General, when replying to the debate, to make clear his position on this matter of the income-tax surcharge or double taxation. It is another issue regarding which the Government's credibility may very well be at stake.

I referred last week to the 17 000 jobs that must be produced reasonably soon in order to maintain the Government's credibility. I refer to such about-turns as the Bank of Adelaide matter last week, and now we have another issue. Does Mr. Tonkin, despite his saying before the election that he would not impose an income tax surcharge, now think that that is an option that is open to him? I should like some replies from the Leader of the Government in the Council when this debate is completed. The problem as I see it is that Mr. Tonkin, because of his membership of the Liberal Party, is committed to the Fraser policies of new federalism and has many times supported them publicly. On the other hand, surely the interests of this State would be better served by some kind of guarantee that would reintroduce in the State a degree of stability, certainly in relation to payments coming from the Federal Government.

So, I believe that the integral part of the new federalism policy is that the States impose an income tax surcharge. This has been made more likely in South Australia because of the other revenue cuts that have been made by the State Government. Mr. Tonkin said during the election campaign that he would not impose a surcharge. However, no such assurance is contained in the Budget papers. The Attorney-General should clarify the position. Does the Government support Mr. Fraser's new federalism policy, or does it adhere to its pre-election statements that it will not impose double taxation?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In discussing the Budget papers, I should like to comment on some of the things that have already been said by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. C. J. Sumner). First, regarding the Address in Reply debate taking precedence of all other debates, I point out the unique circumstances in which we are placed at present.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I pointed them out, too.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realise that, but perhaps the Leader did not place enough emphasis on some of them. Because of the early election, we are forced into the position of virtually hurrying along with our Loan Estimates and Budget debate in order to allow the State to function. I point out to the Hon. Mr. Sumner that in 1977, when the Dunstan Government called an early election, we did exactly the same thing.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I am not complaining.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: So, it is the usual procedure for the Address in Reply debate to take precedence. In unusual circumstances such as those that now exist, the

manner in which we are approaching the matter, namely, debating it at the same time as the Address in Reply, is quite justified.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's what I said.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Hon. Mr. Sumner also criticised the comments made regarding the former Government's policies. He took issue with the fact that the papers contained criticisms of the previous Government. I am inclined to agree with the Hon. Mr. Sumner on that point.

I have on occasions pointed out previously that the Dunstan Government really started this sort of ball rolling. In the presentation of the Budget papers to the Parliament, the adversary nature of the Parliamentary system as we know it became ever more obvious. In previous Budget speeches I have drawn attention to this matter. The adversary nature of the Parliamentary system that we have inherited is becoming clearer and clearer. Although the Hon. Mr. Sumner's criticisms regarding these Budget papers is valid, I point out that the criticism of the previous Government in its Budget papers is nowhere near as trenchant as were the criticisms of the Playford Government contained in the Dunstan Government's papers or the criticism of the Federal Government in papers that the Dunstan Government brought before the Parliament in the past 10 years.

It is a shame (and I know that this is worrying those who serve in the Westminster Parliament as well) that the Parliamentary system is developing more into a rank adversary system, almost as though our Parliamentary system is following the same model as our legal system.

What has sharpened this argument in relation to the increasing intrusion of adversary politics into our Parliamentary system is that the stakes are extremely high. What is at stake is nothing short of the plenitude of Government power, in other words, a winner-take-all system where one works like hell for three years to present one's case to the jury, which makes its decision every three years or thereabouts.

Because of our system and the way in which it has been developing, one must consider for a moment how vast this unqualified power is that we are developing under the Westminster system. There is a need for a greater ability for consensus opinion and for us to move away from the straight adversary politics to which we are moving so quickly, in order to achieve legislation that is in line with community needs. Although I do not want to develop that theme now, I point out to the Hon. Mr. Sumner that it was the development of that type of adversary policy in the papers presented to this Parliament during the Dunstan regime that started this sort of critical comment appearing in Budget papers.

I hope the Government does not take those words as a trenchant criticism of the Budget papers. However, in the future I hope it will not use those particular tactics which have been criticised by the Hon. Chris Sumner and which I have trenchantly criticised before in regard to the Dunstan papers that came before Parliament. The Budget has been prepared in haste, and everyone can understand the reasons why that has been the case.

The actual increase in State expenditure will be about 8.4 per cent. It is difficult to assess the various changes in expenditure in the various departments because of the changeover that has taken place in many of the departments and their responsibilities. As usual, I have prepared an analysis of the taxation revenue and the expenditure in the various departments. I seek leave to have that Budget analysis inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

BUDGET ANALYSIS—REVENUE

	Est. 1978/79 \$m.	Est. 1979/80 \$m.	Increase \$m.	% Increase
Taxation	304.2	320.1	15.9	5.0
Public Works & Services	128.9	145.5	16.6	11.4
Recoveries of Debt Services	75.7	79.4	3.7	4.7
Departmental Fees	197.1	193.3	-3.8	-2.0
Territorial	5.74	6.73	0.99	14.7
Commonwealth	558.8	632.8	74.0	11.7
Total Receipts	1 270.6	1 377.8	107.8	7.8
Premier & Treasurer	57.0	55.3	-1.7	-3.1
Deputy Premier, Mines & Energy	16.9	13.5	-3.4	-20.0
Attorney-General & Corporate Affairs	11.3	12.8	1.5	13.3
Minister Industrial Affairs	10.8	13.8	3.0	36.0
Minister of Public Works	56.2	57.9	1.7	3.0
Minister of Education & Aboriginal Affairs	382.2	397.2	15.0	3.9
Chief Secretary	74.6	81.9	7.3	21.9
Minister of Fisheries	0.9	1.7	0.8	88.0
Minister of Marine	12.7	13.4	0.7	5.5
Minister of Local Government, Housing and Arts	17.4	21.8	4.8	27.6
Minister of Agriculture & Minister of Forests	31.9	22.9	-9.0	-28.0
Minister of Environment, Minister of Planning	9.4	13.2	3.8	40.4
Minister of Transport & Recreation & Sport	71.1	81.3	10.2	14.3
Minister of Community Welfare, Consumer Affairs	47.1	50.9	3.8	8.1
Minister of Health	167.1	172.6	5.5	3.3
Minister of Tourism	4.6	2.8	-1.8	-39.0
Minister of Water Resources & Irrigation	64.2	67.6	3.4	5.3
Minister of Land & Repatriation	14.3	14.9	0.6	4.2
Allowance for Increased Wage & Salary Rates	33.0	56.0	23.0	70.0
Allowance for Increased Prices	2.5	5.0	2.5	100.0
Total Expenditure	1 270.6	1 377.8	107.2	8.4

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As I pointed out, it is very difficult to make any comparisons in departmental expenditures. The increase in expenditure will be about 8.4 per cent and the total receipts amounted to \$1 270 000 000 in 1978-79, while the estimated receipts for 1979-80 amount to \$1 377 000 000, which is an increase of \$107 000 000. The rise in State tax will be about 5 per cent, while in public works and services it will be about 11.4 per cent. In recoveries of debt services the increase is 4.7 per cent, but there will be a drop in departmental fees of about 2 per cent. Territorial income is estimated to increase by 14.7 per cent. Commonwealth reimbursements will increase by about 11.7 per cent, making an overall increase of 8.4 per cent. I do not intend commenting on the various Ministers, because it is very difficult to establish the exact movement within each portfolio. However, there is a very sharp decline in the figures for the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Forests. That decline is a result of no provision being made for natural disasters, whereas last year the expenditure for that was almost \$9 000 000. While my budget analysis document is reasonably accurate, comparisons are difficult because of the rearrangement of portfolios. In some cases I have had to use actual expenditure for 1978-79, instead of the estimated expenditure. Nevertheless, the comparisons illustrate that the Budget shows the application of considerable restraint in Government expenditure and a very conservative contingency provision. The contingency provision amounts to \$56 000 000 and the allowance for increase in prices is about \$5 000 000. Whether the expenditure as predicted can be held at that estimate remains to be seen. In certain areas I am very doubtful whether the Government will be able to hold the expenditure to that estimated in the lines before us, and this is particularly so in the health lines.

The restraint obviously being placed upon Government expenditure is a welcome change in policy because, for a number of years, we have been presented with Budget papers extolling the values of increasing expenditures in what one may term the social areas. However, I still direct criticism at the lack of financial resources being directed

towards the areas of Government expenditure that will assist in producing greater economic depth to the State. In offering that criticism I am only too aware of the fact that the Budget and Loan Estimates this year are only a cosmetic operation on a socialist Budget. In the short time available to the Treasurer, the only approach he could possibly make was to take a budget, previously prepared, and make quick alterations.

Therefore, any criticism that I address to the papers as presented must be understood in that context. The one area that will shift the South Australian economy into top gear more quickly than any other is the development of our mineral resources. This is the key to unlock the decline in our economic activity over the past few years. It is in this area that one would have thought that greater Government expenditure may have been directed.

We need to direct our efforts into greater exploration and to assist the development of existing resources as quickly as possible. For example, the increase in expenditure in the Department of Mines and Energy is a meagre 4 per cent—less than the inflation rate—while expenditure on the arts increases by 9 per cent. In saying this, I am not criticising the expenditure on the arts but am pointing out that I am disappointed that the allocation for the Department of Mines and Energy has not kept pace with the rate of inflation.

It is impossible in a debate of this nature to cover all the points that one could cover, but I would like to congratulate the Government on the general direction the Budget and Loan Estimates take. The general direction is clear: a reduction in the level of taxation, matched with a policy of encouraging development in the private sector. The taxation cuts are in the areas that will give a lift to investment potential, it will give confidence to capital, it will encourage capital to stay in South Australia, even though we may lose one entrepreneur in Mount Gambier.

While this is so, there is also a need to ensure that our departments, which are directly involved in the fields where we need the private sector to once again become more active, are sufficiently funded to enable them to play their role in that development. The Department of Mines

and Energy is one such department. This State urgently needs to spend more money on research programmes, for one thing on our coal resources. While a great deal of research work is being undertaken overseas, the work being undertaken in Australia, both at the Commonwealth and State levels, is largely unco-ordinated and unsatisfactory.

We cannot rely, I suggest, upon overseas research to provide us with the necessary technologies when, among other things, we know so little about our own natural resources. Not only is there a need for research into our own coal resources in South Australia, with a view to their use in electricity generation, but we will in the near future be depending upon that coal as a source of liquid and gaseous fuels. While the gasification or liquefaction of coal may be some time off, the Government must assume a leading role in research and encouraging and underwriting the introduction of coal conversion technology.

Our ability to meet a significant part of our energy requirements from indigenous resources should be a State as well as a national goal and, because the capital costs of coal conversion plants will be high, it would seem logical for Government, both Commonwealth and State, to assume a leading role. As a nation we do not have a national energy policy; much is the pity. Nor have we ever had one, irrespective of the colour of the Government in Canberra.

The development of a national energy policy, with the full co-operation of the State departments would seem to me to be of paramount importance, with parallel research programmes which would recognise the important potential of coal and other resources in the Australian energy scene. The need is for a sustained co-ordinated research commitment on all relevant aspects of coal resources and coal utilisation.

One could go on dealing with the need for an expanded research programme on the energy question, but such a course would take a long time. Associated with this sort of research, of course, we must also ensure that our search for liquid hydrocarbon is expanded and goes unabated.

The proving of sufficient reserves is essential, of course, to the establishment of a petro-chemical industry which appears to be becoming more certain as the days go by. I admit I have certain hesitation on the chosen site at the top of Spencer Gulf for such a project, and I would ask the Government in any reappraisal of the scheme to examine alternative sites for its construction.

I am pleased that, with the change of Government, the development of Roxby Downs can now proceed without hindrance. I do not wish to debate, at this stage, the question of mining uranium, as I believe that debate, as far as debate goes, is over, with the results of the election. The world in its energy mix must use the nuclear reactor, and the simple question is that, whether we mine uranium or not, the world market will continue to buy uranium as an energy resource. The development of Roxby Downs is as important to South Australia as the discovery of copper was in 1851.

In its policy speech the Government promised the abolition of drainage rates in the South-East. I touch on this matter as I know a little about it. Although it is not dealt with in the Budget, I have no doubt that it will be included in the next Budget. The previous Government's policy on this matter was plainly stupid and, although the Legislative Council tried to point this out to the Government when changes were made to the rating system, the Government was adamant and the Bill passed because the new scheme reduced the overall rates to be paid. Therefore, this Council could do little but point out the stupidity of the action taken.

There is only one way now to go, to produce any sanity, and that is to provide for the total abolition of those rates. I congratulate the Government on its approach in this matter. Perhaps I could explain to the Council the history of this matter and direct a question to the Government on the implementation of its promise about the abolition of drainage rates.

The drainage of the South-East began in the Millicent-Tantanoola area with the establishment of drainage boards, which, after the land was drained, were cloaked with the power of local government. The land, when drained, was sold and an assessment was made of the value of the land before drainage and the value of the land after drainage, and the difference in value became the betterment factor which became the assessed value for rating purposes, and each block varied in assessment according to the increased value of that block due to drainage.

In passing, may I point out that the first drain constructed was through what is known as the Narrow Neck which connected Cootel Swamp and Lake Frome, allowing the drainage of that swamp. The drain was not constructed to reclaim agricultural land but to prevent the telegraph line from inundation by water. The original drainage boards, which were responsible for rating on the betterment assessment for the maintenance of the drainage system and the building of roads and bridges, finally amalgamated, forming mainly the Millicent and Tantanoola councils, which had the responsibility of rating and maintaining the drainage system.

To assist the councils, a large area of commonage land was made available to the council for leasing; the revenue from this being paid into the Drainage Maintenance Fund. Following the success of the Millicent-Tantanoola scheme, other schemes were undertaken under the control of the South-Eastern Drainage Board but, in most if not all cases in these schemes, the land was already privately owned. The same procedure was followed: a betterment assessment was made and a rate payable on that betterment assessment. There is a lot of other information that could be provided but that broadly is the picture.

The responsibility for drainage control lies with the South-Eastern Drainage Board in its areas and with the Millicent District Council (amalgamated recently with Tantanoola). The previous Government decided to change the basis of assessment to an unimproved land system in the South-Eastern Drainage Board area. This is a ridiculous method of assessing rates for any drainage system. There can be no justification for having a drainage rate based on unimproved land values, and the Government ran into all manner of difficulties in implementing that concept, which I will not elaborate upon here. I give one illustration. How can one assess a mount, which never was inundated for drainage rates? I will leave the question there to show the stupidity of that system.

There is only one satisfactory solution to the problem now, and that is total abolition of rates, which amount to \$140 000 a year. It is the only sensible thing to do.

But we are still left with the one problem, and that problem is the Millicent District Council drainage area. This council has maintained its own drainage system over 100 years without any cost to the taxpaying community, or at least with very little taxpayer assistance, as compared to a large taxpayer contribution to the South-Eastern Drainage Board area.

Approaches have been made on many occasions to the council to relinquish its responsibilities and hand them over to the South-Eastern Drainage Board. These approaches have been refused by the council with almost

the unanimous approval of the ratepaying public of that district. Therefore, my question to the Government is: In the implementation of the drainage rate abolition, what consideration will be given to the Millicent District Council?

It would be quite wrong to abolish drainage rating in all the South-East with the exception of the one area, the Millicent District Council, and I believe it would be quite foolish to take away from the council the responsibilities it has fulfilled extremely well over 100 years of operation at a lesser cost to the ratepayers and the taxpaying public than the cost of the board. No doubt the policy implementation will be included in next year's Budget but, in the implementation of that promise, the Government must give consideration to the question I have asked.

It is difficult in the Budget papers to understand all the ramifications of the Loan programme and I would recommend to the Government, for the future, that the Loan allocations be set out more clearly. I know that, with the many changes that have taken place in semi-government borrowings and authority borrowings, it is difficult to set out the position with clarity; nevertheless, when the papers state that the total works programme will be undertaken from the Loan Budget it should be a simple task to identify those allocations, but it is extremely difficult to do so.

I appreciate the fact that the Government has had little time to prepare the papers, but I do suggest that in future a clearer method for presentation be adopted. I have been able to identify most of the \$218 000 000 allocated from Loan funds but a small sum has so far eluded me in checking those figures.

I suggest that, if the Government looks at what I am saying, it will find that I am correct. It is difficult to understand the allocation of the sum to which I have referred. The Hon. Mr. Sumner made much noise about the tax-sharing formula with the Commonwealth Government. I point out to him that the Commonwealth tax-sharing formula has always been a complicated system that takes a great deal of understanding.

The basic concept of the so-called new federalism is, in my view, correct because in the previous arrangement the States, as spenders of money, and not collectors, could always blame the Commonwealth for any mismanagement of the State finances. If we go back through the debates for the past 10 years, we will see that constantly the Commonwealth has been blamed for everything that a writer could lay his finger to. It all came back to the question of the Commonwealth.

State Premiers have always been only too quick to take this course of action. It will always be difficult while the States do not share the responsibility of tax raising. However, the developments under the new federalism plan have already shown that there is no simple solution to this problem. What the States want, of course, is a known growth tax so their budgeting can be made with some certainty. The Commonwealth, on the other hand, likes a similar position, where it does not have to act as the "hedge", providing guarantees when it does not know the income it will be receiving.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It has become more scared.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, but that does not alter the point that I am making. States face a less certain future after this Commonwealth Budget in relation to Federal income tax. I think the words in the Budget were (and the Hon. Mr. Sumner may be able to help me here) "more volatile tax sharing".

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: No-one can help you. You're on the back-bench.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, but I am here with

honour.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I repeat that I think the words used in the Budget papers are "more volatile sharing arrangement". The States cannot have it both ways. If they choose the comfort of a fixed sum formula, allowing the Commonwealth to be the cushion between fluctuating tax seasons, then it is the comfortable road they will be choosing. If they are to ride the ups and downs of seasonal changes, then they will have to exercise greater caution and greater skills in budgeting preparation and planning.

I am one who favours the latter course, with the States having the right to impose a surcharge allowing the Commonwealth to reduce income tax for its own purposes. Much political mileage has been made by certain politicians, branding this sort of policy as double taxation. This, of course, is nonsense. It is no more double taxation than is land tax, council rating, or a whole range of taxes that apply at present. It is double talk to lay a claim that, because the State should have the right to income tax, that is double taxation. Until 1942 the States had income-taxing powers. They were transferred to the Federal Parliament in that year as a wartime measure, and that has not been revoked. The Opposition is trying to say that, because the Commonwealth is the only income tax levier, if the position reverts to the previous position, that will be double taxation. However, all that it does is place tax-raising in the hands of those who are spending. If that is the case, there is more likely to be a reduction in income tax than an increase.

If the taxing powers of those spending the money were in the hands of those raising it, there would be a greater likelihood of responsibility on the part of those raising it. Nothing tends to be more inefficient than to have an authority with the power of spending but relying on someone else to find the funds from a taxpaying Budget. Whatever happens regarding the new federalism scheme, any movement to a surcharge for taxation at State level is not double taxation. That is my first strong point.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You are taxed twice on your income.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member is trying to tell me that excise on beer and the hotel licence are double taxation measures. Honourable members opposite are dead scared of having responsibility, as pure socialists, for taxing the people. They are trying to tell me that, because the States may have the right to impose a surcharge on income, that is double taxation. I am saying it is not. All they will see is more responsibility in the expenditure of money by those who raise it.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Does Mr. Tonkin agree with you, and does he want to impose the income tax surcharge?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: All I am saying is that there is no need to be afraid of the new federalism policy, whatever direction it takes us in. The honourable member wants to be in the position of the boy with his hand out for the lolly.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Tell me what the Government will do.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is no way in which I can determine what the process will be in the next Budget papers. All I am saying is that if, as a State, we impose some form of income tax, it will not be double taxation.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The Hon. Mr. Griffin, when he replies, may be able to tell us.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not know, but I am saying that the new federalism policy will undergo changes, just as every policy on Commonwealth-State

financial relationships has done. I believe firmly that, if we are to achieve responsible expenditure at State level and get away from the stupidity of what Mr. Dunstan did for 10 years in blaming the Commonwealth for not handing out—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The people supported him for those 10 years.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Doesn't Dick Hamer adopt exactly the same line?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: All States do it. You are taking the point that I am criticising a particular Party. You are dead scared. You have placed that on top of the Grants Commission. The Grants Commission, of course, would still have its role to play, where special consideration and grants could be undertaken to maintain relativities between the States.

It may well be that the Commonwealth, if it changes its taxation policy to more indirect forms of taxation, may force the States to accept responsibility for certain income-tax raisings and, while there will be great flutterings in the dove-cote from certain politicians, the direction by and large is a correct one.

The whole of the Commonwealth-State financial relationship is in a state of flux at present, and I do not think very many people know exactly where that relationship may finish. The opinion has been expressed that the 1927 Financial Agreement terminates in 1980. This, of course, does not cut across tax-sharing policy, as that policy stems from the wartime passage of income-taxing powers to the Commonwealth, but, nevertheless, if it is a valid contention that the 1927 Financial Agreement terminates in 1980, further strains will be placed upon Commonwealth-State relationships.

The Budget has been made in a very difficult period. It is a Budget that will bring some confidence back to the South Australian economy. It is a Budget that has moved away from concentration on mainly social areas of development in this State. I hope that the Budget will encourage the private sector. I am certain that it will. I am looking forward to those Bills that will be passing through this House to implement the Government's policy in these matters.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 18 October. Page 185.)

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It was moved so long ago that I have almost forgotten what the motion was. Nevertheless, as everyone else has supported it, I am determined to do the same! May I congratulate all those who were successful in the recent election, and I thank previous speakers for the kind sentiments expressed to me.

It is with a deep feeling of gratitude, pride, humility, affection, fear and all the natural human emotions, which I am unable to hide, that I speak today. These feelings have been accentuated by the courtesy and understanding which members from both the Government and the Opposition have shown to me over the past two weeks or so in circumstances which were not all that easy. I do not regard that consideration as anything but a genuine desire to help in a situation which is new to some members and, I need hardly say, to me. Be that as it may, honourable

members have all been kind and thoughtful, and I would be pleased if they would convey my gratitude to their Leaders in another place. I realise full well what a responsible position I will be in personally. On many occasions and certainly on matters of controversy, my vote in this Chamber will be decisive. On every question before us I shall try, as I must, to make a judgment as to which outcome is the better for the State, irrespective of which side is supported by the Liberal Party and which side is supported by the Labor Party.

There are now two Democrats in this Parliament. My colleague, Robin Millhouse, a member of the House of Assembly, and I plan to work together, to be a team and where appropriate to speak with one voice and to take the same attitude. In doing so, we shall be guided by the political philosophy which we share and for which the Australian Democrats stand. That, I trust, will make it easier for us and, hopefully, for all members of this Parliament.

There has only been one blemish in the courtesy extended to me, and that happened during the opening of Parliament. I was talking in one of the corridors of power when a fellow came up to me (not a member of this Council, I hasten to add) and said, "You're a bit old to enter politics, aren't you?" "I don't know about that", I said. "By the way, this is my father, Mr. Kenneth Milne. He has just decided to stand for preselection for the coming Senate election." The good man wandered off in the direction of another place to report to his masters that something dreadful was about to happen to the Australian Democrats and to Parliament.

In his Speech at the opening of Parliament, His Excellency the Governor said, among other things:

... all sections of our community must arrive at a larger vision of the true welfare and purpose of our society with its delicately balanced social, economic and legal structures. Only when we have achieved a general recognition, a general consensus, that we are all bound together by an essential commonality of interest and that, conversely, the forces that divide our community are based largely upon irrational prejudice, will the peace, harmony and prosperity of this State be firmly established upon a secure foundation.

That is the kind of platitude we hear all the time, but I happen to believe it, and I am certain honourable members do, too. My humble response to these sentiments, which I share—and have shared for a long time—is to bring a number of matters to the Council's attention in the hope that honourable members will consider them when they arise again, as they surely will.

Before I get too far away from the pleasant part of my speech, I would like to congratulate the Government on negotiating the introduction of what the *Advertiser* referred to as "a radical plan which could see skilled and semi-skilled Government workers seconded to work for private companies". I do not think it meant private companies. However, it went on:

Under the plan, firms taking on Government contracts will be asked to use some Government workers on the job and pay their wages.

That seemed to me to be eminently sensible and a practical solution to a very grave problem, and I am very pleased. I ought to be, since it has been taken from my policy speech during the recent election campaign. Referring to the large number of public servants who were under-utilised or actually idle, I said:

One solution would be for contracts to be let to private contractors wherever possible and for the successful contractors to recruit an agreed proportion of the additional labour and expertise required from the appropriate Government departments, on secondment, for the term of

the contracts—those on secondment retaining their Public Service rights and returning to it when no longer required on those contracts. This would bolster the private sector, reduce unemployment, and likewise reduce the cost of the Public Service. This is a simple scheme which, with goodwill on both sides, will work for the benefit of us all. It is working in a small way now, and I understand from the Public Service Association that the idea is neither new nor necessarily repugnant to them.

Well, I suppose it does not matter who does what, provided it works—and helps to get the State going again.

We must face the fact, I think, that in South Australia in particular a very real and worsening problem is that of survival of a small State in the face of increasing pressures from the Eastern States and Canberra. We should be concerned not only with the differences between the left and the right of politics but also with the unnecessary and undesirable division between the city and the country. We live in a huge island continent, and any policy on agriculture or horticulture in Australia must be discussed in this context. Australia is different: it is the size of 1918 Europe, with a population of only 14 000 000 people, mostly living in six major capital cities and on the coast. The distances from internal and external markets, climatic variations, and the small percentage of the population working "on the land" all help to make the problems of the rural community in Australia distinct, if not unique.

Australia has an "outback", unlike Britain, the United States, or other primary producing countries which we tend to copy. The further one goes from the coast and the capital cities, the fewer the people, both in the country towns and on the land itself. This problem of distance, access, and isolation in the vast area of the Australian continent creates special problems which require innovative policies to solve.

We must also understand that there are big farmers and small farmers, that there are rich farmers and poor farmers, farmers who inherit their properties and those who are paying off mortgages. City people imagine that all primary producers are wealthy, which simply is not true. The Henderson Report pointed out that over 50 per cent of Australian poverty is in the rural sector, covering those living in country towns as well. First, let us get the South Australian situation straight. South Australia's total population is approximately 1 300 000 people, of whom only 350 000 (25 per cent) reside outside the areas of Adelaide and its suburbs.

In 1977-78, South Australia exported to overseas countries commodities valued at approximately \$660 000 000, the vast majority of which were produced by the 350 000 rural dwellers—or the 25 per cent. In the same year, South Australia imported from overseas commodities valued at \$629 000 000 which, in the main, were used by the 950 000 city and urban dwellers—or the 75 per cent. In other words, the balancing of South Australia's import/export budget is nearly achieved by 25 per cent of the State's population, almost on their own. This clearly illustrates the real dependence of both communities on each other, which we tend to forget, and the vital need for better understanding and co-operation to be fostered between them. This we must all try to achieve, and I hope that we can discuss the matter in the not too distant future.

The Australian Democrats regard unemployment as the most serious problem in this country. This is not just a matter of whether they are earning money or not: it is a problem in which so many people in Australia have no part to play, are not needed and not wanted. That is the real tragedy of unemployment. We would like to see official consultation on a continuous basis between banks, finance houses, employers, trade unions, and the

Government with representatives of the unemployed themselves. We would like to see the introduction of self-help and training schemes that really work, without all the restrictions and complications, that make it difficult for those trying to improve their own position.

Automation is here to stay, and technological change is accelerating. This change will inevitably make skilled, hardworking people redundant (blue collar, white collar workers and professional people) through no fault of their own, while increasing the incomes and security of others. We must further develop retraining schemes to allow all people to benefit from technological revolution. Furthermore, we must adopt an entirely new attitude to those who are what we call "unemployed", and not treat them as second-class citizens. If society has caused their problem, which it has, then society must share it with them. Members of this Council must show that we, too, are prepared to share it with them, and let them know that at least we care.

I believe that we would all be wise to stop thinking of the mining industry in the way in which we have thought of it from the gold rush days until now. We still tend to look upon mining as a source of rapid and easy wealth. The nation has a boom and bust. The share market has a boom and bust. We have done it over and over again and according to the news yesterday we will do it again. That is not good enough, and we as members must try to change it. We have not yet realised or adjusted our thinking to the fact that a mine normally benefits comparatively few people, and that frequently much of the proceeds goes overseas or that, once the ore is gone, it cannot be replaced: it is gone forever.

Mining is unlike the rural or manufacturing industries where international trade, say, between Australia and one or more countries can be carried on over a long period. Every mine has a limited life and, for many, it is a comparatively short life, particularly if we work them at maximum speed. For these and other reasons, which I will not go into now, we must carefully review our whole attitude to the expenditure of those resources, which Australia is lucky enough to discover and which belong to future generations, as well as to us.

This leads me to uranium mining. The Hon. Barbara Wiese dealt with the technical dangers of uranium mining in her excellent speech last Thursday. Therefore, I shall content myself with discussing a different side of it altogether. I have made the policy of the Australian Democrats perfectly clear in recent announcements. It is simply this: we are opposed to the mining and sale of uranium until the security of plutonium, the disposal of nuclear waste, the safety of the operation and the miners, the control on its use and the economy of the nuclear industry are completely satisfactory. While this may be painful to some, it will protect the many and, to do otherwise, we believe, is unthinkable.

Honourable members should consider just who is making the noise both for and against uranium. What is the real motive behind those who support uranium? Are they shareholders in uranium projects? Are they really looking at the benefits to the State and its people? Or are they taking the old-fashioned selfish, narrow view of easy personal gain? Have they really considered the dangers and possible tragedies for future generations and for their own descendants? I very much doubt it. What about the opponents of uranium mining? Why do they frantically oppose it? Why is their attitude so utterly inflexible?

For example, are the Friends of the Earth really worried about the environment, or are they using that as an excuse or a bit of something in between? Is there an element amongst them that is simply opposed to any development?

Has the environment group gone too far, and is it now enjoying the power of obstruction? Who is trying to foster alternative sources of energy? Are they encouraged or discouraged? If discouraged, who stands to gain by discouraging them? Why have we no major thrust towards solar energy, wind power, wave power, or something else? Have they given this sufficient thought? I very much doubt it.

Not very long before the recent election, the previous Government indicated that it intended to reduce the office of the Agent-General in London and establish another office, I think, in Hong Kong. I find that very few people, even in Parliament, understand just how the Agent-General's office came into being and what functions it fulfils. I had the privilege, at the request of the Walsh Government, of occupying that post, in which I served for five years, and naturally I feel deeply and sentimentally about it. Before Federation, each State, being a Sovereign State, had Agents-General in London. These were authorised by Acts passed by the British Parliament and reciprocal Acts passed in the various States. Those appointed as Agent-General are given diplomatic status at the level of Consul-General (which is the bottom rung, incidentally).

On Federation, the diplomatic representative of Australia in London became the High Commissioner; but, by some typical British flexibility, the States were allowed to retain their Agents-General with diplomatic status. In fact, while I was still in London, as Agent-General for South Australia, the British Parliament actually confirmed and strengthened the office of Agent-General and gave diplomatic status to Official Secretaries. Honourable members will readily understand, therefore, that this is a privilege which should not lightly be given away. And in any case it would be foolish for one State to downgrade its official London office, while the other States retained them at high level. To do so would be an admission of defeat or decline.

Over the years, the importance of South Australia House in London, its functions, and its work load, have fluctuated with the fortunes of the State. At times it has seemed an unnecessary expense, which need not be very great, and at other times, vital. I think that the Government must take the long view about representation in London, because it is quite different from just having an office in Hong Kong, Brussels, Tokyo or somewhere else. It is a strong, traditional, practical link with one of the main centres of the world and should be treated with care. I remember what an American said to me once, when talking about tradition. He said, "Don't stop it, because you can't start it." I also remember Mr. Fred Peart, now Lord Peart, speaking at the Lord Mayor's Easter Banquet in London. It is the biggest diplomatic banquet in the world and he was representing the then British Prime Minister, the Hon. Harold Wilson. Among other things, he said:

I am a reformer and a traditionalist as well.

If that attitude is good enough for him, it is good enough for me. I turn next to electoral reform, to the criticisms which have been voiced about the present system of election to this Chamber, and to that Liberal Party advertisement, which I have contended misled the electors as to how the system works. I distinguish two arguments which the Hon. Ren DeGaris, in his remarks, treated as though they were the same. The first argument is that the present system is defective, because, first, it fails to give every formal vote its full value throughout all the counting procedures, and, second, it fails to maximise the proportion of votes which ultimately assist in the election of a member. I entirely agree that the system has these

defects, and I endorse the criticisms offered by the Hon. Ren DeGaris on these grounds. However, the system is far from being "the most undemocratic in Australia", as he claimed.

The electoral systems for the Federal House of Representatives and for all State Lower Houses, except Tasmania, are far more undemocratic. The Australian Democrat voter in the Legislative Council District of South Australia has been able to obtain a representative of his choice; the Liberal voter in the House of Assembly electorate of Spence or the Labor voter in Goyder will never in his life have a representative of his choice. His or her vote will never assist in the election of a member. Nothing can be done to improve this situation by fiddling with individual electoral boundaries. The only way to remedy the defects I have described is to introduce the Tasmanian Hare-Clark system throughout: multi-member electorates for the House of Assembly as well as the Legislative Council, and fully transferrable preferential voting in both. I hope that the Government will soon give this suggestion serious consideration in its study of electoral reform.

The second argument is that in the light of these defects the voter has one—and only one—strategy for minimising the risk that his vote will not receive its full value throughout counting, namely, to vote for a major Party. This proposition is false. The illusion that it is true arises in this way: if a minor Party gets more than half a quota but fails to get a candidate elected, all those who voted for that Party can assume that their votes did not assist in the election of a member. If a major Party gets, say, four quotas, and nearly but not quite gets a fifth candidate elected, none of that Party's voters knows whether his own vote was one of the unused surplus ("consigned to the wastepaper basket", as the saying goes). Yet unused surplus there certainly is, and as many voters can be left stranded in this way by voting for a major Party, as for a minor Party. So far as the electoral system provides, the probability that you will, so to speak, lose your investment totally (that neither your primary vote nor your preferences will assist in electing a member, and that a candidate you do not prefer will be elected, while your vote languishes in the wastepaper basket) is no less if you vote for a major Party than if you vote for a minor Party. In fact, it must be somewhat greater, since there is a certain possibility that a minor Party voter's preference will be used but no possibility at all that a major Party voter's preference will be used. On the other side, the potential return on this investment is greater for the minor Party voter than for a major Party voter. To take my own case, I arrived here with less than a full quota of votes, whereas the Liberal and Labor Parties received more than six and four full quotas respectively. Therefore, my supporters made a shrewd investment!

I hope these remarks help to clarify the grounds on which I have charged the Liberal Party with unfairly misrepresenting the provisions of the Electoral Act in their advertisements of 14 and 15 September 1979. Responding to the charge in this Chamber the other day, the Attorney-General, perhaps wisely, contented himself with a simple denial. The Hon. Ren DeGaris insisted that he could explain everything, but, as I have indicated, his explanation showed that he had misunderstood the nature of the charge. The two crucial sentences of this advertisement are as follows:

Your vote for any Party other than Liberal or Labor may not be counted.

The peculiar system of voting for the South Australian Legislative Council means that votes cast for any group other than the major Parties may result in preferences not being

distributed.

What will an otherwise uninstructed elector (which means most of them) conclude from the first sentence? Surely, he will conclude that the return submitted by the Returning Officer is a thoroughly fraudulent document, for it says that 731 396 formal votes were cast, but how can that be known if some votes were not counted? How could the Returning Officer calculate what the quota should be? How could he tell that any Party has or has not achieved half a quota of votes if some of its votes have not been counted? That sentence is clearly untrue and misleading and indeed casts an aspersion on the whole conduct of the election. The Liberal Party will no doubt say that our hypothetical elector would be able to infer from the second sentence that "vote" really meant "second preference". The Hon. Ren DeGaris did not distinguish between primary votes, all of which are counted, and second preference votes, most of which are not. If that was all the Liberal Party meant to convey in that first sentence, it could have done it more accurately and no less succinctly by saying:

If you vote for any Party other than Liberal or Labor, your second preference may not be counted.

Failure to do this can only be deliberate obscurantism. That a large number of voters were, in fact, misled is shown by the fact that many telephoned the Australian Democrats' office, asking why they could not vote Australian Democrat, and I know personally of a number who actually changed their mind because of it. That is what the Liberal Party wanted; it did not quite work and I say, "Bad luck." The second sentence is, in any case, itself misleading. The voter must infer from this sentence that by voting for a majority Party he secures himself against the risk of his preference not being distributed. In fact, of course, he ensures the very opposite, in that his preference would certainly not be distributed if he or she voted Liberal or Labor, and the Liberal Party knew that.

Looking back to June 1973, we see that the three major Parties were Labor, Liberal and Liberal Movement. The system whereby preferences of major Parties would not be counted was obviously a device introduced by the then Labor Government to prevent its opponents from trading preferences. This was highly successful, and distorted the wishes of the electorate in the 1975 election, as the Hon. Ren DeGaris pointed out. The extraordinary compromise agreed to by the Legislative Council in 1973 can only have been to avoid a double dissolution, which was threatened at the time, and hardly bears out the third claim in the Liberal Party advertisement, where it states:

The Liberal Legislative Council has protected individual rights from abuse by Government . . .

I still contend that the advertisement was untrue and unfair, and I sincerely hope that, for the sake of the dignity of Parliament, such advertisements are never used again. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris tried for years to get some sense into an electoral system, against overwhelming odds, and I admire him for it.

Now, if I may seek your forbearance I want to talk about the schizophrenia of Australians. For Australia to be accepted as part of the real world, East or West, we must have a demonstrable quality in our people, our politics, our attitude to other countries and other people, and in our approach to wealth and the materialism of our time. One of the most striking impressions on returning to Australia after a long absence of five years was the very evident—and increasing—materialism of our people, which was once a problem for a relative few.

All my life I have been taught to work hard and earn a good income, the more the better. The more income one earned, the more successful one was supposed to be.

However, this was the direct opposite of what I was taught on Sunday. Now, with current social attitudes, this conflict is coming to everyone in the Western world, and I feel that the position is growing more complex and more difficult to cope with. In Australia, just as in other countries, there is an evident deterioration in our social and business attitudes, even in our treatment of each other. Quite suddenly we all want to be rich, we want to join the affluent society, in the belief that it will bring happiness.

It seems that the more that wealth is created and spread the more we want things to buy, the more we want to be comfortable, the more we try to live unto ourselves, and the less we care about other people, which is not democracy. It is a story of "Bread and Circuses" all over again. Democracy will not work that way; it will not work on selfishness, certainly not in an alien geographical area such as that in which we Australians now thrive. The economic situation in the world is that the rich nations are getting richer and the poor nations are getting comparatively poorer (except the oil-rich Arab countries), yet we do not seem to have an answer to it or are not prepared to find an answer to it, because it would mean making some sort of real sacrifice which, frankly, we have not been prepared to make.

Our quest for luxury and comfort continues, aided by our ability to invent things, our ability to manufacture things, and our skill with money and credit. Yet, as Australians, we want to be known as, and even seen as, a healthy, honest, unselfish, friendly people. In other words, we are schizophrenic: we have split personalities. This schizophrenia is very noticeable in Australia today, where we have the added problems of trying to pretend that we are not any longer Europeans, which we are, in effect, and trying to establish in the minds of our northern neighbours that we are an Eastern nation, which we are not really. If honourable members had travelled in South-East Asia enough to make friends there, they would learn what the people think about us.

I mention these problems because they have an effect on our politics and show up in political platforms and policies. They also have a bearing on organisations such as this Chamber and what it should be doing. In most areas there is dilemma. Nobody is really sure what to do and therefore there is constant argument inside and outside our Parliaments as to the solutions.

The challenge for politically-minded Australians is to propose the survival of this nation (not the comfort, but survival) as a highly principled democracy, which it has always had the chance to be. However, that opportunity will not last forever. Indeed, it seems to be under attack at this very moment, and it feels to people of my age, or our age, that we are missing the bus somewhere by converting what Australia was meant to be into a shabby copy of something else.

Reforms there must be, and the process must be continuous, which is why the Parliamentary system is so valuable. However, to change things in a hurry and without sufficient thought, and to try to make us all richer for no good reason, can be the cause of unnecessary disruption in a finely balanced system such as ours. We have that now, when one section of the community is rich and an increasingly large section is unemployed.

We have a tendency in Australia, I think, to copy political developments overseas, whether they are appropriate to Australia or not. One moment we look up to the United States of America (as we did in 1901 when designing our Constitution) as the great democratic experiment, yet it must be obvious to most of us now that the American colonists were so angry with George III that they "threw out the baby and kept the bath water" to a

very large extent.

Another time we copy Britain, and now we in Australia seem to look upon Sweden or Germany as the Holy Grail, or Russia, China, or somewhere else that has little or no real relationship to the Australian scene and outlook, historically, politically, geographically, in the character of our people, or in relation to the wrongs which need redress.

If you have travelled as much as I have (many of you probably have) and lived overseas so much, and have had business relationships with as many nationalities as I have, you must come to the sad but inescapable conclusion that we are regarded by the rest of the world as a small, distant, selfish, and rather conceited people. The fact is that they do not like us very much. I am not saying that this is entirely fair, but it is the judgment of many people in many nations I have visited. I still believe that the greatest dignity we can attain in the short run is to be quite open and proud, in fact, about being a British-style democracy, growing and maturing, determined yet humble—democrats, in fact, with good international manners, with ambition to come of age eventually, but not in a hurry and not at other people's expense. I say that because that is what most of the world wishes we were like, that is what most migrants wish we were like, and that is why so many of them came here.

The contrast between Australian life and the tragedies of so many other countries strikes me over and over again when watching a film on television about Northern Ireland, Vietnam, Kampuchea, or some other film about human suffering where the people are desperate, frightened, poor and full of hatred: when suddenly advertisements appear encouraging us all, the young in particular, to spend more on food, drink, beauty treatments, pills, hair styles, motor cars, radios, T.V., stomach powder, and so on—all money to spend on ourselves—all luxurious and very easy living. Then the film goes back to the story of human suffering, of which there is so much, and it worries me. I feel that our lives are unreal and that our situation cannot last.

Compared with most of the rest of the world, we are a very lucky country indeed. The point I am making, really, is that we have in a big way joined the league of the comfort-loving, pleasure-seeking people of the world, while pretending that it is all right and proper and that there should be more of it, with the corollary, of course, that, if people do not like us and if we continue to be so selfish, there can be no justification for leaving us alone in the country which we have adopted.

Unimportant though we may be in this Council in relation to the rest of Australia, I would dearly love to see us take a stand and to set an example of how a House of Parliament like this can have an influence on others. I believe that we can do what we are supposed to do and do it in such a way that we create more light and less heat, that we can stimulate Governments of the day to act with honesty, tolerance and compassion. To do that, of course, we must do the same. I earnestly believe that Australia has a part to play in the South-East Asian area, but that we have neither found it, nor played it. We must fulfil a much more unselfish role if we are to make and keep new friends in the Indian Pacific region.

We as Australians who aspire to being an independent nation must realise the behaviour which makes one nation friendly to another and the behaviour which makes them antagonistic. As a nation, typical of what we ought to be and what we could so easily be, we will have many friends but, as a shabby and selfish copy of something else, we will have no friends. We will have little respect and little chance of a happy future as a people with a destiny to fulfil

and the right to survive.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I support the motion and offer my congratulations to the newly elected members and my congratulations to you, Sir, on your re-election as President. To former members Don Banfield, Tom Casey, and Dick Geddes, I express my goodwill, and I trust that they will enjoy their future.

To say that I was disappointed at the results of the election is somewhat of an understatement. It was difficult to accept the fact. It must be remembered that not one Labor member in this Council has ever been in Opposition and only two in the House of Assembly have been in Opposition. I have no doubt that some members of the Liberal Party, having been through it in 1965 and 1970, will understand the lost feeling. No doubt some criticism could be levelled at us: perhaps we had become complacent, but during our term in office we left no stone unturned in order to get people to participate, to get them to feel part of the community. Our theme was to let them know that the State was for all of them. We wanted them involved and accepting responsibility. After we came to Government we treated them like thinking adults. We raised them out of the doldrums and gave them the right to think for themselves, to be grown up and to do their own thing.

The Liberal Party did not win the election; that Party's manipulators won it for them. They manipulated the people and, as evidence, I draw attention to the daily diet of scurrilous, lying garbage served up as advertising and news items. It is time the people with community responsibilities paid some attention to the effect of their actions on the community.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Mr. President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: It is time that those with responsibility considered all angles. They should not take drastic, unwarranted action before a lot of thought is given to the effect on others. Successful crooked or suspect actions taken by those with authority will always cause others to follow. A number of articles have been written about the sudden, unexpected and resounding defeat of the Labor Government. They said that we had become too complacent and that we went into the election without any money, without any research and without an issue. Still others dragged up the old Salisbury affair. How many other reasons could our detractors find? One only had to examine the advertisements in the newspapers. The advertisements screamed their twisted messages from nuts from Unley, Kingscote, Rostrevor, Morphett Vale, Walkerville and Highbury.

Even community leaders from prominent groups within the community—the Chamber of Commerce, Master Builders, Printing and Allied Employees Federation, Retail Traders Association, South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce and the South Australian Employers Federation—all joined in the chorus of the song of hate, not because they thought the community would benefit from a change of Government but because they could see that there was money in it. It is strange how their minds work. The sort of people I am talking about feel quite at ease; indeed, they feel that they have every right to seek jobs for the boys and favours for themselves. They do not have any conscience about telling Governments to legislate along their narrow self-seeking lines; yet they use every vicious smear known if the Labor Government appoints one of its capable friends to a position of importance or legislates to help those in need. I have not heard the Liberal Party offer any expression of

condemnation, so I can only assume that it was backing it.

Perhaps Mr. McRae was on the right track when he said, when speaking in the Assembly, that a prominent motor dealer found substantial amounts of money to support his crazy fancy. Then again, there has been a rumour that a Mr. Bond had offered nearly \$50 000 to a Mr. Tonkin to assist with his campaign. It is said that Mr. Tonkin refused this offer, but the multiplicity of large advertisements in the daily papers was evidence that someone could be bought.

It is doubtful whether these people had the intelligence to work out the advertisements themselves. Anyone knowing anything about pre-war Germany and Dr. Goebbels' methods will understand only too well the apparent similarity between the methods used by News Limited and the other advertisers.

On this occasion, the Labor Party was beset by enemies from all sides. We expected that our normal Opposition would show some fight. It came as a great shock to find that the bus drivers at Morphetville and Elizabeth in particular were having their own war with the Labor Government. It is usual for us in the Australian Labor Party to look upon unionists as friends, but, in our case and on this occasion, one could ask, "With those kinds of friends, who needs enemies?" I know that the various chambers of commerce committed their members and friends to help pay for some of that spiteful advertising, and then had to send out their enforcers to collect the donations. I am led to believe that in some cases they were not all that successful.

The Retail Traders Association and others said that the South Australian Labor Government was responsible for the poor returns being experienced by the retailing fraternity. They frightened shop assistants with the threat of the sack if the Labor Government was returned to office. This is probably as good a time as any to look at a report in the 22 October issue of the *News*. Under the heading, "Retail demand 'flat', says David Jones", the report states:

There is no evidence of any improvement in consumer demand, according to the Chairman of one of Australia's leading retail stores. Mr. Charles Lloyd Jones, Chairman of David Jones Limited, says the company's directors are disappointed in the continuing flatness of Australian consumer demand.

In his report with the group's accounts for the year ended 28 July, Mr. Lloyd Jones says:

"No evidence of any improvement is yet discernible and in fact sluggishness in sales was most evident in the final quarter of the year and has continued into this year.

The position in California is quite different where our sales are up by more than 25 per cent and profits have risen commensurately.

Continuing growth in profitability of our U.S. investment is anticipated."

The group's newly appointed Managing Director, Australian retail operations, Mr. Eric E. Greenhalgh, reveals Australian operations would have shown a much healthier improvement but for the poor performance in Canberra.

That, of course, puts the blame where it rightly belongs. It is too late to help us now, but eventually the former Corcoran Labor Government will be exonerated of all the dastardly claims that have been made against it. It is appropriate that I now read something that Fred Daly, a former member of the House of Representatives, who retired after many years service, said in his recent book, as follows:

However, perhaps every politician should follow the saying from the Scriptures which I paraphrase as, "Do unto others as they would do unto you—but do it earlier, more often, and

better."

I hope that our political enemies are not trying to make us stoop to their level. There is justice in being criticised if one is clearly in the wrong, and one can always be critical if one believes that an injustice has been done. If we have taken things for granted (and there are many who say that we have done so), the next three years in Opposition will bring back the humility with which we all began and make us genuinely concerned with the needs of the people of this State.

[Sitting suspended from 5.45 to 7.45 p.m.]

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. While it is traditional always to support this motion I do so on this occasion with much more conviction than I did a little over two months ago. Since that time there has been an election and a change in Government. South Australia now has a Government under which it is likely to go ahead, rather than stagnate. I look forward to a period of growth over the coming years, rather than the economic decline that we have suffered over the last nine years. I will deal briefly with the election later in my remarks, but before doing so I wish to mention those members who are no longer with us. I refer to the Hon. Jessie Cooper, the Hon. Dick Geddes, the Hon. Don Banfield, and the Hon. Tom Casey. I believe that I can truthfully say that over the years they have all become friends of mine, and that all of them contributed much not only to this Council but also to South Australia's welfare.

I would also like to congratulate those new members who have come into this Chamber as a result of the recent election, and I refer to the Hon. Bob Ritson on this side, the Hon. Barbara Wiese and the Hon. Gordon Bruce on the Opposition benches, and the Hon. Lance Milne on the cross bench. I have listened with interest to their maiden speeches and there is no doubt in my mind from their contributions that this Chamber will be the better for their presence. I say that in all sincerity and honesty. I may not agree with all that they have said, and I include the member on my own side in that, because while on this particular occasion I agree with his remarks, I am not one of those who believe that one should always follow the members on one's own side of the Council. Those members who know me know that there have been occasions when I have disagreed with my own Party members. However, I respect the fact that the views expressed in their maiden speeches were sincerely held.

In my maiden speech in this Chamber in 1975 I mentioned that I was proud to have been elected on the first full franchise vote for the Legislative Council in South Australia. In the election held on 15 September that process was completed, and I am now proud to be a member of a Legislative Council that is wholly elected on a full franchise basis. I spent a considerable part of my early political life fighting for this system. In fact, it could be said that I paid a price for fighting for this system at that time. It is now with some satisfaction that I can look around this Chamber today and see that what I fought for at that time has finally come to pass. However, although we now have full adult franchise for the Legislative Council it is still not yet a fully democratic system. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to anomalies in the system of voting for the Legislative Council, which I will not refer to now except to say that I hope that this Government will bring in amendments to the Electoral Act so that electors can vote for an individual rather than a Party if they so wish, and also to provide for all preferences to be counted; at present some preferences are wasted.

I take the point made by the Hon. Mr. Milne today that primary votes are always counted out in full; otherwise quotas could not be determined. However, preferences are not always counted in this way and under this system are often wasted. As I have said, I hope that this Government will introduce amendments to remedy this situation. When that happens, we will then be able to say in all truth that elections for the Legislative Council are fully democratic.

The reasons for the overwhelming victory of the Liberal Party on 15 September have been the subject of many post-mortems within the Labor Party, and those post-mortems could go on for some time. It could be that I have put that the wrong way round and that the phrasing would be better in the reverse; I should refer to the overwhelming loss of the A.L.P., because I believe that normally Governments lose elections rather than Oppositions win them. Naturally, an Opposition must be seen to be a viable alternative by the public. In that respect the Liberal Party was ready with well-researched and well-costed policies that were acceptable to the electors. However, it was largely the mistakes of the Labor Party that cost it the election, and I believe those mistakes will keep it in Opposition for a long time to come.

The first mistake was the calling of the election itself; this was referred to by the Hon. Mr. Sumner in his contribution to this debate when he said that it was now apparent that an early election was ill-advised. That is putting it rather mildly; the election certainly was ill-advised. The Hon. Mr. Sumner went on to say that Mr. Fraser had called an early election and got away with it. The Leader of the Opposition referred to double standards and implied that the Liberal Party could call an early election and win, yet the Labor Party called an early election and lost. It could also be said that the Labor Party called an election in 1977 and won. In other words, it got away with it. So, I do not believe there are any double standards in this matter. I do not believe that any Party would get away with calling an early election today. If Mr. Fraser called an election prematurely, particularly without a major issue, I have no doubt there would be the same reaction against him as there was against Mr. Corcoran. That was another reason why the A.L.P. lost the last election; there was no major issue to take to the people. The former Premier arrogantly thought that his personal popularity was enough.

As has been mentioned by other members on both sides of this Chamber, the electors showed on 15 September that personal popularity was not enough. Comment has been made about the community's fear of the left-wing influence on the Labor Party, I believe it has been referred to as "the Trades Hall march on Parliament". The Leader of the Opposition accused the Liberal Party of playing on and developing those fears. It is not necessary to play on and develop those fears, because they were already there. Not only were they there, but they were growing, because of the activities of the left wing both inside and outside Parliament. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the member for Ascot Park who was quoted in the *Sunday Mail* as saying that only 12 of the 47 A.L.P. candidates at the recent election were trade union officials. That is a case of the tail wagging the dog, because to the public at large Trades Hall has a very great influence on the Parliamentary Labor Party.

The Leader of the Opposition said by way of interjection last week that John Klunder, Molly Byrne and Terry Groom were not members of the left wing of the Labor Party. From my knowledge of those members, I believe that that was true.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Describe left wingers. Have they

got four heads and seven legs?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: As we have come back for an evening sitting, I do not care whether we stay here until midnight. The Hon. Mr. Foster may finish his tirade if he wishes.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Carnie need not take so much notice of interjections.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I do not believe that those and other members were left wingers but they were swept up in a public reaction against the left and they paid the price of allowing this small group (if we can believe the Leader of the Opposition) to appear to have an inordinate influence on the Parliamentary Labor Party. People are frightened of those like Scott, Fairweather and Apap. Apap lost in Semaphore not because he is not Australian—

The Hon. Anne Levy: He is an Australian.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I agree, and it does no credit to anyone to suggest that the vote went against him because he was not. Members opposite have suggested that the campaign was against Apap because he was of Maltese origin. There was a strong Labor vote in Semaphore, but it did not go to the official Labor candidate, because people were frightened of him and what he represented. I think it was the Hon. Mr. DeGaris who said last week that he hoped that the A.L.P. continued to put up candidates like him. I agree. If they do, we will continue to either win the district or get an Independent in, as happened in Semaphore.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why did so many Labor voters vote against Apap?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: That was because they were frightened of people like him and of what he represents. I refer now to the speech made by the Hon. Miss Wiese, and I pay a tribute to the work she did on the speech and to her obvious sincerity. However, like most people who take an anti-uranium stand, she tends to play on people's prejudices and fears, and presents her argument in such a way as to appeal to emotions or fear of the unknown. The honourable member referred to a current study concerning Radium Hill miners. This study first came to light in June this year because of a completely irresponsible statement by the former Minister of Health (Peter Duncan), made, I imagine, for reasons of pure sensationalism.

He made a statement about something which had not been proven and which, at best, was premature. This was borne out the following week when the scientist in charge of the project stated that the research was in its very early stages and would not be ready for public release for some years. That certainly did not stop our former Minister of Health from making a public statement on the matter. The implication of his statement was that, of miners who had worked at Radium Hill in the 1950's and 1960's, 40.9 per cent had died from cancer. The true position was that, of Radium Hill workers who had since died, 40.9 per cent had died from cancer. The actual number who had died was 58. Anyone who has been involved in research (and the Hon. Miss Levy will bear me out) knows that that is an unscientific sample from which to draw a conclusion.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You can still draw conclusions but it gives a bigger standard error.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am not saying that the research should not go on: it should. The Hon. Miss Wiese said that it was going on and that it could be the mid-1980's before the information was all in. However, to release the information before all evidence is in was a play on public fear, and there is still play on fears and lack of understanding by ordinary people by the Hon. Miss Wiese raising the matter now. The fact is that uranium mining is considered far safer than many other forms of mining.

The Hon. Miss Wiese, in her speech last week and by way of a question today, referred to John Hallam. She did not say who he was or what his authority was. However, in all sincerity, I should like to know more about him. I think the Hon. Miss Wiese also said that, for each opinion on one side, it is possible to come up with an equally expert opinion on another. I intend to read what Mr. Hallam has said and done, because I am not one-eyed pro-uranium. I believe that I, as well as other people, have the right to speak, and I should like to see all sides, not only one.

My son-in-law is a mining engineer, and he would much rather be involved in uranium mining than coal mining, because it is generally known in the mining industry that coal mining is far more dangerous. The Hon. Miss Wiese said that this was a red herring and that it was quite irrelevant. It is not irrelevant. One cannot condemn one method of power generation as being dangerous when the alternative is as dangerous or more dangerous. One cannot say that coal mining and asbestos mining deaths are high because of the profit motive of mining corporations. I admit that this used to happen and that conditions until comparatively recently were appalling. Scant regard was had for the safety and health of miners. I do not profess to know of the standards overseas but I know from personal involvement in mining through my son-in-law that safety requirements are now extremely stringent, particularly in Australia, yet coal mining is still considered to be much more dangerous than uranium mining.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: It depends on the miner himself.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It does not, and the Hon. Mr. Dunford must know this. I admit that unions played a part in forcing mining corporations to bring in safety measures. However, coal mining is considered to be much more dangerous than uranium mining. Whether we like it or not, nuclear power generation is with us and will remain with us.

Research is going on (and it must continue) in regard to renewable energy sources, such as solar power, wind and tidal power, wave power, and the ultimate solution, fusion, although I do not think we will see the latter in our lifetime. These are all some time off, and the reality of the situation (and no amount of talking or wishful thinking will change this reality) is that no other viable energy system can make up the power that is now generated from nuclear sources. Millions of people depend for their livelihood and wellbeing on electricity generated by nuclear reactors. They have done so for many years and will continue to do so for many more years. I am confident that alternative sources will be found, but we must look at the present. There is no way in which the nuclear power programme can stop.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What we are looking at now is really the energy mix for the future.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes. These other sources of power will come, but they are not with us now. Solar energy, wind and tidal power, and fusion, the ultimate answer, will come, but they are not here now. In countries already using nuclear power generation, an increase is evident. For example, in France, 15 per cent of the power already comes from nuclear fuel. The plan is by 1985 to have 55 per cent of the power generated by nuclear reactors.

Britain, although it does have coal, oil and gas reserves, is planning to raise its proportion of nuclear power from 12 per cent to 20 per cent by 1985. Put bluntly, the world cannot do without nuclear power at the moment, and we are fools not to recognise that. I am not suggesting that research into other sources of power should not go on. On the contrary, it should be stepped up, but here again is an

example of how the anti-nuclear lobby is misleading the public. We have all seen cars going around with "Solar not nuclear" displayed on their rear windows. I would like somebody to explain to me what that slogan means. Do these people honestly think that solar power can replace nuclear power, coal power, oil power or any other form of generating electricity? I cannot see that it implies anything else. That is being totally dishonest. It is a fact that solar power cannot replace any of the other forms of generating electricity at the moment. I very much doubt that it can do that at any time in the future.

Solar energy is useful for low heat generation for hot water services, and so on. Certainly, solar power batteries are available. When I was home during the dinner break tonight, I saw an advertisement for a solar battery-powered digital watch. There are solar batteries available that generate more than that. The energy required to manufacture such a battery is something like 100 times in excess of the energy output of that battery. There is no conservation of energy. In fact, there is a substantial net loss. Governments and nuclear industries must reassure the people that uranium is a safe source of power.

In most cases it is a fear of the unknown which has led to the controversy and disquiet concerning nuclear energy. This has been played on by the anti-nuclear people. They should know better but they still play on the fears and lack of knowledge of the ordinary people. It is emotionalism. The nuclear fuel industry is gravely at fault in not explaining its programme to the community. If it had embarked 20 years ago on the educational programme that it now has, the public would have been spared a great deal of unnecessary concern and fear. Nuclear power would be accepted now as an energy source which, when used properly, generates electricity with an enviable safety record. I do not believe that uranium should be mined or exported until adequate safeguards exist, both at the mining level right through to the reactor level. I do not think the anti-uranium faction will ever agree that there can ever be adequate safeguards. Miss Wiese and, I take it from his speech, Mr. Milne will not admit that adequate safeguards will ever exist. They will always find excuses and reasons. I believe that sufficient safeguards exist already and so does the future member for Wills in the Federal Government. He believes that they exist, as does the former Minister of Mines and Energy in this State. He was defeated in the recent election.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He never said it.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: He was not allowed to say it but he certainly did say it.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: When did he say it? You can't mislead the House.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am not misleading the House. He comes under the control of others, but, although he is no longer with us (we have a new Minister), that Minister—

The Hon. Anne Levy: He's not dead.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I know, but I know what it is like to be politically dead. It is only right that we should insist on stringent safeguards. However, at least two of our potential customers for uranium believe that our requirements are too stringent. I do not agree with that. The Federal Government should adhere to the strict requirements which it has laid down. The Hon. Miss Wiese mentioned the Harrisburg incident. There is no doubt that the incident at Three Mile Island will be remembered by the world and the nuclear power industry for many years to come. There are so many things that loom large in the public mind. There has been a crystallisation of public opinion. Those who oppose nuclear energy say that the risk was immediate and great and that

a disaster was barely averted. Those in favour of nuclear power pointed out that the incident was contained with no casualties.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Whom do you believe?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I believe somewhere in the middle. If the Hon. Mr. Dunford would listen to me he would see that. I wish it were as black and white as those two opinions would have us believe. The media treated it as a major story, which it was, and their questions were along the lines of, "What is the worst thing that could happen?" All those involved—the scientists, the administrative officers, etc.—probably tried to answer this question honestly. They admitted the possibility, however slight, of a melt-down and the subsequent need for massive evacuations—something like 3 000 000 people. The reservations and opinions which were added to the actual likelihood of a melt-down and a need for evacuation were lost in the report. The safeguards in the operation at the reactor worked; the accident was contained and there was no loss of life and no significant leakage of radiation.

Nevertheless, there was much to be learnt by the United States nuclear industry from the Three Mile Island incident. I understand from inquiries that I have made that, as a result of this incident, there will be several significant changes in the nuclear industry in America. Some of these changes which I have read about include further improvements in reactor design and modification to existing reactors; increased standards for operator training; more stringent inspection procedures by the Nuclear Regulatory Authority; and greater co-operation between the State, Federal, nuclear and other agency officials with a clear statement of respective responsibilities. One thing that comes out in the Three Mile incident is that everybody was passing the buck and refused to accept responsibility for the accident.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: That is exactly what will happen here in Australia.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Mr. Dunford knows that we will not have any nuclear reactors in Australia. I am admitting that this accident was a bad accident, but I am saying that the safeguards worked—it was contained and, above all else, the nuclear industry will learn from what happened at Three Mile Island. Further safeguards will be insisted upon, and we can all be very thankful that these lessons can be learnt without loss of life and without any significant leakage of radiation. The nuclear age is with us. There is no way that there can be a moratorium on the use of nuclear fuel. There are millions of people in countries like France, Japan and Sweden where little or no indigenous fuel resources exist and where there is no alternative to nuclear power. Unfortunately, there has been a polarisation of the pro-uranium and anti-uranium factions, whose arguments are diametrically opposed.

As I said earlier, the position is not entirely black and white. Few things in this life are. Nuclear power is a fact of life, and we in South Australia can play our part along with the rest of the world in seeing that it is developed safely and for the benefit of mankind.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: First, I congratulate you, Sir, on your re-election to the Council and, following that, your election as President of the Council. The experience of members on this side of the House during your previous term as President meant that, when we had to make a decision as to whom we would support, it was easy and it was unanimous. You have always been completely fair to all members of the House, whilst conceding almost nothing politically. As a member of the Liberal Party you have served that Party faithfully, and the way that Party dumped you when it came to the Presidency was

inexcusable.

It has been suggested, Sir, that the Liberal Party nominee, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, was owed something by members of the Liberal Party because Mr. Tonkin did not want him in his Cabinet. Although that may be true, no-one on this side of the House can see why the pay-off to Mr. DeGaris should be at your expense. If a wrong was done to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, it was not done by you, and I am pleased that members on this side were able to prevent a further wrong, that is, depriving you of the presidency, being done. It may be an old cliché, Sir, but it is still correct: two wrongs do not make a right.

I should like to make just one further point of interest on this topic. If memory serves me correctly, the catalyst that brought about the Liberal Party split was the Party room vote to take away the right of any future Liberal Premier to pick his or her own Cabinet. It was reported at the time that the reason for wanting to take away this right was that it was felt that no future Liberal Premier would have Mr. DeGaris in his Cabinet. How right that fear turned out to be. Whether the decade of the destruction of the Liberal Party that was caused by Mr. DeGaris and his protectors was worth it is for them to say. On behalf of the Labor Party I can only thank them for giving us a dream run during the 1970's.

Since the Council last met, Sir, three members, Don Banfield, Tom Casey, and Dick Geddes, have retired. All three members served this Parliament and the people who sent them here very well indeed. Tom Casey, of course, was always a Minister while he was in the Council, and a very good one, too. Don Banfield had the rare experience, that is, prior to 1975, of being a Labor Party back-bencher. He was for some time the only Labor Party back-bencher in this Council.

Those were the days when the Hon. Mr. DeGaris would allow only the people of this State to elect one Australian Labor Party back-bencher, even though they consistently voted majorities for the Labor Party in Legislative Council elections.

From my reading of *Hansard* during Don Banfield's spell as a back-bencher, I consider that he thoroughly enjoyed it. I wish both Tom Casey and Don Banfield a long and happy retirement. They have certainly earned it.

The retirement of Dick Geddes was premature and enforced. Dick Geddes lost his preselection because he supported the people of this State when the Santos legislation was before the Parliament. As the Opposition spokesman for minerals and energy, Dick Geddes knew better than almost anyone else in the Liberal Party how essential it was for South Australia to keep control of its energy resources. He had the courage to vote against a totally incorrect Party line and he paid the price, as did Jessie Cooper.

The Hon. Don Laidlaw was the other member who refused to accept this incorrect Party line on Santos. Nothing, of course, will happen to him because he can buy and sell the Liberal Party at any time he likes. Mr. Laidlaw, Sir, is not a servant of the Liberal Party: he owns it. Dick Geddes did not have that amount of clout and paid the political price for having principles. It was, Sir, a pleasure to work with Dick Geddes; he was a gentleman and a man of his word, and the Liberal Party and this Parliament will be the poorer for his absence. I hope that Dick enjoys his retirement and obtains some satisfaction from knowing that the principle stand that he took over the Santos Bill will benefit the people of this State for decades to come.

It was ironic for us to read in the paper just before the election that, if a Tonkin Government was elected (as it has been), it would not change that legislation. "What is done is done," says Mr. Tonkin. A fat lot of good that will

do Dick Geddes!

I want to welcome the new members of this Council and congratulate them on both their election and their maiden speeches. Whilst all the speeches differed in content, they all had one thing in common, and that was the obvious sincerity with which they held their views and the way in which they expressed them. I think all members will agree that the new members of the Council will be a real asset to their respective Parties and to the Council as a whole.

I was not going to comment on any of the new members' speeches, not because they were not worthy of comment but because of the constraints of time. However, the Hon. Lance Milne's speech this afternoon forces me to make one comment. I do so with the utmost respect for the Hon. Mr. Milne. He said in his Address in Reply speech this afternoon that he wanted to congratulate the Hon. Mr. DeGaris for the work that he had done over the years to achieve electoral reform.

I say with the greatest of respect that I cannot understand how Mr. Milne can possibly have come to that conclusion. One has merely to look around this Chamber to see the Hon. Mr. Carnie and the Hon. Mr. Cameron and, around the other Chamber, some members of the Liberal Party who were almost crucified by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris because they wanted to give every member of the South Australian public a vote to elect members to the Council. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris for, I suppose, decades has done everything possible to rot this State's electoral system, and he has certainly spent very little time trying to reform it.

I can only suggest to the Hon. Mr. Milne (I am sure that over the next six years he will get plenty of advice, probably most of it unwelcome, from members on both sides) that, if he looks back a little more than the past couple of years into the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's electoral history, he will revise that opinion.

I should like to comment on a couple of aspects of the last election. It is quite painful for me to do so. However, it is necessary. The reasons given for the Labor Party's losing the last election are many and varied. I refer, for example, to the quite ridiculous flights of fancy by the Hon. Mr. Carnie, who preceded me in this debate. He said that the people were frightened because of George Apap and a couple of other people. It was suggested that Trades Hall was about to take over Parliament House, when the Hon. Mr. Foster interjected, "Perhaps you would like that to be the case." Of course, that was utter nonsense.

The calibre of Labor Party candidates who came from the trade union movement is typified by the Hon. Gordon Bruce. If anyone here, having heard him speak in the Address in Reply debate, said that he was a part of some militant left-wing take-over of this Parliament by Trades Hall, words would fail me.

The candidates from the trade union movement who stood for the Labor Party were candidates of the highest calibre, candidates who knew something about the working people of this State, candidates who were very sincere, and I was proud to be associated with them.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Were they all right-wing?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not sure what the Hon. Mr. Davis means. First, the honourable member should give me his definition of "right-wing", "left-wing", "centre", and "moderate", and then perhaps I can answer him. I suggest that anyone who is slightly left of Adolph Hitler would be a dangerous left-winger to the Hon. Mr. Davis.

The reason the Labor Party lost the election is perfectly clear: there is no mystery or need to worry about left-wing plots. The reason is that the Labor Party called an early election and was never able to justify that election in the

public mind. Perhaps we could not justify the election because it was unjustifiable, especially given that it enabled the media to have a field day with us, and the media certainly made the most of it. I will come back to that a little later.

Another significant factor was the campaign waged by employers during the election period. It was a most effective campaign in many respects, a dishonest campaign, although I concede that it was well done and professional. I am sure that John Singleton, another neo-fascist, would have been proud of it. When I use the term "neo-fascist" I remember that the Hon. Mr. Cameron claimed some credit for the employers' campaign, although I am not sure that he is now claiming much credit for it.

On this occasion the employers decided to spend the money themselves, rather than tipping it into the Liberal Party coffers, because of the industrial legislation that the Labor Party was discussing with them. However, I stress that it was not because of legislation that was before Parliament: it was legislation that the Minister of Labour and Industry was consulting the employers about—

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Telling them.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He was consulting them. The Hon. Mr. Cameron claims he was telling them but, if the Minister had been telling them, he would have presented the Bill to Parliament and would have said, "There it is." He did not do that. He sent the employers draft copies of the Bill, asking for opinions, saying that it was the basis of negotiation.

If that is telling them, then the English language does not mean much. There was a variety of matters in the legislation, but its main thrust was to protect workers from the harsh actions of some employers (not all employers) and give workers some measure of job security to ensure that retrenchments were not done in a cavalier and high-handed manner that left people with nowhere to go but on the dole with only a week's pay in their pocket.

I believe that such legislation frightened the employers in South Australia. It caused them to react in the way that they did during the election campaign and, in part, it caused us to lose the election. However, if that is part of the reason, then I am proud of that, because if we lost the election on those grounds then, in my opinion, we lost it for the right reasons. The day that the Labor Party stops putting forward legislation to protect the working conditions of the working class of this State, then I suggest it is time for the Party to wrap up and go home.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: If you had known that you were going to lose the election because of that provision would you have still put it in the Bill?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Indeed, most strongly. Another reason why the conservatives came out in force during the election campaign was that, for the first time, they could see the possibility of losing their grip on this Council, which has been the last line of defence for the conservatives in South Australia. The thought of losing control activated some people who had been slumbering for years.

Again, with the conservative forces grouped against us in these various ways, or against the possible Labor control of the Legislative Council, against the calling of the early election and against the industrial legislation, it seems that although we lost the election overall, we lost it for possibly the right reasons.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Can you lose elections for the right reasons?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris asks whether one can lose elections for the right reasons, but today he made a remark that I thought was

rather quick, but rather nasty.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: What was it?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was not to me but, when it was pointed out to him by a member on this side that he was sitting on the back bench, he said, "Yes, but I am sitting here with honour." We sit on this side with honour. What the campaigns and the various issues add up to is that the Liberal Party fell into Government because the Labor Party made one of the greatest political blunders of all time: the Labor Party committed political suicide and will have to grin and bear the consequences of that blunder for the next three years. All I can say to the Government is to remember the promises it made, because we will, and I will have something to say about those promises during the Budget debate.

The Government should also remember that it only requires the Labor Party to regain half the votes it lost at the last election to regain office, and I believe that we will do that at the next State election, whenever it is held.

Another further aspect of the election I wish to cover is the role the press adopted as saviours of free enterprise. There is a great deal of anger being directed at the press from within the Labor Party and from a large section of the electorate. It is being said that the press was unfair to the Labor Party during the election campaign. Of course, that is completely true. What I do not understand is why people assume that the press is in business to be fair: it is in business to protect and promote the section of society which owns it, and in the case of the large media monopolies it does that very well. It should always be remembered that the media is, in the main, owned by large capital-intensive corporations such as the Murdochs, Packers, Fairfaxes, etc., and the entire output of their publications will always be directed at serving their class interests.

They do this by selecting the events they feel are suitable for public consumption, they then decide how the story is to be told in accordance with editorial policy, which is a journalistic euphemism for political bias, and then making sure that the so-called facts are not likely to contradict the illusions created by the advertisement. The role of the press has less to do with printing news than implanting views. Indeed, we could all give examples of news items that, if reported honestly, would contradict the editorial line of the owners.

We all know what actually happens, such news is either ignored or distorted to reinforce the political bias of the paper concerned. Media managers are in the main very clever. They have certainly won the propaganda battle question over whether or not we have a free press. Most people believe that we do, and I will concede that in one way that is correct. The press is free in most capitalist countries.

In those countries the press is free—free to lie, to distort, publish trivia and exclude serious issues. They do these things very well indeed, and no paper I know does it better than the *Adelaide News*, unless it is the *Sunday Mail*.

There have also been some rather harsh words said about the editorial staff and the journalists of the *News* and *Sunday Mail*. It is suggested that somehow these employees should protect us from their employer Rupert Murdoch, that they should take an impartial view of events, and report and publish accordingly. This is totally unrealistic. It has to be remembered that, no matter what the owners say about giving editorial freedom, of freedom to print or not to print anything they like, the hard facts of life are that these employees can be sacked any time Murdoch likes. Because of this the editor makes sure that nothing goes into the paper that could in any way offend

the publisher. Exactly the same goes for journalists. We have just seen a whole series of profiles of the new Ministers. If the journalists wrote what we all know they think of the Ministers, they would be told to put on their hat and coat and clear off out of their nice jobs onto the dole. In other words, the press is just another part of the business of capitalism, and they exist primarily not in the public interest, but in the interest of the owners. These owners are, indeed must be, concerned with circulation and profits, given that so-called independent editors and journalists can be hired and fired by those who own the show. Just like less exalted members of the working class, there is no way they are going to risk their jobs, and I do not blame them.

A small verse, Sir, written by Humbert Wolfe sums up rather neatly, I think, what the working class movement is up against with the press—

You cannot hope
To bribe or twist,
Thank God! The
British journalist.
But seeing what
The man will do
Unbribed, there's
no occasion to.

Nothing I have seen in 15 years in Australia has indicated any difference between Australian and British press practice, so I think the verse is appropriate.

There has been talk in Labor circles of organising a boycott of the *News* and *Sunday Mail*. I would find it difficult to agree to this for two reasons. The first is because I have not bought a copy of the *Adelaide News* in 15 years, and it is difficult for me to boycott it any further. Sir, I have not bought a copy in 15 years, not because of its political bias (as I have said, all papers are biased one way or another) but because it is just a lousy, worthless paper. Its only rival as one of the worst papers I have ever read is the *Sunday Mail*.

Whilst I appreciate the need in a capitalist system for both papers to be populist and make a profit, surely when both papers have a monopoly they could afford to upgrade the standard of the papers to something more reasonable, readable and informative. The second reason I could not agree to any organised boycott is that for all the abuse of the freedom, it cannot be denied that there is the freedom in Australia to publish alternative ideas and that is something we should defend. The only way we can defend our rights to publish what we want is to defend the right of the *News* and *Sunday Mail* to publish the unremitting stream of heavily slanted claptrap with which we were assailed during the last election campaign.

I believe that the capitalist press would tolerate some form of censorship, provided the censorship is right across the board and ideas that oppose the capitalist ethic were also censored. Mr. President, I have always believed that censorship is anti-working class and anti-socialist and an insult to the intelligence of ordinary men and women, since it implies that they cannot be trusted to hear or read certain ideas and are incapable of making rational judgments on the merits of rival ideas. The answer to the *News* and *Sunday Mail* is not to organise a boycott but to organise for a press that is biased in favour of the working class, or, failing that, attempt to educate workers to analyse newspapers more critically. If that is done, I have enough faith in the intelligence of workers that they will not be brainwashed by some of the rubbish that the media dishes out. When looking for bright spots over the past few weeks, and there have not been too many, I think that the way the media has exposed itself as a ruling class tool will, in the long run, be to the benefit of the working class. It

was a salutary lesson to us all, and it does us no harm to be reminded occasionally just who our enemies are.

Mr. President, I want to conclude by looking at the role of members on this side of the House during the next three years. The Liberal Party made great play during the election campaign of its attitude to this Council, that it should be a House of Review and not controlled by the same Party that controls the Lower House. This was the opposite to what the A.L.P. put before the people. The people seemed to agree with the Liberal Party and want this Council to act differently from the House of Assembly. If that is what they want, then who are we on this side to disagree? With every member here democratically elected and endorsed by a political Party with a particular platform, it means that the Council will be a very interesting place for the next three years. I know that all members on this side of the Council are looking forward to it. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I support the motion. I would also like to extend my congratulations to the new members who have been elected to this Council, and I also extend my best wishes to those members who have retired. There have been some confusing statements reported in the press concerning the future of the overseas projects initiated by the South Australian Labor Government through the Agriculture Department. The new Liberal Minister has made a number of announcements stating that current negotiations and projects will be reviewed, scaled down, and so on. In an interview with the *Advertiser* soon after he was appointed, the Minister of Agriculture said that he was opposed to the State Government being involved in foreign aid and that he would look very hard at overseas projects. I assume that it was as a result of this hard look that the contract with Mr. Denis O'Neill was so summarily cancelled, leaving him with a letter of offer from the department, a house nearly sold in Canberra, and a very nearly purchased house in Adelaide. The day after this happened the new Minister was briefed by his officers and found that overseas projects set up and in the process of being negotiated by the Labor Government were not foreign aid but were commercial operations in the best sense of that term and that all negotiations on future projects were being set up as profitable commercial operations.

Naturally, I cannot reveal how much profit is involved, because that would weaken the department's position in negotiating contracts. However, the Algerian and Jordanian projects will make a margin of profit over both direct and indirect costs. By now the Minister may also be aware of the employment opportunities that these projects and future projects would have brought to the agricultural and industrial communities in this State. We have heard a lot about the Liberal Government's concern to increase employment in this State. The Minister of Agriculture seems not to be particularly concerned about this aspect of his Party's promises. Certainly his action so far with regard to overseas projects would lead one to believe that that is the position.

The Labor Government encouraged the development of overseas projects because they provided specific opportunities for an increase in employment in particular areas. First, overseas projects provide employment to South Australian farmers overseas and thus help farm income. Secondly, South Australia is suffering quite badly in the agricultural area from severe cut-backs in Federal Government funds and we have been facing redundancies of trained and qualified departmental officers because of the refusal of the Commonwealth to continue to meet their

salaries under previous Commonwealth approved programmes. Many of these officers could be retained by involving them in overseas projects, and many of them were very keen for this to happen.

We have also had very high unemployment in Australia for young agricultural diplomates and graduates. The secondment of departmental officers to overseas projects thus would allow the South Australian Government to recruit young diplomates and graduates where it is possible to pay a replacement officer. This is particularly useful in the new regional centres. Thus, the diplomate or graduate would gain realistic work experience and then be eligible for future appointments either here in Australia or overseas.

Fourthly, but very importantly, the demonstration of the South Australian system requires certain agricultural inputs. Once the system is adopted by a client country, these inputs must be purchased from South Australia. What we were finding with our overseas projects was that quite huge trade followed the setting up of our projects. This means that every successful project provides this State with major employment opportunities in the industrial sector. We in the South Australian Labor Government proved that this range of employment opportunities was available through our activity in overseas projects.

Let me say that it is the integrated promotion of our South Australian technology that proved such a success with overseas client countries whenever their representatives visited this State under a Labor Government. The Chinese Vice Minister of Agricultural Machinery went out of his way to report back to the Government that the co-operation of industry, government, and private farmers in this State was outstanding in his opinion and that this made South Australia under Labor a leading contender for projects in China. The same sort of report has been made to their respective Governments by representatives from Iraq, Libya and Jordan.

However, it seems that all the good work done by the Labor Government in building up such an integrated development for South Australia overseas, using our farming technology as a base, is now to be "put down", and the reason is hard to fathom. It may be that the ideological commitment of the Liberal Government to private enterprise is a factor in this decision. After all, we all know that it is big business that runs the Liberal Party. Indeed, now that they hold Government, one can quite legitimately ask "Who is running this State?" It is doubtful if it is the Liberal Party which runs the State now—certainly if one believes the advertisements that appeared in the newspaper proprietors daily sheets during the election campaign—or, indeed, the words of that well known publicist of private enterprise Mr. Michael Gregg. They all seem to indicate that, far from the unions running the State, big business does—and it is quite prepared to (in Mr. Gregg's words) "tip a few cans" if the political party they promoted does not do as it is told.

If it is the dog of private enterprise that is wagging the tail of the Minister in the matter of overseas projects, then he will find that the private consultants in this area do not have the capacity to undertake such major projects overseas. The Australian consultants are just too small. After all, the South Australian Labor Government tried to develop the Algerian project with the largest South Australian consultant but that firm pulled out as the project was beyond their financial capacity to set up. The Liberal-Country Party Federal Government has also found this to be sad, but true. When it first came to office it decided to give overseas aid contracts to private agricultural consultants—on purely ideological grounds.

Since 1975 there has been a gradual reversal of this decision as the private consultants have been unable to cope and State Departments of Agriculture have again become the contractors for the Federal Government. Hence, the South Australian involvement in Jordan. It is not only the financial resource that is difficult for private consultants to find, particularly in a commercial context, but there is the most important resource; that is, the human resource. Certainly private industry can find farmers to employ. In fact, the South Australian Seedgrowers' Co-operative is a fine example of this with its extremely successful sales programme in which it not only sells supplies of seed to foreign countries, but also supplies South Australian practical farmers to demonstrate how to sow the seed and how to grow it for the best results.

But private consultants also need technical officers and the majority of these are regularly employed by State Departments of Agriculture. The cost to the taxpayer of seconded officers as part of private consultants projects can be quite high. While they are away, their superannuation, and so on, must be paid and they must be replaced by other officers. Rarely does the private consultant pay the department concerned sufficient (if any) fee to cover the use of such a technical officer. However, when the department itself is the contractor, such costs are written into the contract and, indeed, by freeing up the recruitment and placing of officers within the department as a whole, the taxpayer benefits, the farming community benefits, and the officers within the department benefit, particularly from the added dimension they gain to their basic qualifications by experience overseas, where their technological knowledge is increased and widened for the eventual benefit of agriculture here in this State.

If it is not purely the ideological factor of support for private enterprise at any price that is the reason for the Liberal Government's winding down of the South Australian Labor Government's overseas initiatives, perhaps it is just pettiness that is at the bottom of it all. However, I remind the Minister of the high-flown rhetoric of the Liberal Party during the recent election campaign. We all remember that rolling phrase used so often "for the good of South Australia." Certainly, Western Australia (with a Liberal Government) sees overseas projects as for "the good of Western Australia".

Indeed, it is ironical that Western Australia actually demonstrates the South Australian farming system very successfully in Libya. Increasingly, Victoria (Liberal) and New South Wales (Labor) see overseas projects as "for the good of Victoria and New South Wales" respectively. The Federal Government (particularly the Minister for Trade and the previous Minister for Primary Industry) saw such projects as "good for Australia." However, for some obscure (but possibly personal) reason the present South Australian Liberal Minister of Agriculture has qualms and doubts and is pulling back and out.

I should explain, Mr. President, that technology or know-how is the fastest growing area of international trade at present. It is true that, on the whole, Australia tends to be an importer of technology rather than an exporter. Most developing countries naturally wish to foster as much local production and employment as possible, so they like contracts that enable them to manufacture commodities locally. However, even though the manufacture can be done locally, the know-how must be imported. I will give two examples of this difference in the nature of imports as far as Australia is concerned. First, at the new Northern

power station in this State we want maximum local content and employment, but must import the technology to provide it. Secondly, we should look at the area of defence equipment, where we in Australia are totally dependent on foreign technology and know how.

Australia has only rarely reversed the trend. I believe B.H.P. is involved in the export of steel-making technology to China. However, the area of greatest potential in the export of Australian technology is that of agriculture. We have a perceived excellence in agricultural technology internationally that surpasses many other agriculturally advanced countries. What often confuses those people involved in export market development, and leads them to discount farming systems as a profitable export in its own right, is the fact that agricultural technology is apparently available free. Hundreds of journals, fact sheets, books, etc., describe every facet of our agricultural technology and are easily available at very low cost. Compare this with industrial processes where plans for production techniques are protected with patents, and royalties are easily charged.

However, the free availability of agricultural technological know-how is an illusion because of the need to adapt it to particular physical, social and economic environments. This is why overseas countries require, and will continue to require for many decades, the practical demonstration of that technology in their own environment. The written instructions may seem easy to follow but the complexities of agriculture demand practical demonstrations by pragmatic practitioners if any worthwhile development and adoption are to take place. As most home gardeners know, just buying the packet of seeds and reading the instructions on the back is not enough to produce a lush and productive harvest. Out of the great spectrum of agricultural technology available in Australia, there is one system which is uniquely South Australian and for which we now know we have a huge potential market. Our system of cereal/medic rotation is particularly suited to countries from Iraq to Morocco in a wide sweep from the mountains of Kurdistan around the Mediterranean and down to the western side of North Africa.

This group of countries have very similar soils and climates to our own and, most importantly, they have money from oil revenues (either their own or their neighbours) with which to pay for our technology. The South Australian Labor Government made sure the opportunity is there for South Australia to make the most of this, and we must take full advantage of it. Certainly Western Australia is right in there making sure that it benefits, and New South Wales and Victoria are not far behind. The system they are and will be using, is the South Australian farming system.

I hope that, for the sake of South Australia, and particularly for the farming community and the industrial sector, the Liberal Government will reconsider its attitude to the Overseas Project Unit in the Department of Agriculture and allow it to get on with the job of gaining valuable export trade for this State and employment opportunities that go with them.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8.58 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 24 October at 2.15 p.m.