

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 24 October 1979

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

QUESTIONS

PRICE CONTROL

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about price control.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: A report in today's *News*, headed "Open go on prices", states:

The State Government may abandon price control. Liberals may relax control.

The report also states:

Mr. Tonkin revealed in Parliament yesterday the Government was "in the process of reviewing price control measures as they currently exist in South Australia."

The report continues:

Asked today if his reply meant the Prices Branch was about to be wound down, he said, "That is the whole point. The question is under review."

Will the Minister indicate whether the Government is planning to end or scale down significantly the administration of South Australian price control?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I can vouch for the answer given by the Premier in another place yesterday. A Question on Notice was asked by Mr. McRae, as follows:

Is it the policy of the Government to continue price control in South Australia as it currently exists and, if not, why not?

The reply was as follows:

The Government is in the process of reviewing price control measures as they currently exist in South Australia.

That is entirely consistent with what I have said in answer to earlier questions in this Council. As to the accuracy or otherwise of what is alleged to have been said outside the House, I do not know. However, the matter was accurately stated by the Premier, and accurately stated by me, that the Government is in the process of reviewing price control measures. Obviously, when one is in the process of reviewing something one does not say anything about the outcome, because one cannot do that until the review is completed.

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I direct my question to the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs. Did the transfers referred to yesterday that occurred in the Ethnic Affairs Division come about as a result of a Ministerial instruction to the Public Service Board or the head of the department? If so, upon what basis was it decided that the five people referred to yesterday but not others in the division should be transferred?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The answer to the first part is "Yes". The answer to the second part is as explained, as I recall, yesterday. On coming to office and in assuming my responsibilities as Minister assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, I looked at this branch.

As the Government was examining all departments and sections with a view to reviewing staff structures, I decided that it was possible for some reductions to be made in that

branch. As I decided also that the branch could do with five fewer persons, five officers were asked to transfer.

B.Y.O. RESTAURANTS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question regarding b.y.o. licences.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The Minister will be aware that, in November 1977, I introduced in this Council a Bill to amend the Licensing Act to provide for restricted restaurant licences, better known as b.y.o. restaurants. That Bill subsequently passed both Houses and was proclaimed, I think, in March 1978. Since then, very few establishments have opened under this licence. I have been surprised and naturally somewhat disappointed about this, as I have believed, and still believe, that there will be a wide public acceptance of b.y.o. restaurants.

It has been brought to my attention that some officers in the Licensing Branch have been actively discouraging any inquiries. On one occasion of which I am aware, when such a licence was sought, no encouragement was given by officers in the Licensing Branch, and it could be said that obstacles were placed in the way of the application. Nevertheless, in this case an application was proceeded with in the Licensing Court and the licence was granted, giving the lie to the officers of the Licensing Branch concerning requirements for such a licence. Naturally, such actions cause me to wonder whether others have made inquiries and, having been discouraged, have proceeded no further with the matter.

Will the Minister ascertain how many inquiries concerning restricted restaurant licences have been made, and how many restaurants are now in operation? Also, will the Minister ascertain whether his officers have been discouraging prospective applicants and, if they have, will he see that they cease this practice?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: When the Licensing Act Amendment Act allowing limited restaurant licences (or, as the honourable member said, b.y.o. restaurants) came into effect on 9 March 1978—

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: A Dorothy Dixer!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No, it is not. When the Act to which I referred came into effect on 9 March 1978, a press release indicated that procedures for making an application for such a licence would be the same as for a restaurant and most other licences. The standard of premises for b.y.o. licences would be similar in most respects to the standard required for restaurant licences generally, with the exception that bar serverly areas would not be required. Also, officers of the Licensed Premises Division, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, then known as the Liquor Licensing Branch, would be available to assist with inquiries relating to new b.y.o. licences.

Since 9 March 1978 eight applications for limited restaurant licences have been received by the Clerk of the Licensing Court. Six licences have been granted. One application in respect of a restaurant, an objection to the granting of which has been lodged, is waiting to be heard, and one application was refused by the court at the applicant's request. During the same period 47 restaurant licences (that is, ordinary restaurant licences) have been granted. A number of inquiries concerning the licensing of restaurants are received each week by officers of the division at the public counter or by telephone, and a limited number of inquiries refer to b.y.o. licences. Inquirers are informed of the procedures for making

application for licences, the standard of premises looked for, and the options available to them under the Licensing Act. This is possibly the key thing.

When requested by intending applicants for restaurant licences, inspections have been conducted by Licensing Inspectors to advise as to the suitability of the premises for the purpose sought and what work need be done. In such circumstances the standards expected for restaurant and limited restaurant licences are explained, together with the options available under the Licensing Act. It is a matter of record that intending applicants have generally preferred the greater benefits of the restaurant licence, which allows "b.y.o." at the discretion of the proprietor, to the more restrictive limited restaurant alternative.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: On a point of order, Mr. President. As this seems to be a prepared answer that the Minister is reading out, I wonder whether he could ask leave for it to be incorporated in *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Burdett.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I seek a ruling on the point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order. The Hon. Mr. Burdett.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am most concerned about the allegation made by the honourable member that there has been obstruction on the part of the officers of the Licensed Premises Division. I will certainly investigate that allegation and bring down a detailed reply.

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs say whether, before he made the decision to shift the officers referred to in my previous question, any evidence was placed before him which indicated that any of those officers were not performing their duties satisfactorily?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In general terms I believe that the officers were performing—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Qualify "in general terms".

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One matter that gave me some concern regarding the manner in which officers in that department were carrying out their duties was that they were indulging in politics which, in my view, is contrary to Public Service practice in general and, in particular, contrary to the practice in that department. I do not blame the officers for that, because the example set them by the then Government in that area, of bringing politics into ethnic affairs and into the Ethnic Affairs Branch, was deplorable. For example, on 20 August, only a matter of some weeks before the recent election, the then Government opened an ethnic information centre at Felixstow. The Government issued its invitations to the opening of that public facility, but no-one from the Liberal Party was invited, and it was bandied around at that function that the reason why the Liberals were not invited was that "there is no need for them to be here". The whole matter was treated as a joke. The Hon. Mr. Sumner was there. The Hon. Mr. Cornwall was there, as were members of the Ethnic Affairs Branch.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am sorry, it was not the Hon. Mr. Cornwall but Mr. Corcoran. Senior members of the Ethnic Affairs Branch were there. I understand that Mr. Marino from the Greek Community, Franklin Street, was there and, if he was not there, then Mr. Manos from the same community was invited. Also, three members from the ethnic press were invited, and the Italian Consul and

the Greek Consul were also invited. Those people, who hold public office in South Australia, were invited and, in effect—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One Greek bishop from the Orthodox Greek Diocese, Bishop Ezekiel, was invited. That is just one example of how the former Government used the Ethnic Affairs Branch, a section of the Public Service, in a highly political and most unfortunate way. For that reason, I am saying that I am not blaming the staff in the branch for becoming somewhat political in their activity. The example that the Government set rather encouraged them to do that.

Apart from that particular involvement by the people in that branch, I had no other complaints about their general efficiency.

DIESEL FUEL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, comment on the continuing reports of diesel fuel shortages in northern Queensland, as a result of which farmers in that State are worried about the continuation of their farming operations? Will the Minister report to the Council the situation of farm diesel fuel supplies in South Australia? Can farmers in this State be assured that there will be no shortages of fuel for the coming harvest? Has the Liberal Government instituted a contingency plan to provide priority for farming operations if a shortage of diesel fuel does occur? Has the Government received any assurances from the Federal Government on safeguards for this State's fuel supplies in the coming year?

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

FIRE BRIGADE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, say whether the Government is aware of the changes that have been made in Western Australia and Tasmania (and I believe will be made in Victoria) in relation to the financing arrangements for fire brigades in those States? If not, will the Treasurer examine these changes to see whether it is possible to implement similar changes in the financing of fire brigades in South Australia?

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

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about community development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: We have just heard the Minister, in reply to another question, openly admit that, because he felt that he was being politically thwarted and was denied an opportunity to indulge in free afternoon tea and a bun fight, he dismissed a whole group of public servants. That is one of the most deplorable things I have had to suffer in this place. To deny a person's livelihood in his chosen profession after he was appointed to it by a properly and democratically elected Government is

remarkable, especially coming from the lips of a person who claims responsibility for a portfolio. I draw the Council's attention to a letter that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*, written by a Mr. Ken Brennan, who is the Chairman of the Enfield, Prospect and Walkerville Community Development Board. Why did Mr. Brennan seek to write a letter that took up almost a column and a half in the "Letters to the Editor" section of this morning's *Advertiser*, in reply to a whole pack of lies and insinuations by the Minister opposite? The letter states:

Mr. Hill believes local government has been pleading for more power and resources to act in matters of community development. To our knowledge—

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Mr. President, I rise on a point of order. I ask the honourable member to withdraw his allegation that I told a pack of lies.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Mr. President, I will not withdraw my statement about the Minister telling a pack of lies, until the Minister hears what is stated in this newspaper. I never said that the Minister told a pack of lies, but those lies are enumerated in this newspaper. Why should the Minister stand there and put you, Mr. President, in a position of tossing out of this Chamber or forcing me to withdraw something that I have yet to qualify?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not want to toss anyone out of this Chamber but, when you are asked to retract unparliamentary words, I expect you to do so.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I do not consider those words to be unparliamentary, but I will withdraw to enable me to continue in this vein.

The PRESIDENT: Is that acceptable to the Minister?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No. I want the honourable member to give an unqualified withdrawal.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Minister will not get an unqualified withdrawal, on the statement he made the other day, until you, Mr. President, have before you a statement regarding what he had to say about community development programmes. Nor should you appeal to Caesar, who will do no more than back him up.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I give an unqualified withdrawal in order to get you out of a spot, Mr. President, and not because of that man.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member should not get so excited. I think that is acceptable.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I only wish I had drawn the Chamber's attention to the attitude of this Minister, this real estate agent, who has been closer to local government for gain than has anybody else in this place.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I take strong objection to that remark, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster will apologise.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, I apologise. Mr. Hill has been the most unsuccessful real estate agent in the business if he did not enter it for gain.

The PRESIDENT: I think the point is that the Minister made a gain from local government.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: He was a member of local government, in Adelaide, for many years. I gave an unqualified withdrawal. He is one of the very few who has been in the land agents' game who never went into it for gain. If that is not a withdrawal, I do not know what is.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member had better ask his question before he gets into deeper water.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has anybody called "Question"?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I have.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has anybody on the

Government side? I will do the same on this side.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will have to withdraw the honourable member's leave unless he—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I therefore ask a series of questions of the Minister, if he will shut up and listen. Will he undertake to make a public statement, by way of a press release, on his belief that local government has been pleading for more power and resources to act in matters of community development? Will he include in that statement a reference to the true position regarding development boards and say whether or not the allegation he has made that they bypass local government is true? Will he also deal in his statement with the false allegation that local government is losing its traditional effectiveness and needs a renewal of confidence? Further, will he include in his statement an apology to a person in the community named Ken Brennan, who has had to resort to the columns of the *Advertiser* because the Minister has refused to acknowledge his complaints?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will detail the initiatives which I have introduced and which the Government has approved in regard to community development boards, and I hope that my reply will contain sufficient detail to satisfy the honourable member.

All existing community development boards and their members will be encouraged to continue and to join with their local council or councils in achieving the transition from their previous role to that outlined in the Government's policy. Over the next month, officers of my department will be sponsoring a series of initial meetings between councils and existing boards and will of course be available for continuing advice and support. Where it is the wish of the particular local authority, a community development board will be established for that council. Where adjoining councils prefer it, a board may be established to embrace more than one council area.

The functions of community development boards will be—

- to encourage and assist people to become more involved in the life of their local community;

- to help local government to develop understanding within the local community on key issues;

- to promote the development of links and co-operation between organisations and groups within the local community;

- to investigate and report to local government on any matter affecting the local community that may be referred to it by the local government or that in the opinion of the board warrants consideration by the local government.

Boards will be invited to establish close liaison with voluntary organisations involved in the provision of services for the well-being of the community. Boards should conduct their business as laid down by the council. The number and pattern of meetings is a matter to be determined by each board and the council. Boards should assist local government in the general process of identifying and studying local needs, establishing local priorities and planning how to best meet these community needs through the use of local resources.

Membership of the selection mechanism for a local community development board should be a matter determined by local government. Ideally, composition of each board should be broad enough to include representation from all the major service providers in the local community, such as education, police, welfare and voluntary organisations, as well as offering opportunity for community service by interested individuals.

Each community development board will be responsible to its particular local government and will report regularly

to that local government. Boards serving more than one council will report to each council involved.

Officers of the Local Government Department will be available at all times to advise and assist both councils and boards. The Government will continue to provide financial assistance towards basic meeting and administrative costs of boards during the transition period and/or their early formative stages.

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs say what evidence he has before him that any of the officers that he has referred to in previous replies had a part in the decision not to invite members of the then Opposition to the opening of a branch office of the Ethnic Affairs Division at Felixstow?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I did not have any information that the officers themselves initiated the list of invitees. I blamed the Government for that.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In that case, what were the criteria whereby the Minister decided that it should be these five officers who were to be transferred and not other officers within the division?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There were no specific criteria. A general assessment of the total staff was made by me, and I made those decisions.

FOOTBALL PARK LIGHTS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about Football Park lights.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Last evening, on one of the television news services, the Minister of Transport stated that it was intended to proceed with the installation of lights at Football Park. However, in his statement he said that it was intended that the light intensity would be reduced by one-third. Some public feeling already exists against having the lights at all but, forgetting that for the moment, I think all members would agree that it would be the height of folly to have lights which are not suitable for the purpose intended. I ask the Minister whether, in making his decision to reduce the light intensity from that recommended by the Royal Commission, he is satisfied that the lights will still be suitable for the intended purpose.

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

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs say whether any inquiry was carried out by the Public Service Board, departmental heads or any management services people within the department into the suitability of these officers for their position prior to any decision being taken by the Minister that they should be transferred?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There was not any specific inquiry. I had general discussions with departmental staff on the matter.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a further question about staff transfers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yesterday, the Minister indicated that a Mr. Tom Economou had been transferred from his position in the Riverland to the Thebarton Department of Community Welfare. I understand that considerable concern has been expressed by members of the Greek community in the Riverland about his transfer because of the excellent work that he was doing for the welfare of the Greek community in that area, particularly as they have special problems. First, was Mr. Economou seconded from the Department of Community Welfare to the Inquiry Unit of the Premier's Department for work in the Riverland? Secondly, does the Minister agree that the work being done in the Riverland was essentially welfare work, that Mr. Economou was primarily engaged in community welfare work, and that his performance was satisfactory?

Thirdly, in view of the concern expressed by members of the Greek community in the Riverland about Mr. Economou's transfer, will the Minister intervene to enable Mr. Economou to remain in the Riverland and continue with his work?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have had a number of consultations with my officers about this matter. However, I will consult with them further and bring back a detailed reply.

SEX DISCRIMINATION ACT

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in the Council, a question regarding the Sex Discrimination Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: A few days ago, the Minister of Consumer Affairs tabled in this Parliament the annual report of the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity, which report details all the work undertaken by the section of the department and makes recommendations for the future. I am sure that all those who have looked at the document will appreciate the facts, figures and arguments presented therein. It is an extremely worthwhile document indeed that I can recommend to all honourable members.

The conclusion of the report makes three recommendations regarding amendments to the Sex Discrimination Act. First, it recommends that discrimination against a person on the grounds of his or her homosexuality should be included in the definition of discrimination on the grounds of sex. Secondly, the report recommends that the Act be amended to make it unlawful for an employer to dismiss a woman on the grounds of her pregnancy alone. The third recommendation is that the Sex Discrimination Act be amended to extend the coverage of section 26 to the provision of services by clubs, and that the only exception should be clubs of a purely social character that are organised solely for mutual companionship and formed by and for members of the one sex.

I realise that two of those three recommendations appeared in the previous report made by the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity, and I understand that the former Government had been considering legislation that might implement those two recommendations. They are now repeated in this annual report by the Commissioner, with the third recommendation regarding an amendment to the Act being added. Will the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in the Council, say whether the Government intends to follow the recommendations made by the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity and to amend the Act in the three areas recommended?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Government is not in a position to indicate its attitude to the recommendations. However, when it has formulated that view the Government will notify the honourable member accordingly.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS DIVISION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs say what information he had before him, and from which source he obtained that information, that gave the basis for the decision to transfer the five officers from the Ethnic Affairs Division to other areas of Government service?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thought I answered that question when I answered the earlier one on the same subject. I simply had discussions with some departmental officers. I deliberated in relation to those discussions, and made the specific decisions.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Did the Minister have discussions with the Public Service Board? If he did not, with whom did he have the discussions that led to this decision being made?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The decisions were made by me before I discussed the matter with the Public Service Board.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister say whether it is expected that legislation will be required to set up the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission and, secondly, when it is expected that the commission will be established?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Legislation will be necessary, and I hope that it will be introduced during the autumn session.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Given that five members of the Ethnic Affairs Division are now being transferred to other Government departments and that for another several months there will be no Ethnic Affairs Commission to take the place of the work that the division is now doing, will the Minister say how the Government intends to maintain services to ethnic communities until an Ethnic Affairs Commission is set up?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have every confidence in the existing staff at the Ethnic Affairs Branch, who are working better now than they have ever worked. I have every confidence in the new acting head, Mr. George Giannopoulos, who has been in the branch since its inception. That gentleman reports to me almost daily concerning the administration of the branch, and the services that the branch has given to migrants and to ethnic people and communities generally are of the highest order.

DOUBLE TAXATION

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about double taxation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Attorney-General would no doubt be aware of the comments and statements made yesterday by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris in his Budget speech. The honourable member extolled the virtues of the system of double taxation that the Federal Liberal Party wishes to introduce. There was some debate whether this form of double taxation should be called a surcharge or, more honestly, double taxation. The Attorney-General will also be aware that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris tried to justify Federal Government policy, and suggested

it was not double taxation. How, when one's income is taxed twice, once by the Commonwealth and once by the State, it can be said not to be double taxation escapes me. However, I am concerned not about what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris thinks but about what the Government thinks regarding double taxation. Indeed, I am sure that this would be of interest to all members and everyone in this State. Will the Attorney-General state the Government's policy regarding the imposition of an income tax surcharge on the people of South Australia, in line with the Federal Government's known desire in this area?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I, too, express the view that the honourable member's comprehension of the matter is inaccurate, because it is not double taxation. The proposal of the Liberal Party's federalism policy is that among other things those who spend the money must be accountable to those from whom it is collected.

The proposal in the federalism policy is that the States, if they accept the responsibility, will have an opportunity either to grant a rebate of income tax or to concur in the addition of a surcharge, all of which will be related to income but which will all be part of the one scheme of income taxation. The Government's view is clear. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the Budget papers yesterday and said that there was no indication in the papers whether or not the Government intended to take advantage of the surcharge provision. It did not appear in the Budget because there was no need for it to be included in the current Budget. The Government has no intention of imposing that surcharge.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the Attorney for his unequivocal answer. The Attorney said that the Government had no intention of imposing this system of double taxation. Will the Attorney give that guarantee for the life of this Parliament or just for the rest of this financial year?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is not for me to give a guarantee on behalf of the Government.

PECUNIARY INTERESTS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Hon. Mr. Hill, who is the Minister of Local Government and also the Minister of Housing, a question about pecuniary interests.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I have been doing research in *Hansard* relating to the days when the Minister was in Government between 1968 and 1970. In a personal explanation regarding house sales reported in *Hansard* (6 August 1969), the Hon. Mr. Hill stated:

Recently, my attention was drawn to the fact that pamphlets in the name of Murray Hill Pty. Ltd. seeking properties for sale had been left in letter boxes of some houses that, on examination, appeared to lie within the routes of proposed freeways described in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. I appreciated the concern of the householders who received such notices, and I immediately obtained an explanation from the management of Murray Hill Pty. Ltd. I have been informed that the firm, implementing an accepted promotional method of obtaining property listings, distributed about 10 000 notices throughout the suburbs. Although it was the management's intention that properties within proposed freeway routes were to be excluded from distribution, some forms were placed, in error, in letter boxes of some of those properties.

It has been reported to me that no properties were listed and submitted to the Highways Department as a result of the particular sales promotion exercise. Although when I became

a Minister I entirely relinquished management responsibilities of the business, and resigned as a director, and although I no longer take part in the formulation of its policies, the company has agreed, in order to prevent misunderstandings, to discontinue the practice....

On 7 August 1969 the Hon. D. A. Dunstan asked the then Premier (Hon. R. S. Hall) the following question:

I rise on a matter of grave importance. Members of my Party are reluctant to raise allegations concerning the propriety of actions of other members of Parliament, because we consider that it is policies and not personalities that ought to be public issues, but this is a matter which cannot be allowed to pass. For some time now we on this side have had complaints that pamphlets purporting to be published by Murray Hill Proprietary Limited, inviting owners of properties to offer those properties for sale to or through Murray Hill Proprietary Limited, have been distributed to properties, including those affected by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. We have not previously raised this matter, as we had no adequate evidence as to who was responsible for their distribution. However, yesterday, the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Hill) made a personal statement in which he acknowledged that the notices in question had been distributed by the company, Murray Hill Proprietary Limited. That is a proprietary company of which the Minister is no longer a director or, he says, a person who takes part in the management, but the Minister has not suggested that he has no financial interest in it.

It is quite apparent from the facts now publicly admitted that, after certain properties have had their values adversely affected by the MATS Report, invitations were issued to the owners of properties concerned to sell those properties to or through a company in which the Minister has an interest, and that this was done at a time when a subsequent Ministerial decision to improve the value of the properties by rejection of that part of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan concerned could be taken and, in fact, was taken.

Does the Minister agree that at the time of this scandalous incident he had access to the details of the MATS plan and a financial interest in Murray Hill and Company Proprietary Limited? Secondly, has the Minister ever used his position while in local government or as a Minister of the Crown to provide information directly or indirectly to any person or persons which has resulted in financial gain or advantage of any kind? Thirdly, has the Minister yet asked the Premier to change his portfolio, as I suggested two weeks ago?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I can recall the matter that gave rise to the personal explanation that I brought to Parliament when this matter was first brought to my notice back in 1969. As soon as I knew what had happened within the management of the company, I thought it proper that I should make a personal explanation to the Council, and that I did. I can recall, too, the other occasion in another place—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You're not answering the question. I did not ask how your memory was. I am sure that you can remember the situation clearly.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I can recall that members who were on the staff of that firm at that time came down and gave an explanation to the Premier of the day as to what they had done without my knowledge. That was the matter of letterboxing—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You've still not answered my question.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not think there is any point in pursuing this matter. It was a case that worried me, as I admitted to the Council at the time, as soon as I found out about it. I came down and explained the position.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Would you like me to put the questions on notice?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member can put the questions on notice. To be asked a series of questions like that—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: There are only three. I will put them on notice for Wednesday 31 October.

HIGH-PROTEIN DIETS

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about high-protein diet formulae.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I refer to a report published in the October issue of *Choice* concerning high-protein diets. The report states:

The files of the United States Food and Drug Administration (F.D.A.), which has been monitoring the deaths, are also full of complaints that people who have been taking the formulae have experienced nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea or constipation, faintness, amenorrhoea (cessation of menstruation), muscle cramps, weakness or fatigue, irritability, cold intolerance, hair loss and skin dryness.

And, if that's not enough, more serious reactions have been reported—heart irregularities, high blood pressure, dehydration, renal failure and gout, to name but a few. High-protein foods named include Harmony Way, NaturSlim and Trimplicity. The report indicates that these products are similar to the suspected American product. The report continues:

... the literature accompanying the true high-protein products has some dangerous omissions. It

- doesn't warn against replacing all three meals with the formulae;
- doesn't emphasise the importance of mixing the formulae with milk;
- doesn't emphasise the importance of medical supervision, although it's mentioned in the fine print;
- doesn't say anything about the possible medical consequences of adhering to the diet for extended periods;

Some of these brands are extensively advertised on television to induce people to use them as weight reducing agents. An article appeared in the *Advertiser* of 10 October stating that some smart wheeler dealer overseas bought huge quantities of diet supplement from America, where it was banned by health authorities, relabelled it "protein supplement", and supplied it abroad, where it sold like hot cakes. I hope none of it is being sold in South Australia, although some of the brands sold here are American made and some are made in Australia. The minimum mark-up from the manufacturer to the consumer is 440 per cent on Trimplicity, which is the cheapest product per meal. On the most expensive products, the minimum mark-up for Harmony Way is 858 per cent and the minimum mark-up on NaturSlim is 920 per cent. Is the Minister aware of the likely dangers to people who use these products? If the Minister is satisfied that no health risk exists, will he ensure that a satisfactory warning about the need for a correct diet is attached to each can sold and that that warning is mentioned in all advertising? What can be done to warn people of the exorbitant prices that are being charged for these products?

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

ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs. In view of the fact that the Minister told the Council last week that the activities and functions of the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission would substantially take over the activities of the Ethnic Affairs Division, why was it not possible for the Minister to enable the five officers who have been transferred from the division to continue their employment in the division until the Ethnic Affairs Commission is established? It could have been possible for positions to be found for them in the Commission, given that they had been appointed to the Public Service within the Ethnic Affairs Division of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, which were the original jobs that they had applied for and obtained. If there were no positions in the Ethnic Affairs Commission then, ultimately a decision could have been taken to transfer them.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If new positions are created when the Ethnic Affairs Commission is established, those officers, along with other people, will be entitled to apply for them. I have already told the Leader, and I thought I made it clear, that all Ministers on assuming office looked at their departments and the sections and branches within those departments to see whether any adjustments were desirable to comply with the present Government's policy to try to reduce government. That is why, under that general umbrella, I looked at this group and took the action I did.

HARRISBURG NUCLEAR POWER STATION

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about the nuclear power station failure at Harrisburg in the United States.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: All members will recall that Mr. Tonkin went overseas—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I point out that I do not want a recurrence of what happened yesterday.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: What happened yesterday occurred because of the stupidity of a harsh rule, and I make that point before the clock ticks on any further. After his trip overseas the Premier said that Harrisburg was quite safe. He met with most of the nuclear and atomic energy freaks in the United Kingdom and the United States. Today's *News* carries a presidential report from the United States that condemns the failure and the disaster of Harrisburg. Among other things, that article mentions that that disaster will cost about \$2 000 000 000. That presidential report condemns the engineers, the construction engineers, and the designers. However, the Premier returned from the United States and told the people of South Australia that a nuclear programme was acceptable, despite what had happened at Harrisburg. Will the Attorney-General request the Premier to make available, through the Parliamentary Library, the full presidential report about the Harrisburg disaster?

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

HOMELESS TEENAGERS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of a survey in Melbourne which reported that there are 15 000 homeless teenagers in that city?

2. Has the Minister any estimate of the number of homeless teenagers in Adelaide and, if so, what is that estimate?

3. How many homeless teenagers can be accommodated in the existing children's shelters in Adelaide at any one time?

4. If the Minister has no estimate of the number of homeless teenagers in Adelaide, will he organise a survey to determine the extent of the problem here?

5. If the number of homeless teenagers in Adelaide is found to be greater than the numbers who can be accommodated in the existing children's shelters, will the Minister support and finance further children's shelters?

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

1. Yes.

2. The Emergency Housing Office has received inquiries from about 350 teenagers this year.

3. 65.

4. Not at this time.

5. Projects which will provide accommodation for homeless teenagers in houses in the community with a resident supervisor are being developed in preference to additional children's shelters.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT REGULATIONS

Order of the Day, Private Business, No. 4: the Hon. J. A. Carnie to move:

That the regulations made on 8 March 1979 under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1971-1974, in respect of the definition of workman, and laid on the table of this Council on 24 May 1979, be disallowed.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: As the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has decided to take no further action to disallow these regulations, as shown in the minutes table yesterday, I do not intend proceeding with this notice of motion.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 23 October. Page 237).

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply so ably moved and seconded by my new colleagues the Hon. Bob Ritson and the Hon. Legh Davis. That pleasure is reinforced by the fact that, after a long period in Opposition, we again have a good Government in this State—a Government which is dedicated to the advancement of South Australia and which has settled into its work very well indeed.

I hasten to reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, and I thank His Excellency for the Speech with which he opened Parliament. I congratulate the Premier and the members of the new Government on being confirmed in office as Ministers of the Crown, and I especially express my best wishes to the Ministers who occupy the front bench in this Council. I am sure that they will be successful in their efforts for this State. I would like to convey my best wishes to the Hon. Don Banfield and the Hon. Tom Casey, both of whom have recently retired. I hope that they have a long and happy retirement. I also express my deep regret that the Hon. Richard Geddes,

who also recently retired (as a result of not being re-endorsed by his Party), is no longer a member of this Chamber.

Dick Geddes is a most honourable man, who was a very valuable member of Parliament for over 14 years. All Parties make mistakes—the Labor Party would be the last to deny that, particularly at present—and I know that my Party made a very serious mistake when it failed to re-endorse Mr. Geddes.

It is not sensible to make a snap judgment over one matter but rather is it sensible to consider the worth of 14 years of valuable, experienced service to this Parliament, and this is why I very much regret the mistake that was made. I pay a tribute to my friend Mr. Geddes and wish him well in his retirement.

Naturally I am very pleased to be making this speech from the Government side of the Council, and I look forward to the Liberal Party's being in Government for a long time to come. We have won a number of seats which the former Government regarded as permanently its own. We won them well and we intend to retain them.

We have some excellent talent on the back bench amongst the new members in another place, and they are prepared to work hard and long to consolidate their hard-won seats, as indeed they proved during the election campaign and in the months preceding it.

I mentioned earlier the speeches of the mover and seconder of this motion. Not long ago I welcomed to this place the Hon. Legh Davis, and I now welcome the Hon. Bob Ritson. The Hon. Legh Davis replaced the Hon. Jessie Cooper, whose service to the State I mentioned after her retirement, in July of this year. The Hon. Bob Ritson has just joined us. These two new members are destined to make a most valuable contribution to the welfare and advancement of South Australia, and I look forward to their contributions with great confidence.

I also welcome the Hon. Gordon Bruce, the Hon. Barbara Wiese and the Hon. Lance Milne, and congratulate them on their maiden speeches in this place, even though I could not agree with all that they said. I cannot, of course, accept their political philosophies, but I wish them a long term on the benches which they now occupy and congratulate the Hon. Chris Sumner on being Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council.

The Labor Party Leader (Hon. Chris Sumner) is already asking foolish questions about how soon our election promises will be carried out—foolish because Rome was not built in a day; neither can election promises be implemented overnight. However, in many instances the answer will come in ensuing legislation mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, some of which I will mention in the course of my speech.

On the one hand, the Australian Labor Party wants everything done at a moment's notice (it took nine years to do nothing in some of these fields) and on the other hand it says that we do not have a mandate for Roxby Downs. Incidentally, I take note of and agree with the points made by the Hon. John Carnie regarding coal mining and uranium mining. However, to say that we have no mandate for the development of Roxby Downs is nonsense, because we have the biggest endorsement by the people that any Government has had for a number of years—not in seats, perhaps, because of the gerrymander of Hugh Hudson, but in percentage of the vote—particularly in the Legislative Council, where we were very successful.

I recall only too well the 1975 election, when the Labor Party was returned to power, with 47 per cent of the vote in one House and 49 per cent in another place—a minority of seats in both Chambers, yet it still came to office.

That great architect Hugh Hudson put up a redistribution plan, which was accepted in considerable measure by the redistribution tribunal, to endeavour to ensure that the Labor Party stayed in Government forever, virtually—a plan which meant that Labor could possibly stay in office with 46 per cent of the vote. As I have said, the redistribution tribunal accepted a very considerable proportion of the Hudson plan, which it was entitled to do, but the then Opposition had to win over 54 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote to gain Government under this scheme.

In the event, we did win over 54 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote (nearly 55 per cent) in the House of Assembly and 56.5 per cent in the Legislative Council. It may well be ironic, but it is also entirely appropriate that the somewhat arrogant gentleman to whom I have just referred (Hugh Hudson) should have been defeated by his own so-called foolproof scheme and is no longer of any consequence in the South Australian political scene. He is dead politically, a member said in this place last night, and is unlikely to be resurrected.

I congratulate the Hon. Ren DeGaris, who led the Liberal team in the Legislative Council to the greatest victory one could have wished for in the Council elections—a very great achievement, especially as all the so-called media experts predicted that the Labor Party must win six of the 11 seats, and they were backed up by some tertiary lecturers who, it appears, are more often wrong than right. In fact, Mr. DeGaris's team won six and the Labor Party only four and the Democrats one—a tribute to Mr. DeGaris and his team.

It must be galling to the Labor Party to know that its longed for control of this Chamber has been postponed indefinitely, but it is the verdict of the people of this State—and a very good verdict it is. They have spoken—the people of South Australia told the A.L.P. what day it was—and is—and what they think of the left wing. We are by no means the first State that has rejected handing over the Upper House to the radicals on the political scene. It has happened before in other States, and it will happen again.

A new Government, of course, has virtually to start again. It cannot proceed with much of the legislation that has been prepared for a socialist regime which has an entirely different approach—the “dead hand of socialism”, one of my respected colleagues called it.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the first part of this session is expected to be relatively short. It will deal with the most urgent matters which have to be dealt with before the end of the year—the Budget itself, Bills pertaining to the Budget and to election promises, and the Address in Reply. The main legislative programme is likely to come in the autumn portion of the session. It is pleasing, however, to note that the Government will introduce Bills to abolish succession duty on the estates of persons dying after 1 January 1980 and to abolish gift duty on gifts made on or after that date, according to our election policy speech. A lot of nonsense has been talked by Labor Party spokesmen about such abolition benefiting only the rich. This is nonsense, of course, as I have demonstrated in this Council before (and other members have also) by giving instances of very small estates attracting duty. I do not propose to repeat those examples, but they do occur. Fortunately, they will not occur any more after 1 January 1980.

Suffice to say, if the Leader opposite continues to expect, in his rather naive way, promises to be implemented virtually overnight, that here are two examples of things which are being done now. One could think of a number of A.L.P. promises which were trotted

out at all or most elections and which have never been carried out over nine years—Monarto, Redcliff, dial-a-bus, to name but three. Monarto has become a very expensive running sore for which the people of South Australia have to pay.

The Leader, before he continues his rather childish questioning about immediate implementation of promises, should look at the record of his own Party in this context. It will not bear examination, as the people of South Australia told him in such a devastating manner on 15 September.

Other promises made by this Government will also be carried out as soon as possible, as mentioned by His Excellency, including remissions of pay-roll tax, and reduced stamp duty and removal of land tax on the taxpayer's principal place of residence. I commend the Government particularly for this last measure, which will place home owners all over the State in the same position.

When land tax was taken off rural land some time ago, I was of the opinion that, until such a measure as will now come before us was introduced, land tax should remain on the landowner's principal place of residence in rural areas. The fact that it is now going to be removed, not only in rural areas but also in urban areas, places home owners throughout the State in the same position, and that is a very commendable intention.

I commend the Government for its intention to abolish drainage rates in the South-East under the South-Eastern Drainage Act. I do not intend to go into that in great detail, as it was dealt with by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday. I also commend the Government for its intention during the life of this Parliament to phase out hospital levies, which the previous Government consistently refused to do and which is an unwarranted burden on hospitals under the new arrangements that have come into force.

I was interested to hear the Hon. Dr. Cornwall refer in his speech last week to the three or three and a half years of this Parliament. Incidentally, it was the only part of his speech which I found interesting, as I believe that this Parliament will run its full term of 3½ years. Dr. Cornwall was admitting this probability, and it probably was the A.L.P.'s intention, at long last (had it won both Houses as it expected), to do likewise.

Honourable members are aware that, if the writs are returnable in October, the time of the Parliament goes on to the following March whereas, if they are returned earlier, the period of the Parliament is taken from the previous March. It is no coincidence that the Labor Party has now twice had an election so that the writs are returnable in October. No doubt, at one stage members opposite had in mind to extend the last Parliament over 3½ years. They made a disastrous decision to cut that short by 18 months. I have no doubt that they had in mind to stay in the present Parliament for 3½ years. I suggest that they will stay in this present Parliament for 3½ years—in their present position. However, the term of Parliament should be looked at carefully.

I applaud the Government's intention to look into the possibility of limiting the *ad hoc* termination of a Parliament (as the last one was terminated) without adequate reason (such as defeat on the floor of the House) before its full-time is up. It was a major mistake, as the Hon. Frank Blevins admitted yesterday, which the A.L.P. tried once too often.

I commend the Hon. R. C. DeGaris for his comments on this matter and also for his quotes on the matter, first from Alpheus Todd and then from Quick and Garran, which I do not propose to repeat but to which I direct the attention of honourable members. The honourable

gentleman's comments on the recent election should also be studied by all members. It is a valuable document.

Dealing with the life of a Parliament, I personally believe that a three-year term is too short and that an election should be held every four years—or even five years, as in some other countries such as Great Britain, and not for as short a term as this country and New Zealand have. The reason for this belief is that the slightly longer term does enable a Government to get on with the job instead of looking over its shoulder thinking about what this or that legislation will do to its election prospects in the not-too-distant—in fact, all too near—future.

I firmly believe that a slightly longer term would produce more stable Government, and I urge the Government to try to find a formula which would make it difficult, if not impossible, for a Government to rush to the people before its term was complete except where (to quote Alpheus Todd) "circumstances arise which render the efficient operation of Parliament impossible"—and he went on, as the Hon. R. C. DeGaris mentioned, to set out those circumstances.

I now turn to the matter of local government. I am very pleased to see that this Government intends to update local government and give it more independence and a better status in the community. For far too long we have seen local government denigrated to the extent that it was almost to the stage of a local community welfare or development office with a decrease in what were the main duties of local government over many years. The previous Government tended to centralise to make the Highways Department a colossus. That is not surprising when one considers that members opposite believe in a one-House Parliament in Canberra and a lot of small "regions" which have no power.

In previous years prior to the early 1970's, many competent local government councils demonstrated their efficiency to the Minister and other departments in no uncertain manner. They were given the opportunity to do that and, in the field of road construction, many councils were able to prove that they could do this important work at least as effectively as the Highways Department and, in some cases, more economically than that department. I have had experience of this in local government in previous years.

This has also the benefit of making local councils more viable and proficient and providing more local employment. However, under the previous Administration (that is, the Labor Government, which was recently defeated), it is not too much to say that in some areas the debit order system seems to have gone by the board entirely. Although this is but one (albeit an important one) aspect of local government work, I trust that under the new Administration local government will resume more of its local importance and will be given more opportunity to prove itself, and be given the opportunity to decentralise where it appears wise to do this.

I hope that the Minister will keep these matters in mind and that he has success in his efforts to reintroduce some tried and proven methods and inject a new enthusiasm into this important sector. I indicate my best wishes to the many very valuable citizens who give able and unstinting service to local government. I am very glad that, to quote His Excellency's Speech, "appropriate recognition will be accorded to local government".

I refer to the Pyap irrigation settlement which His Excellency also mentioned. When I first entered this Parliament one of my first opportunities was to support the installation of a new pumping plant for the Pyap irrigation scheme and later, with my then colleague the Hon. C. R. Story, to attend its opening by the late Hon.

Tom Stott. Therefore, I am glad to see that this Government will bring down legislation to enable the Pyap Irrigation Trust to use Government funds—received either by way of loan or grant—to improve the drainage system of the Pyap irrigation settlement, which was established, I understand, many years ago, before the turn of the century.

I refer to a matter that has come before the public in the last day or two in regard to the Australian Broadcasting Commission being unable to use the Festival Theatre for two months next year. The commission has applied to the Government for reconsideration, which may be a bit unpractical at this stage. It is unfortunate indeed that the Festival Theatre will not be available for the Australian Broadcasting Commission's concerts and that they have to be transferred to the Adelaide Town Hall, which is a little more than half the size of the Festival Theatre and in which the concerts will have to be repeated four times rather than the present twice. If the Adelaide Town Hall had only been built to exactly twice its present size with the present dimensions doubled in detail, it would then be adequate as one of the best concert halls in the world. Indeed, it is one of the best concert halls in the world, except for the fact that it holds only 1 200 people. The unfortunate part of it is that 15 years ago there was a move to build a concert hall for Adelaide.

I had the pleasure of supporting legislation to that effect which passed through this Parliament. Over the years it got altered, so that we now have a multi-purpose theatre, which cannot always be used for concerts when it should be being used for that purpose. Mr. Earle, the General Manager of the Festival Centre Trust, is quoted in yesterday's *Advertiser* as stating that the problem is that of managing and filling a multi-purpose theatre. He was also quoted as saying:

One solution to the problem would be for Adelaide to build a concert hall.

That is ironical when one thinks that the Festival Theatre exists today only because of the need to build a concert hall! That is what was to be built in the mid-1960's, but it got changed. It must be remembered that the Festival Theatre, good though it is, is by no means an ideal concert hall. It could be said that it is the best sort of compromise one could get. However, when one compares it to the Adelaide Town Hall (overlooking the difference in size), to the concert hall of the Sydney Opera House, or to the Royal Festival Hall in London, one realises that the Festival Theatre is anything but an ideal concert hall. If anyone doubts that statement, he should ask any prominent professional musician whether it is correct. The Festival Theatre is a compromise, and it is regrettable and ironical that we have this problem with the A.B.C., when the original intention was to build a concert hall.

We have Mr. Earle saying that one solution to the problem would be for Adelaide to build a concert hall. Of course, the original arrangement to build a concert hall took note of the fact that we had two theatres in Adelaide, one of which has been upgraded, and the other of which could still be used for live theatre. If both of those theatres had been upgraded, and Adelaide had had a concert hall built, the A.B.C. would not be in the sort of impasse in which it now finds itself. It is indeed unfortunate that Adelaide has built a compromise theatre, which is not always available for the type of concerts that the A.B.C. or any other entrepreneur wants to put on.

The final matter to which I refer relates to meat hygiene, about which all honourable members should be concerned. There is no doubt whatsoever that improvements are most necessary, and this is especially so in some (and I emphasise "some") country areas. However, there

were some queries about the legislation that the previous Minister wished to bring down, so much so that these queries undoubtedly delayed its introduction, which was probably just as well.

Although I am pleased to see that the Government intends to proceed with legislation on this matter, I am interested to note in His Excellency's Speech that a substantially modified measure will be brought down. I hope that this legislation, when it is introduced, will overcome some of the problems that delayed the previous Bill, and will also improve considerably the standards of meat hygiene and health of the people of this State.

I congratulate the Government on its magnificent victory. The ball is now in its court. Its job is to make South Australia great again, and I am confident that, given adequate time, the new Government can do just that. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of the Council. I know that Government members will not agree; otherwise they would not have voted against you. However, that is my opinion, and I believe with all my Opposition colleagues, that in the previous Parliament you, Sir, conducted yourself as an unbiased President, and I see no reason why you should have got the sack.

I also congratulate the two new Labor members in the Council, the Hon. Barbara Wiese and the Hon. Gordon Bruce, on their maiden speeches. Certainly, I hope that all goes well for them in their future representations in this Council on behalf of the great Australian Labor Party.

I now comment briefly on the recent State election. I have attended several meetings since the election was held, at which meetings the Labor Government's defeat has been discussed. The general consensus of opinion in the Labor Party is that we should not have had the election. However, the damage has been done and, as a result of our judgment, the people of South Australia have elected a Liberal Government. I honestly believe that, had the former Labor Government had its full term of office, the Liberal Party would have continued in disarray.

We have witnessed recently the dismissal of Mr. Stan Evans from the shadow Cabinet. We also had the sacking by Mr. Tonkin of Dick Geddes, the former shadow Minister of Mines and Energy. I am always reluctant to congratulate or eulogise members of the Liberal Party but, in Dick Geddes's case, I will make an exception. Mr. Geddes honestly believed in the system that he represented. In fact, in a report by political reporter Greg Kelton in the 18 September issue of the *Advertiser*, Mr. Geddes was reported as saying:

Mr. Tonkin had told me that my work was good in all respects as far as the shadow Ministry was concerned but, because I voted on the Santos legislation in the way I did, he could not tolerate me in the shadow Cabinet. As far as I was concerned the energy needs of this State are more important than the political implications.

That is the reason why I must voice my support of the Hon. Mr. Geddes. He laid his political future on the line because he believed the future energy needs of the State were more important than his political career. That, in my opinion, shows rare courage, and I believe the new Liberal Government will miss Mr. Geddes in the future.

The Liberal Party would, in my opinion, never have won this election had it not been for the support of the Murdoch press. It would not have won the election without the support of the retail traders group. They included many notable anti-Labor people with them, including Mr. Max Gregg of the Employers Federation,

who has such a blind hatred of the Labor Party, its members and the trade unions. He is the sort of recruit that Mr. Rundle will always have by his side.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We would rather have him than George Apap.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will refer to him later. I was also disgusted during the campaign with the spokesman for the retail traders group. He suggested that shop assistants would lose their jobs if Labor was elected. I believe that the publicity and the fear that was instilled in workers by the media campaign such as "Stop the job rot" did have its effect in the campaign.

I recall reading the story of Jack Lang's life and political career, and I believe that in 1932 Mr. Lang was favoured to be re-elected as Premier of New South Wales. There was a concerted campaign by the employers at that time, and I believe the book states that the employers advised the employees that, if Lang was elected on election day, they need not come to work on Monday. As a result of this campaign against Lang, the blackmail of workers and the fear that was instilled into them by the employers, Lang was defeated. So, I believe that in this election the Liberal Party and its supporters pulled out all stops and stooped very low in political terms to gain the Treasury benches. It is interesting to note that the newspaper reports indicate that things are not as bad in South Australia as we were led to believe during the election campaign.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Not now.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: What, two days after the election? If the honourable member will listen and behave himself, I will tell him. On 12 October, contrary to the Liberals' "Stop the job rot" election campaign in the *Advertiser*, an article stated "Jobless up in all States except South Australia". On 23 September 1979, in the business section of the *Sunday Mail*, an article by Barry Hughes, a top South Australian economist, stated that the South Australian economy had been on a fair recovery during 1979.

He went on to say:

Take employment, for example: Contrary to the employer maps shown in the election advertising, which covers the entire period from late 1977 to the present, including the disastrous 1977-78 financial year, South Australian private sector employment this year had actually grown marginally faster than the rest of Australia.

I do not know how the Minister of Industrial Affairs, Mr. Dean Brown, will be able to look the workers in the face when he speaks to the unemployed. On 1 November 1979, in the Conference Room of this Parliament, the first step the Liberal Party in this State took to stop the so-called job rot was to do away with the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, known as SURS. I know that thousands of workers were employed under this scheme and would have continued to be employed under it until the change of Government. I do not know how Mr. Brown is going to second people from public sector employment to private sector employment.

Certainly, from my experience with earth-moving contractors in South Australia on civil engineering, if I were a Government employee and if they asked my advice, I would advise very strongly against their being seconded to private sector employment, and I say this for a very good reason. The wages and the working conditions in Government departments are much more secure than they are with the private contractors. It is not uncommon for private earth-moving contractors to go broke. I know of many such cases. I have had several cases when I was Secretary of the Australian Workers Union where they could not pay their workers their wages, holiday pay, and other accumulated entitlements.

It was quite common in private sector contracting for penalty rates not to be paid. Awards were continually breached by the private sector, and I would hasten to warn any Government employee who allows himself to be seconded for or by these private contractors that he will not have the job security that he has presently in Government departments, nor will he get service and over-award payments from the private contractor.

He will also not be encouraged to join his particular union—in fact, on the contrary: he will be discouraged from joining a trade union and, as their record shows, the employers have a very good reason for doing that, as they continually breach industrial awards.

It was pleasing to note that the Secretary of the Australian Workers Union, Mr. A. S. Begg, said in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 20 November 1979 that the secondment plan was unworkable. He went on to say that it might be all right in the short term, but I think it could mean getting rid of quite a number of people in Government departments, and I think that Mr. Begg, a very astute trade union secretary, has woken up to Mr. Dean Brown.

Mr. Tonkin has been recorded in the newspaper as saying that South Australia is a good place to live in, and he is absolutely correct in that statement. I hope he does not take the credit in two weeks for making South Australia a good place to live in. Bearing in mind that this is the International Year of the Child, most of us have had our children at one time or other, unfortunately, in the Childrens Hospital. I have had personal experience with the Adelaide Childrens Hospital and, in fact, I have the highest regard for it and the staff employed there.

They saved my first son's life and only last year saved the leg of one of my other sons. I know that members on this side of the Council and certainly many people in the community were very concerned when they read in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 20 October 1979, under the heading "Childrens Hospital faces cuts" the report stated:

The Adelaide Childrens Hospital may have to cut staff and services if the South Australian Health Commission stands firm on its severely reduced budgetary allocation.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: They're running out of patients at the Children's. Modbury Hospital is pinching them.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Do you know much about it?

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: Yes.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He knows much more about it than you do, Jim.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You get back to the farm, silly old fool that you are.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask that the honourable member to withdraw and apologise.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Dawkins has asked the Hon. Mr. Dunford to withdraw—

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It is perfectly true that his behaviour has been perfectly unforgivable. He has been interjecting on the Ministers and telling them—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Do you intend to apologise and withdraw that remark?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I think he is a fool. Is that unparliamentary, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: You have been asked to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will withdraw that remark and say that the honourable member is foolish.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: And apologise!

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will not apologise. The honourable member asked me to withdraw. I withdraw and say he is foolish, and then the honourable member wants me to apologise. He cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster will get the opportunity to withdraw from the Chamber unless he is more careful. I believe that the Hon. Mr. Dunford should apologise and withdraw his remark.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The South Australian Health Commission stands firm on its severely reduced budgetary allocation—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not finished with the matter yet. It will be cleared up to my satisfaction before you proceed. I ask the Hon. Mr. Dunford once again to apologise and withdraw his remark.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will withdraw, but I will not apologise.

The PRESIDENT: Then I will have no option but to name the honourable member.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I draw your attention, Mr. President, to Standing Order 193, which deals with objectionable words. I believe that that is the Standing Order that you have referred to in taking objection to what the Hon. Mr. Dunford has said, but I believe that what he has said is not against Standing Orders. If I may refresh your memory, Mr. President, some time over the past 12 months you gave a ruling that it was not necessary for a member to apologise in respect of simple breaches of Standing Order 193 if the member was willing to withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: I do not know whose memory the honourable member is testing.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Although I cannot show you it today, I can show you tomorrow. During the last session you did not insist that a member apologise, provided that he withdrew. As this is a minor breach, as was the previous case to which I refer, I request that that be sufficient in this case.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a matter for debate, as far as I am concerned. Following the request of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, that is where the matter lies. It is with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. If he is prepared to accept the Hon. Mr. Dunford's withdrawal as an apology, I will accept that. If he persists, then I have no option but to carry out the request.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Hon. Mr. Dunford said that he would withdraw but would not apologise. I have asked for a withdrawal and an apology. I refer to Standing Order No. 208, which specifically refers to an apology. I seek that apology.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to have to persist, but I do so at the request of the honourable member, who has asked for both a withdrawal and an apology. He is not prepared to accept the withdrawal as an apology. I again call on the Hon. Mr. Dunford to do both of those things, and I hope that he will.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In deference to you and very very reluctantly, Mr. President, I withdraw and apologise, in terrible pain.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins will accept that.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I accept.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the Hon. Mr. Dunford to resume.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: One thing I have done is make Mr. Dawkins laugh. The Chairman of the hospital board and management, Mr. A. W. Crompton, said yesterday that the hospital would get \$642 000 less cash this year. He told the annual general meeting that the board was prepared to work with the South Australian Health Commission, but not for it: in other words, in partnership and not as servants. Mr. Crompton said that the commission had reduced the hospital's allocation by

8.4 per cent on its budget, or 3.56 per cent in relation to last year's allocation. He went on further to say that, if the Health Commission stood firm he would have no option but to reduce staff and services, which is very worrying to the board and staff. I am sure that this will be very worrying to people in the community who have sick children. This is one organisation that deserves the full support of the Government, and it is one of the worst tragedies I have heard of in the short time this new Government has been in office.

Our new Minister of Health, Mrs. Jennifer Adamson, who attended the meeting of the hospital board as a guest, said at the meeting she was confident that the challenge could be met. She went on further to say that she was writing to various South Australian hospital boards and she hoped this would solve some of the problems that hospitals were faced with. I believe a letter from Mrs. Adamson would not be as acceptable as the necessary funds would be to maintain these very valuable hospital services.

I want to take the opportunity, during this contribution, to talk about one of the biggest problems—in fact a cancer—in our society. Unfortunately, this cancer could be with us for a long time in the future unless the Labor Party is able to wrest, through the ballot box, the Treasury Benches from Malcolm Fraser. The cancer to which I am referring is the unemployment situation and the problems associated with being without a job at the present time. The economic crisis is putting a tremendous strain on the health, family life and mental well-being of hundreds of thousands of Australians. The economic crisis has become an alarming social crisis. Unemployment has helped to produce more crime, more drug addicts, more teenage drunkenness and more marriage breakups.

The economic crisis is helping to boost tragic statistics of mental illness, suicide, heart attacks and infectious disease. It has also become an important factor in the death rate of children among families of unemployed workers. Australia is showing all the symptoms of a very sick society and, if unemployment continues in the 1980's at anything like the present level, there is no doubt that our society will get worse.

At least one-third of the unemployed are under 21. In some industrial centres half the school leavers cannot find work, and many face the prospect of missing out for the rest of their lives because employers will not take on people with a history of unemployment. The President of the School Careers Advisory Association has said:

In today's job climate if a school leaver does not get a job in the first six months, he or she has had it. Employers take on their trainee apprentices and cadets at the beginning of the year. If a young person has to wait until the next intake he or she is competing with a new batch of fresh school leavers.

Not surprisingly, many youngsters are cracking up under these strains, or they turn to drugs to shut themselves off from a world that does not seem to give a damn.

The New South Wales Health Commission has found heroin addiction in areas of high youth unemployment. Drug convictions in New South Wales have increased by between 60 per cent and 80 per cent during the economic crisis. Teenage alcoholism has gone up by 15 per cent. Many youngsters also face the problem of hopelessness as they move around, often from country to city, looking for work. The Fraser Government has denied them the dole for six weeks after they leave school, and the regulations on payment have become stricter. This means that many young job seekers away from home end up sleeping in the parks or in doss houses. Nowadays about 20 per cent of those seeking shelter in refuges run by the Salvation Army

or St. Vincent de Paul are under 25 years old. When young people are denied job opportunities they are also denied the prospect of economic self-reliance and self-esteem, and they face poverty plus a sense of being social outcasts. Some try to escape their despair with drugs or drink, and they become bitter and cynical.

In Australia today up to 30 per cent of all people arrested, depending on the State, are unemployed. In some States juvenile crime has shot up by 60 per cent. During the economic crisis in South Australia, where accurate statistics are kept, offences committed by the unemployed were up by 240 per cent. Some unemployed persons have taken out their frustrations on members of their families. The Royal Commission on Human Relations found that unemployment was an important cause of wife battery and violence towards children. In Victoria the mental health authorities found an unusually high rate of attempted suicide among the unemployed. Research shows that people without jobs are between seven and 12 times more likely to try and kill themselves than those with jobs.

Meanwhile studies conducted by the Economics Department at Macquarie University in Sydney have shown that the level of unemployment is closely connected with heart disease. The strain of unemployment often leads to increased blood pressure. This connection has been further substantiated by comparing the figures for heart attack death, and the high unemployment in the past. The families of the unemployed suffer health problems, too. Children of unemployed parents are twice as likely to be hospitalised with infectious disease as are other children. The infant mortality rates also increase during times of economic crisis when the pay packet is no longer coming in, and the mortgage has to be paid. Many families are forced to cut back on food and clothing, which are essential to good health.

It seems to me that Dr. Tonkin, like his Leader, Mr. Fraser, in Canberra, believes that increased wages is the reason that people are losing their jobs. In fact, they use the argument that one person's wage rise can cost another his job. This argument has been repeated in no fewer than four Budget speeches by Liberal members. But, if wages are to be further cut by not keeping up with the cost of living, then those who cop the cuts will be a majority of workers earning less than the average weekly wage. It will affect only those on award wages subject to the control of the Arbitration Commission. The present campaign to end penalty rates, if it is successful, will further lower wages for those on the bottom of the income ladder. The cuts will not be imposed on the administrators, the newspaper, radio and T.V. experts earning over \$300 a week. Conservative economists and journalists who are at the moment falling over one another in their haste to cut the wages of those on lower incomes will not lose a cent.

The Treasurer, Mr. Howard, in the 1978 Budget speech, stated that it is not that there is not sufficient wealth overall—everyone knows that Australia produces plenty of wealth—it is simply a question of who is to get it. The Government arbitrarily argues that the normal share of national income going to wage and salary earners should be 62.7 per cent. They get this figure by simply averaging out the shares of wages and profits from 1968-72. In 1974, the wages share was 68.9 per cent, but in 1978 it had fallen to 64.9 per cent. In the last three years the Government has successfully reduced the living standards of those on lower wages. There are apparently more cuts to come, yet unemployment remains high and rises weekly. A study completed in 1974 found that the share of national income going to wage and salary earners had fallen since the Second World War and that the profit share had risen.

It also found that there was no such thing as a normal share and stated that the relative sizes of profit and wages share of national income was a question of value judgment.

In other words, shares of national income going to wages and salaries is a product of conflict between employees and employers. It expresses at the national level the struggle between the workers and employers over wages, conditions and power in the work place. Who gets what depends on who is winning, and who is winning depends on who is prepared to fight the hardest.

Stripped of all the fancy economic terms, this exercise by the Government is aimed at imposing the whole weight of the present crisis on those who can least afford it. For instance, in 1975 the Fraser Government claimed that wage-earners' share of national income was 6.2 per cent too high, and this was causing the rapidly rising unemployment. But, from 1974 to 1978 the number without jobs rose from 100 000 to 450 000 even though the wage-earners' share of national income dropped by 4 per cent.

I believe that Ralph Willis's address to the second national conference of Labor economists, in 1978, hit the nail on the head when he said to expect that, in the middle of the worst recession in 40 years, profit share should be at a normal level is absurd. It means a massive redistribution of real income from wage-earners to profits.

The Fraser Government has been successful in cutting back the share of national income going to wages, and it intends to keep doing so. A very conservative estimate of the amount being transferred from wages to profit is \$1 450 000 000 a year since 1974. Workers working in engineering, metal and vehicles have lost an average of at least \$17.50 a week each in real wages since September 1974.

I believe that unemployment could be solved in this country if Australia worked a 35-hour week, if Australia was not being ripped off by multi-nationals. I say ripped off, because I want to refer to an article put out by the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union on page 57 of that magnificent publication. It goes on to say that the rip-off of most Australians continues at a very conservative minimum of \$1 450 000 000 a year, which is being transferred from wages to profit and the push is on to transfer more. At least \$4 000 000 000 is being slashed through the social wage going to workers and their families, and more is being taken away. Meanwhile, hand-outs to big business have been stepped up. Tax evasion by those on high incomes now amounts to \$1 000 000 000 a year at the very least, serviced by an array of tax agents and their employees who are increasing so fast that the tax-evasion industry is soon likely to employ more people than the motor vehicle industry.

In the absence of any tax on capital gains on the wealthy, at least \$300 000 000 a year is lost to the public purse. The Government will not introduce such a tax.

Australia is one of the few capitalist countries in the world which has no direct tax on wealth, and the few taxes on the wealthy are being removed. Up to \$11 000 000 000 a year could be collected by such a tax. Between now and 1981 at least \$13 000 000 in windfall profits will be ripped off petrol consumers by Australian and foreign multi-nationals ranging throughout the mineral industry. The rip-off is stupendous and runs into many thousands of millions of dollars.

The tax load on companies and on the wealthy on high incomes has been practically cut, and this load has been transferred to the majority of workers, whose wages are below the average weekly earnings. Many of the large companies are not paying any tax at all. While this is going

on, millions live in poverty and hundreds of thousands are jobless.

While all this is going on we find Mr. Fraser has a new surprise in store for the unemployed, and I think it is ably depicted in the *Melbourne Truth* of Saturday 20 October 1979 under the heading "Lively Letters". N.B. of Melbourne writes that Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser has launched yet another attack on the young unemployed, those perhaps most vulnerable in these days of economic depression. His latest move in withdrawing dole payments from young people training for employment takes us back to the age of Nelson, when press gangs shanghai youths for service at sea. At least in those days they received pay while training. The Fraser move also tends to obscure the fact that his Government's policy failed, leaving us not only with extremely limited employment for young people but also so few jobs for experts, experienced trained personnel. Will Captain Hornblower Fraser heed the electoral warning against his chartered course, or will he head boldly on to the political rocks in 1980?

They have many other ways, of course, of taking away an unemployed worker's dole payments. One is quite arbitrary—the department can decide whether a person can be taken off unemployment benefits for 12 weeks for having left a job if the department or the Government thought that he should not have already left. The Government also expects, as normal practice, for people to travel for 15 hours a week to and from work. That is three hours a day. It means, in effect, that if I were unemployed and lived at Rostrevor, and there was a job as a labourer at the Port Wakefield council, I would have to accept it and travel those three hours a day, or my dole payments would be taken away from me. There is no doubt that, as a result of this new practice, it is the intention of the Government not only to continue to create policies that will not create jobs but will create a situation where an unemployed worker will find it very difficult to receive a mere pittance or dole money which, incidentally, has not been increased since 1974.

It means, in effect, that, as a result of inflation and consumer price index increases, these people on the dole are already below the poverty line.

It was interesting to read the *Weekend Australian*. It had a very good editorial on the young unemployed and suggested that young people deserved a break. It also believed that they would not get it under the Fraser Government and the Tonkin State Government.

It was also interesting to read in the *Weekend Australian* of 21 October on the front page, "P.M. told to spend on new jobs". State Liberal Party Leaders have told the Federal Government to increase its funds for capital works to ease the growing unemployment problem throughout Australia. They informed the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser) and other Government Ministers on Friday that they needed more money for schools, hospitals and development projects to provide an immediate increase in jobs. The Liberal Party Leaders said they could quickly implement labour-intensive programmes if the Federal Government provided the necessary funds.

It is a pity. I do not know whether Mr. Tonkin was at this meeting, but it certainly is not what he was saying during the recent election campaign.

In conclusion, I will refer, because the Government and its colleagues in Canberra unceasingly refer to British trade unions and the British "disease", to a report in *Australia Ripped Off* at page 56, under the heading "Why British workers are in revolt"; it states:

Since 1974 the British Labour Government has been pursuing "responsible", "sound", "stable" economic management.

The wage "restraint" and tax policies of this social democrat Government has produced the following results.

- The share of total wealth owned by the wealthiest 1 per cent of the population rose from 22.5 per cent in 1974 to 25 per cent in 1976 (latest available figures).
- The share of total wealth owned by the wealthiest 10 per cent rose from 57.5 per cent to 60.6 per cent.
- At the same time the bottom 50 per cent who in 1974 shared a generous 7.1 per cent of total wealth had their greedy hands smacked and their share cut to 5.6 per cent.
- The fast growth rate in consumption of baked beans and other cheap filling foods has been matched by the growth rate in French champagne and the waiting list on luxury cars.

According to a report from London published in the 26 February edition of the *Financial Review* the Callaghan Labour Government is known as "the workers' Party which works wonders for the business sector".

Five years of wage restraint have lowered the living standards of the majority and broken their patience. They are getting stuck into it now with strikes for pay rises rolling through practically every industry.

Four years of the Fraser Government have made the distribution of wealth in Australia much more unequal.

We will not know by precisely how much.

The planned survey of wealth distribution by the Australian Bureau of Statistics has been cancelled.

Why should Australian workers accept another year of wage restraint? It is simply a process which increases inequality and lowers the living standards of the majority.

When winding up—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The man of honour on the back bench agrees. An article on page 44 of the White House Conference Papers should interest him. It states:

Big business in the United States is getting so panicky about the "naked exposure" of their operations that one chairman of a multi-national corporation earnestly warned all those at a White House Conference in 1972 that:

'The kind of social structure we will have in 1990 depends on good measure upon our ability between now and then to re-define capitalism in a manner which is believed'. (Source: White House Conference Papers 1972. The Corporation in the 1990's).

It would be wrong of me not to reply to the speakers on the other side who attacked Mr. George Apap of the Storeman and Packers Union. He has been the Secretary of that union for many years. I realise that nothing I say will help Mr. Apap's position. I speak as a person who has known him well and has worked with him. The things said about him were malicious lies. Reference was made to his nationality throughout the campaign, and the many unfair comments cost him a lot of votes in that election. George Apap came from Malta a number of years ago and became the Secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union. At that time it was at a low ebb; the workers had poor conditions and awards. George Apap, by his left-wing approach to unionism, was able to improve their working conditions and increase membership without compulsory unionism. Those who know George Apap are 100 per cent devoted to him. He was maligned because he came from another country. Mick Young appeared on television (he was not asked by the A.L.P. to do that) at the request of the managers of the various channels. He stated that he had been involved in many political campaigns and that none had been as bad as the one against George Apap, not against the Labor Party. He said that it was the most malicious and underhand campaign that he had ever witnessed in his lifetime. It has been a short life, but with a

wealth of experience. Mr. Young's comments have been reported elsewhere and substantiated.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did you say Mr. Apap was a left-wing radical?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I said that with his left-wing policy, he was able to maintain high membership in his union. He increased awards, and that is what the workers want. One cannot get wages from an employer by sitting down and having a cup of tea with him. The money is there to be got, and it depends on who is the best fighter. He has proved to be a good fighter, and he would have proved to be a good member.

I know that he comes from Malta, and industry regards him as being as solid as a rock. I went to a Maltese ball last year, and the people there were strong-willed and of good character. George is very close to that community and well respected within that community. Members opposite continue to refer by name to left-wing members selected by A.L.P. As the people do not know Mr. Apap, they tend to believe the terrible things that members opposite say about him and other A.L.P. members. Thirty years ago when I worked in industry they used to call me "Red Prince" and "Red Jim". I have never been in the Communist Party, but at one time I started to wonder what it would be like. However, I found it was not for me.

I saw examples of harsh conditions, people eating smelly meat and living in appalling conditions. I decided to fight that without being in the Communist Party, and I joined the A.L.P. Because of the results I achieved I was branded by the employers and stooges in this Parliament—the Liberal members—as being a communist. People like Mr. Chapman, the Minister of Agriculture, referred to me as everything from a communist down to an arrogant militant animal. I have always answered when people have said that I was left wing, and I have not denied it. I looked in the Webster dictionary for the meaning of the word "radical". It said that "radical" was a term used in politics to mean one who favours basic and rapid change in the organisation of society. If the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had been in the Chamber and heard my contribution today, he would agree that we need rapid basic changes in our society and we need a Labor Government, both State and Federal, to do that.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Labor Party is not too radical.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: That could be the reason that we did not win the election: we are not radical enough. The Liberal Party is now trying to lift price control. The Hon. Mr. Hill has talked about the housing industry and the cost of it in South Australia. One will find that in this State the difference between our bricks and those in Victoria is \$40 per thousand. If price control is lifted, manufacturers like P.G.H., Hallett Bricks and other big manufacturers will put that extra \$40 a thousand for bricks into their kick.

The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw will benefit through controls being lifted in connection with the price of aggregate, used in road construction. The price has been \$4 a ton here, but \$7.50 a ton in Victoria. By how much will they put up the price of bituminising our roads? This Liberal Party is controlled, lock, stock and barrel, by the employers and the capitalist class in this State. If they do this to the housing industry and to the bituminising of roads, they will be voted out very vigorously by the public in 3½ years time—if they go that long—at the next election.

I appreciate, Mr. Acting President, the way you have indulged me and treated me in this debate. I apologise for the terrible things I have said about you, and I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It gives me great pleasure

to stand up and speak from the appropriate side of the Council for the Liberal Party. There are several members on the other side that look much better on that side although, I leave one of the new members out of that. I congratulate the Governor on what was the best speech that I have heard since coming into this Parliament. For nine years I have never heard the likes of it. We have had to listen to the usual diatribe that has come out after each election. I listened to the Hon. Mr. Blevins and thought he was being quite frank and open—

The Hon. Anne Levy: He is always Frank.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is so. He said that they lost the election because it had been called early. That was a good start and I thought that the honourable member was going well. Unfortunately, he quickly slipped into the usual trap of blaming everyone else but his Party. The honourable member had a minute of sanity but then went mad on it.

The real reason for calling the election was that the Labor Party thought that it was going to gain control of the Council. Although the Labor Party will not say that, and indeed although it did not say this during the election campaign because it was not game to do so, it is the truth. The Liberals therefore have to say it for them. Indeed, members of the Labor Party have not been game to admit this even since the election. Although the Labor Party had good control of the Lower House, it wanted absolute control so that it could run this State to suit itself. However, the people woke up. I remember just before the election was called seeing the Hon. Mr. Dunford sitting opposite me during a Select Committee hearing, smiling smugly in the knowledge that an election was to be called. However, that smile has since been wiped off his face. I give credit to the people of South Australia for realising that the Labor Party was merely trying to make a grab for absolute power.

I have listened with some interest to the various Opposition speakers who have asked when the Liberal Government would honour the promises that it made during the election campaign. Although the Government has been in office for a mere four weeks, Labor members have the audacity to ask the Government when it will honour its promises.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You've been breaking them for four weeks.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It ill behoves Opposition members to look back at what has happened over the past 10 years. We have been waiting that long for many things to happen in this State. It is important to remind members opposite why the people of South Australia did not believe the Labor Party this time and why it lost its credibility. This is why the Labor Party was rejected in a manner in which no other political Party has been rejected in this State's history.

I refer, first, to the prime example of Monarto. Looking back through the documents associated with Monarto is like reading a Hans Christian Andersen fairy tale. Monarto was started initially because the then Labor Government decided that it did not have an election issue. So, it said, "Let us build another city. What a good idea." We heard the announcement that we were to have a brand new city in South Australia and that it would house 200 000 people. On 17 November 1972 the then Premier took a bus load of journalists and other people to the Monarto site. I must admit that that Premier had great style. He used to promote these shows like an entrepreneur projects some new show at the Festival Theatre. We have everything, right down to the \$800 000 000 cost of the thing. However, the name of the new city was not released at that time: there was to be a

special announcement in that respect.

Thereafter, this matter was rehashed at every election, and announcement after announcement was made regarding it. We even had announcements regarding the type of gardens that were to be designed for the city. They were principally to be dry-land gardens, the principal plant being cactus. This was because it was a totally unacceptable environment for normal gardening techniques. That is perhaps a reason why we should not have had it in the first place. In fact, someone from the Federal Government who came here thought that the whole scheme was a curious one. It would have needed more water than any other city, and air-conditioning to a scale never heard of in Adelaide would have been required for cooling in summer and heating in winter.

To top it all off, Government departments were to be moved wholesale, and public servants were to be told where they had to live. This was to involve whole Government departments, and the Premier said then that he did not give a damn about the public servants. If they did not want to continue in their jobs, they could get out of their departments. That was the most extraordinary outburst that I have heard from a Premier.

We now have a Monarto of a sort, something to which I will refer in later debates. We have a piece of land that is no longer farmed successfully. It has many trees on it and, when one enters and leaves the area on one's way to Murray Bridge, one sees signs stating that one is entering and leaving the boundaries of the proposed new city. However, there is nothing in between, except for a few new trees that have been planted.

Despite all this, the State has built up an enormous debt of \$28 312 000 in relation to Monarto, the land at which is valued at \$10 388 000. However, as honourable members who have been in this place for a while would know, the previous Government indicated that the resale value of the land is about \$6 800 000. So, we have a block of land which we do not need, which will never be used as a city, on which we owe up to \$28 000 000, and for which, if we try to sell it, we would get \$6 800 000. The following statement regarding Monarto appears in this year's Auditor-General's Report:

The land presently held by the Commission would not be expected to realise the amount shown in the balance sheet if sold for purposes other than urban use.

It is fairly obvious that, if the land is to be sold, it will not be sold for urban use, as there is no such use for it.

We also have the Land Commission, which now has debts totalling \$88 000 000. It has enormous tracts of land around Adelaide that it cannot get rid of. This year, the commission's total sales were \$200 000 more than the interest bill.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What about F.C.A.?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will come to that. I thank the honourable member for raising that matter.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I try to help.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I raise a point that was raised by Mr. Duncan, the former Labor Attorney-General. He received front-page treatment in an *Advertiser* report for calling a group of directors incompetent nincompoops. I lay that charge against the former Government, because it has got the taxpayers into the same sort of situation with the Land Commission. At least the shareholders in F.C.A. and the other people who invested in the Bank of Adelaide had a choice. However, in this case, the South Australian taxpayers had no choice. Their funds have been put into the scheme, which now has a total debt of \$88 000 000. One would be interested to know what would be the total value of the Land Commission's holdings on a clearance sale basis.

We have more land than we can ever need, yet it has been taken from people by compulsory acquisition. The former Government built up an enormous debt that can only increase over the years. It has not even been paying the interest. The capitalised interest is now \$20 000 000. At this rate it will not be long before the total interest is greater than the original amount borrowed. It is the most incredible piece of accounting that I have ever come across. Mr. Duncan was the last person to have accused a group of directors as being incompetent nincompoops. Fools must have been involved in getting the taxpayers into this situation.

I now refer to other issues, because it is important to go through a few of the matters from the past in order to remind the Labor Party why it failed to convince the people of South Australia that it was a Government worthy of support. First, I refer to an item that cost the taxpayer a considerable sum—dial-a-bus. I hesitate to raise matters from the past, but they were items on which a Government was elected. One of the major issues in one election was that the Government was going to introduce dial-a-bus. Obviously, Mr. Virgo had the most vivid imagination of any Minister in the former Government, and his statements must be listed for posterity. In the *Advertiser* of 30 January 1971 Mr. Virgo stated:

Adelaide could be one of the first cities in the world to develop viable alternatives to the over-use of the private car in the city.

In the *Advertiser* of 24 March 1973 he stated:

The world's biggest dial-a-bus system would begin operating in Adelaide in June.

The words "biggest dial-a-bus system"—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The world's biggest?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, it is stated clearly in headlines across the *Advertiser*. It was just at a time coming close to an election. This was an election promise. True, it did something: dial-a-bus lasted one day and then disappeared. We were told during that election campaign that dial-a-bus would be the answer to all our problems, that we would have dial-a-bus. It was claimed to be the world's biggest system. Perhaps it was because there was no other dial-a-bus system; so, it was a logical claim. Another report states:

South Australia may get hovertrain.

Another big announcement by Mr. Virgo. At that stage Mr. Virgo was in England, having a flight of fancy. The report continues:

Moves to introduce a 300 m.p.h. hovertrain transport system to South Australia were initiated in London this week by the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo).

It obviously travelled so rapidly that it has not appeared. This is just another matter in the long list promised in the past.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It was not even established in Britain in the end.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I doubt that anyone ever really took it seriously. In May 1977 regarding the broken promise about dial-a-bus the following statement was made:

The State Government itself never promised a dial-a-bus service.

In spite of Mr. Virgo's announcement, that was four years later and I suppose that the Minister's memory had become faulty. Again, getting close to an election (in fact, right in the middle of the campaign), Mr. Virgo had a photograph in the *News* showing himself pointing out the potential redevelopment at the Adelaide Railway Station, and the report of 15 April 1974 states:

State Cabinet has given the go-ahead for architects to draw up plans for the complete redevelopment of the Adelaide

Railway Station site. The project, estimated to cost between \$70 000 000 and \$80 000 000, would extend from the old Legislative Council Building near Parliament House to Morphett Street, and from North Terrace to the River Torrens.

The plans envisage:

- A modern administration building for the railways.
- An international standard hotel.
- A large stadium with seating capacity for 8 000.
- Buildings for the State Transport Authority.
- Commercial development, including office accommodation.
- Restaurants and bistros.
- Retail and service shops.
- Residential developments, such as flats.

Details were released by the Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo, at a press conference today.

All the press was gathered to hear the announcement in the middle of an election campaign.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You put the international hotel—

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: We will get to that. I have been down to the railway station a number of times and have yet to see the development promised in the 1974 election campaign. In 1975 Mr. Dunstan followed that promise up with the same announcement. True, it was a little later, but it was in another election, and his policy speech states:

A modern administration building for the State Transport Authority, an international hotel, restaurants shops and an 8 000 seat stadium would be built on the railway station site. That was the second time around, and still we were not seeing any moves. We never heard any more about that project. Thank goodness it was given away. Once again in 1975, when we were getting close to an election, the Government had made the same statement.

I now refer to an item reported on 28 July 1973, when Mr. Virgo announced that we were going to get double-decker high-speed electric trains for the Adelaide to Christie Downs railway line by 1975. That was a bit of a boo-boo because, when he got home and told his staff, it was found that that equipment would not fit under any of the bridges. That was a minor point. We would have had to rebuild every bridge between Adelaide Station and Christie Downs. Reference was made to a \$22 700 000 project to upgrade the service. The report stated:

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday the trains would be capable of 70 m.p.h. and might be air-conditioned.

I would be happy if they were doing 70 miles an hour. It would not matter whether or not they were air-conditioned. There was no suggestion that they might not come. The statement continues:

With their fast acceleration and braking, they would reduce the Christie Downs trip to Adelaide to 40 minutes—faster and safer than people could expect to travel by road.

The new trains would be quieter, cleaner and cheaper to run than the present diesel cars.

Power would be delivered through arched gantries to avoid the complications of an electrified third rail system . . .

It then went into details about what would be built at Islington, yet again nothing appeared. In the *Advertiser* of 2 June 1973 Mr. Virgo announced that he hoped to have the Christie Downs extension electrified by 1975. I do not know whether that has occurred, but I certainly have not seen it. I do not believe that the Government at that stage intended to have it. Mr. Virgo gave further details of the double-decker trains and stated that they would have 36 cars, 18 power units and 18 trailers operating by the

middle of 1977. On 9 September 1973 Mr. Virgo stated:

Almost certain electrification of the Adelaide-Elizabeth rail line was announced yesterday by the Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo. Mr. Virgo said, "This would follow electrification of the Adelaide-Christie Downs line."

I suppose that did not go ahead because the other one did not go ahead; in other words, you do not do one without the other. In the *Advertiser* of 11 March 1974, Mr. Virgo was reported as saying:

Electrification of Adelaide's metropolitan rail system, at a cost of about \$15 000 000, could be completed within seven years. Work on the three metropolitan lines—Port Adelaide, Gawler and the Adelaide Hills—would begin soon after the \$15 000 000 electric railway between Adelaide and Christie Downs was completed.

I now turn to the 1973 A.L.P. election policy speech which, in part, referred to an Aboriginal cultural centre, as follows:

Tourist attractions: To our growing list of these, we will add an Aborigines' cultural centre near Wellington on the Murray. It will contain Australia's greatest collection of Aboriginal history and culture.

I do not know whether any members have been through Wellington lately, but I go through there quite frequently and I assure honourable members that nothing of that magnitude has ever occurred there and, again, it just happened to be a fluke that this project was announced in the middle of an election campaign! That Government was in office for six years after that announcement, and nothing has been done in that time about that particular promise.

Many member will also recall the great announcement about A.C.T.U. housing. The Federal A.C.T.U. President, Mr. Hawke, was flown to South Australia to assist with this part of the 1973 policy speech, which stated:

We will over a period make up to 300 acres of land in the Noarlunga area available to the Australian Council of Trade Unions to use for low-cost worker housing.

I believe that the project just never occurred and, once again, it was simply an item used to put over the people of South Australia at that time. The 1973 policy speech was a good one! It appears that nothing was done about any of the promises made. That policy speech continued:

We will establish an Environmental Research Institute. This multi-discipline body will provide environmental advice and research for Governments and industry.

I do not know where it is located, but I would be interested to find out because I do not believe that that was established, either. This policy speech was well constructed and was lacking only in the fact that none of the promises was able to be carried out! The 1973 A.L.P. Policy speech continues:

One major new project will be the immediate commencement of a scheme to provide prefabricated rental housing of high standard in park settings. This will occur on transport-corridor land not required for 15 years—in addition to lessen transport costs and to provide greater choice in low-cost housing.

Once again, I do not believe that that was carried out.

The policy speech delivered on 4 July 1975 referred to arts development. This is important because the new Liberal Government has been criticised for not building a new museum in the two months it has been in office. The section of the policy speech on arts development states:

South Australia's new museum building will be erected on the site of the existing bus depot at Hackney.

The only museum of any type that I have seen at that site is the old buses, and I have certainly not seen a new Museum building. The policy speech continues:

This was announced today by the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, in a statement of Government policy on the arts. The Art

Gallery will expand to take over the building immediately west of it, now housing the Museum and part of the Library. The area at the rear of that building will be converted to a sculpture court. The historic Police Barracks building will be restored.

That was four years ago, and I may be wrong, but I do not believe anything of that type has occurred. I believe that it was reannounced during the last election, but people's memories are not that bad. The people of South Australia probably remembered that that had been promised previously and realised that the Labor Government had failed to perform on many other occasions. In the *Advertiser* of 24 October 1973 an article appeared as follows:

Mr. Dunstan announced last night that work on the Redcliff petro-chemical plant was due to start in April. That was in 1973, and Mr. Bannon is still trying to announce it at this time, even though he is not in Government. The Labor Party had six years to perform, but did not perform at all.

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: It must have been blocked in the Upper House.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I can assure you that it was not. Nothing was blocked in the Upper House. We simply did not see anything, although we kept waiting and waiting and heard announcement after announcement. During the first few days of the last election campaign, Mr. Hudson reannounced Redcliff and the roars of laughter from the populace had to be heard to be believed. By a coincidence that particular announcement occurred on the brink of another election.

I could go through the A.L.P. policy speeches year by year, because we almost had an election each year, just in case things started to fall a little. The Labor Government kept announcing that it would have done these things but that it did not have a full three-year term to do them, so it would complete them after the next election. So it went on and on, time after time. The former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, was also referred to in that article of 24 October 1973 as follows:

He said he expected the indenture to build Redcliffs to be signed and ratified by Parliament this session. That was in 1973. Something must have gone wrong, because we have not seen it as yet. The article continues by quoting Mr. Dunstan as follows:

I believe that both of these matters can now be resolved rapidly and that we will be able before Parliament rises to sign an indenture which can be examined by Parliament during this session.

Those announcements on Redcliff went on and on and extended from 1971, when the first announcement was made on the bottom of some supposed letters of intent. Those supposed letters of intent led to a neat con trick, which started in April 1973 and continued up until 1979 when we were still receiving little announcements about it.

I know that the new Government will not carry on with that sort of nonsense. In the *Advertiser* of 18 May 1973, referring to the tourist industry, a report states:

A \$3 000 000 tourist development is planned to promote the Wallaroo area of Yorke Peninsula as the "Copper Coast" of Australia. Although final details of the plan have yet to be worked out, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) described it last night as a "very significant development". A planned foreshore complex will also mean the improvement of the old copper-mining town and surrounding districts, and will make Wallaroo the tourist centre for Yorke Peninsula and surrounding areas. The development is planned to include a hotel-motel complex, holiday shacks and homes, a golf course and a boat haven.

We have not heard any more about that. Fortunately, that

particular project was not brought up during another election campaign, because that seat was no longer vital to the Government, which shifted its attention to Mount Gambier and other places to try to put it over different people. People in the South-East are not stupid, as the Hon. Mr. Cornwall knows, and he should have advised his Party to that effect. People in the South-East cannot be bought.

The Labor Party's policy on uranium enrichment is worth noting, because we are hearing such a lot about it at this time and about how the Labor Party is so opposed to it. On 24 October 1974 Mr. Dunstan said:

We will press for the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. There is some concern about being able to supply enough water.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: There was no concern about their not being able to supply uranium.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No concern whatever. In the *News* on 4 November 1974, Mr. Hopgood said:

Talks between the Prime Minister Mr. Whitlam and the Japanese Prime Minister are believed to have enhanced the State's chances of getting the project. State Mines Minister Mr. Hopgood said today he was more confident than ever that South Australia would get the massive plant.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No concern whatever. An announcement in the *News* of 13 May 1974 stated:

Mr. Connor announced a feasibility study into the possible establishment of a major uranium enrichment plant in the Northern Spencer Gulf region of South Australia.

Again in the *News*, of 27 September 1974, a release stated:

The Premier Mr. Dunstan said today that he did not think the Federal Government's decision to establish a uranium smelting plant in the N.T. would rule out the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant being built in South Australia.

A release in the *Advertiser* of 17 October 1974 stated:

The Premier said yesterday that overseas interests had been told they could achieve significant economies in establishing a plant in South Australia.

A release in the *Advertiser* of 5 November 1974 stated:

Mr. Hopgood, Minister of Mines and Development: "Mr. Connor is awfully keen on letting us have Redcliff as well. He has made that pretty clear to most people I have talked to."

He was keen on our getting a uranium enrichment plant. The *Australian* of 31 March 1977 contained the following release:

His Government had a moral duty to mankind to ensure that it did not create a monster by providing uranium to customer countries.

Mr. Dunstan had obviously changed his mind. Is it any wonder that the people of this State were in doubt about the credibility of the Government going west because of its previous total commitment to this project, and later changing its mind? It thought that it was smart politics to withdraw from its original commitment. In his 1975 policy speech, Mr. Dunstan said:

In addition, on a three-acre site at a corner of Wakefield and Frome Streets, the Government is pursuing plans for a neighbourhood centre, part of which will contain an alternative theatre complex for use by community organisations as well as some commercial buildings.

Another report at about that time, referring to a statement by Mr. Dunstan, is as follows:

The Government would plan a neighbourhood centre on a three-acre site on a corner of Wakefield and Frome Street.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: A great idea.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It would have been had it occurred. Regarding the Windy Point restaurant and tourist development (again, in an election speech in 1973), a release stated:

The restaurant at Windy Point should be able to provide a

first-class restaurant of gourmet standard and a larger area which can be used for general catering purposes, cabarets and the like. Within this there should be provision for a smorgasbord service at lunch time. There could be a terrace for people to eat in the open air, having either got food from the smorgasbord or from a barbecue area on the terrace, and ideally there should also be a swimming pool and changing rooms.

If anyone has been up at Windy Point lately, he would have a job finding that set-up.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: There are plenty of bottles and cans up there.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, there are, and the honourable member had better ask Dr. Cornwall about that matter. It would be a case of back to nature, because you would have to take your own sandwiches and, if someone stripped off his shirt to have a swim, there is nowhere to swim, because there is nothing there. A release in the *Advertiser* of 1 February 1973 stated:

Such Government-backed projects as the Adelaide Festival Hall, Edmund Wright House, Ayers House and the Windy Point restaurant were nearing fruition.

In the works programme of that year, \$40 000 was set aside to begin construction of a first-class 100-seat restaurant at Windy Point. A barbecue, snack bar and kiosk area would seat 200 in a completely enclosed area and 100 in a partly-enclosed extension.

That did not occur, despite its being in a Government document in the House.

The Hon. Anne Levy: How much more have you got?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I want to bring to the attention of the Opposition the complete hypocrisy of its members saying to the Government, "Why haven't you kept your promises?"

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: When did you write all that?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: When I was in opposition. The international hotel in Victoria Square was the daddy of them all. About 23 announcements were made on this project, starting in 1970. There has been no announcement from this Government. Whenever Mr. Dunstan ran out of things to talk about, he used to announce this project once again. Every time a visitor arrived from Hong Kong, Malaysia, or elsewhere, he was given a free meal and hospitality, provided he said that he was interested in an international hotel. An announcement would be made in the press about the visitor's being here and saying that he was going to invest in an international hotel. It made for a good story.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He was going to have Japanese-style rooms.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is right, and the hotel would attract Japanese visitors. It would have Japanese waiters and waitresses, not local employees.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Would they have been forced to join a union?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, probably. I know that I have embarrassed the Opposition. It has now reached the stage where it is ashamed of having stayed in Government so long. It put it over the people of South Australia for so long. Opposition members have the audacity to complain about the press in this State but, if ever a Party had a dream run from the press, it is the Labor Party, which used to put it over the press. Their dream boat Premier used to make these magnificent announcements, well orchestrated by everyone, and the press would publish them. These projects were announced time after time, and the press used to accept every Government statement.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Are you saying that Adelaide journalists are stupid?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No, but they were lazy. They were prepared to accept handouts, but they were not willing to research these matters. When we used to point out that it had all been said previously, the press reporters would say that it was a good story.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They woke up in the end.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. Listen to the Opposition screaming now. Members opposite do not like the press waking up to the fact that the then Government had put it over them. They were not prepared to accept handouts any longer. The loss of the Labor Party's front man was crucial to the former Government. I recall warning the Hon. Mr. Foster, I think it was, at the time that the Labor Party consisted of a personality cult. The danger was that, if the front man disappeared, the Party would collapse. The Party was based on a personality cult and, when that grand man disappeared, nothing was left. The personality cult does not work. Eventually, it catches up, but the Labor Party did not expect it to happen quite so soon. It did not expect its dream boat Premier to depart the scene quite so soon. The Party was left with nothing at all.

Frankly, I was amazed when they called an early election, because surely they should have got the message from the Norwood by-election. There was a terrific swing against them, in fact, one that almost lost them the seat and they should have realised that, because of the personality cult, this potential swing was possible all over South Australia. There had been no Labor Party up until then: everything was Dunstan, Dunstan, Dunstan. When the electoral cards went out, candidates did not get their picture on them: it was always the Premier's picture. It was beyond belief. The former Government got exactly what it deserved for wasting a Government on one person and for prostituting what was a very good Party with a personality cult. I hope that they will learn a lesson and that, when they get back into Government some time 30 years or more hence, they will not make the same mistake but will set about rebuilding a true political party called the Australian Labor Party and not a personality-based cult. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: As the penultimate speaker in this debate, I should like to add my welcome to the new members as has been uttered by other speakers. I extend a warm welcome to the Hons. Gordon Bruce, Barbara Wiese, Bob Ritson and Lance Milne. I hope that they will enjoy the new adventure of Parliament as we oldies appreciate new faces. I should also like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your re-election, and I hope you will continue your tradition of fair and unbiased calling to order of all members of the House when required.

This mention of the word tradition recalls the speech made yesterday by the Hon. Lance Milne who praised the concept of tradition and quoted the phrase, "Don't stop it because you can't start it." I am afraid that I disagree with the Hon. Mr. Milne in this regard. Habits and customs should not be continued merely because they are traditional; equally they should not be dropped merely because they are traditional. Habits and customs should be looked at coolly and rationally and, if they serve a valuable purpose on balance, let us maintain the tradition. But, if not, let us scrap them and not let sentimentality blind us to pointless and perhaps harmful tradition. There are many traditions associated with Parliament which should be thought about carefully and perhaps abolished.

I notice the Governor's Speech when opening Parliament this session did not contain the weather report and the state of the crops statement which is found in the

Governor's Speech of all previous Liberal Governments in this State. When the Labor Government omitted the weather report from the Governor's Speech in 1977 there was an outcry from members opposite, who complained that the traditions of the Governor's Speeches were being broken. No harm came from that omission, either in 1977 or now. I am glad that even the Liberals agree that it was a pointless tradition which there was no sense in continuing.

There are other traditions we could look at with profit. Mr. President wears a thick gown in both winter and summer which means he needs a low temperature in the Chamber, even in the middle of summer, for his own personal comfort. If this tradition could change and he wore a light gown or even (dare I say it?) no gown in summer, less air-conditioning would be required in this Chamber for his comfort. Less energy would be wasted in cooling the Chamber to what I consider an unnecessary extent, and those of us who dress according to the external ambient temperature would not spend all summer shivering in this Chamber. In these days of concern over energy conservation, Parliament should set an example and not use energy unnecessarily for cooling this place in such a wasteful manner.

We also have the tradition whereby any member who crosses from one side of the Chamber to the other during the course of a debate much acknowledge the President as he or she does so. I am not speaking of acknowledging the President when entering or leaving the Chamber, which can be regarded as normal courtesy to the Parliament and to the individual. However, to acknowledge the President when walking to the other side seems to be unnecessary and a bit odd. Perhaps regular churchgoers may find it natural as they acknowledge the altar in the same way when in church but even they would presumably not attribute God-like or Christ-like proprieties to the President of a secular chamber. I mean no disrespect to the Chair in this connection, and I will quite agree that it is a harmless tradition which is not a great effort to uphold. However, I cannot see the point of it and so question it here today.

Other speakers in this debate have spoken extensively about the recent election so I shall not take up further time in doing so except to add one comment. Others have commented on the campaign of misleading advertisements, particularly those from other than the Liberal Party, or officially from other than the Liberal Party. Amongst these advertisements free use was made of photos and names of individuals, particularly that of Mr. Duncan. One advertisement even made free use of my photo and name and was authorised by a Mrs. Mary Kennedy from St. Georges, wife of Dr. Desmond Kennedy, a physician who practises on South Terrace. I have never met Mrs. Kennedy and certainly did not supply her with a copy of a photo of myself. I do not know where she obtained that photo; it certainly did not come from the files of the *Advertiser*, as I checked myself. I suppose that I should be flattered that such an old photo of me was used. However, the whole episode made me think of the report from the A.L.R.C. in 1979. Their report on "unfair publications, defamation and privacy" was tabled in Federal Parliament in June this year. A commentary on this report, in "Reform", states:

The commission, instead of simply dealing with defamation, has advanced many novel new legal ideas. One is that remedies should be provided by the law in the case of a new concept called "unfair publication". Cases of "unfair publication" include:

- defamatory publications;
- publications which unfairly invade personal privacy;

publications which appropriate a person's name, identity or likeness.

It is this third category of which I am now speaking. The aim of this report is to produce a uniform defamation code throughout Australia. If the States and Commonwealth ever agree to adopt such a code I guess I, among others, would be protected on future occasions from misleading advertisements of this nature.

During the election campaign the Liberal Party made great play of cutting out waste and extravagance, should it win Government. There are a few matters, however, where lack of action on its part may well result in waste and extravagance unless it continues with measures begun by the A.L.P.

In this context, I refer particularly to the time and effort that has been expended by the Select Committee on Prostitution set up in another place 15 months ago. This Select Committee has worked very long and hard, and has conducted the most thorough investigation ever undertaken into prostitution in this State. I understand that it met about 35 times, that it has interviewed over 50 witnesses, and that it has received and absorbed about 40 written submissions. Not only have the members of the committee worked extremely hard but also a wide cross-section of the community has obviously put much time and effort into writing submissions and presenting evidence.

It would indeed be a great waste if nothing was to come of this work, and I hope that the Government can find some way of reconstituting this Select Committee and enabling it to present its report. I understand that its report was all but completed, and that one more meeting of the Select Committee would have enabled final agreement to be reached on its recommendations.

I realise also that only four of the committee's seven members are still members of Parliament but, if the report was so near to being completed, perhaps the committee could be reconstituted with only those four members, who, hopefully, could bring in a unanimous report. To add other members would impose a tremendous burden on the new members of the committee, who would have the task of reading the mountain of evidence before taking part in one final meeting.

To start all over again would be wasteful in the extreme not only of money but also of the goodwill and effort put in and time spent by the many witnesses concerned with this matter. I sincerely hope that the Government will give serious and sympathetic consideration to this matter and find a solution through the maze of Parliamentary practice and procedure, and even of tradition, so that this work can bear fruit and result in a deeply considered report to this Parliament.

On the topic of prostitution, I am not of course privy to the substance of the report being prepared by the Select Committee. However, members present may be interested in the policy on prostitution adopted by the Council for Civil Liberties only last week, as follows:

We regard the *de facto* criminalisation of prostitution as an undesirable use of the criminal law. We believe that the criminal law in the area of sexual behaviour should confine itself to the prohibition of assaults, protection of minors and the prevention of substantial public nuisance.

I am sure we all know that there is no offence *per se* of committing prostitution, but the various offences in the Police Offences Act and the criminal code of soliciting, brothel-keeping and living off the earnings of prostitution mean that in practice it is virtually impossible for a prostitute to pursue his or her profession without running foul of the law. Whether or not this situation should be changed has been a matter for consideration by the Select Committee. I am sure that it has looked carefully at the

questions of exploitation of minors and other people, the spread of venereal disease, connections of prostitution with organised crime and the drug scene, and the prevention of offensive behaviour and public nuisance.

Regarding the possible connection of prostitution and venereal disease, I consider it worth quoting a part of the report of the 1977 Royal Commission on Human Relationships, as follows:

Prostitution is often believed to be a major contributor to the spread of venereal disease. A survey of 10 countries done under the auspices of the United Nations in 1958 showed that "the prostitute had ceased to be a major factor in the spread of venereal disease".

I refer also to another comment by Mr. Paul Wilson of the University of Queensland which I think is also relevant. In his book, Mr. Wilson states:

The spread of venereal disease has also been attributed, at least in part, to prostitution. Though unsupervised prostitution can increase the number afflicted, it is carelessness allied with promiscuity which is the real offender in the spread of this disease, and the prostitute is probably more careful than the promiscuous amateur.

One aspect of the law on prostitution to which I have long objected is the section of the Police Offences Act which makes it a crime to live off the earnings of prostitution. Provided that no violence or intimidation is involved (and I stress that proviso very strongly), I cannot see why a prostitute cannot support whoever he or she wishes with his or her earnings.

A woman who works in a shop or factory earns a wage and can support a husband and family with no fear of legal consequences. With increasing unemployment and marriage breakdowns, an increasing number of women are the sole breadwinners for their families. I cannot see why a woman who earns her living by, say, prostitution cannot also support her family with her earnings, without fear of the law.

If prostitution *per se* is not illegal, but merely immoral in the eyes of many people, why on earth should living off the proceeds of prostitution be illegal? This seems to be completely illogical and irrational, a confusion of immorality and illegality, and reflecting nineteenth century notions of the man as the sole breadwinner in a family. That any man could be supported by a woman, however she earned her money, was, of course, an insult to his manhood and to society in bygone days, when such laws were first framed. I suggest that, although such laws tell us a great deal about Victorian attitudes to sex and women, they serve no useful purpose today. I hope that the Select Committee's report, if it ever appears, will recommend abolition of this outdated provision of the law. I would certainly support such a measure.

Regarding other laws concerning prostitution, I consider that the general approach of the Council for Civil Liberties has much to recommend it. Consenting sexual intercourse (and I stress "consenting") between two adults is not illegal, however immoral it may be to some people in certain situations. I cannot see why the exchange of money associated with consenting sexual intercourse between two adults should be an illegal act, particularly in a society such as ours which places a high value on commercial aspects of transactions and accepts exchange of money as a normal and natural part of society.

Of course, I do not know what the Select Committee would have reported on prostitution generally. However, I hope that it will take the same view that I take. Again, I urge the Government to find a way to enable this important Select Committee to complete its thorough and extensive report and present it to Parliament so that the whole community can be aware of its carefully considered

views and recommendations.

I should like to make one final point on a different topic. It is unusual for members to have two opportunities for an Address in Reply debate in 2½ months, as normally we can expect only one such debate each year. However, many members of Parliament often have views that they wish to express in Parliament on matters that are unrelated to the Government's legislative programme, and an Address in Reply debate is at present virtually our sole opportunity to do so.

I wonder whether our Standing Orders Committee could consider introducing provisions for a periodical grievance debate, or a daily adjournment debate as occurs in another place and in many other Parliaments. I am sure that I would not be alone in welcoming the occasional chance to speak briefly on a subject of my own choice.

If two such 10-minute addresses were permitted each day we could all benefit. Presently, I have several questions on notice, and other questions without notice to which I have not yet received a reply. When I do, I may wish to express an opinion on the contents of the reply but, as no replies have yet been received, I cannot include such comments in my speech today. By next June or July such comments would be dated and probably irrelevant.

This Council does not normally have such long sitting hours that it would be an intolerable imposition to extend each day's sitting by up to half an hour. The system of a daily adjournment debate seems to work well in another place, and I am sure that we would all benefit, and the value of Parliament as an institution in our society would be enhanced if such a procedure was adopted in this Council. I urge our Standing Orders Committee very strongly to consider amending our Standing Orders accordingly. I support the motion.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

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 23 October Page 225.)

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I would like to begin my comments by noting what the Hon. Mr. Sumner said in referring to the Treasurer's statement in another place. The Hon. Mr. Sumner talked about the superficial nature of the statements contained in the Budget papers, and said how unfair it was that figures had been taken from different time periods in relation to unemployment, retail sales and the like, yet he did not produce one scrap of evidence to suggest that any of the figures were wrong; nor did he produce one scrap of evidence to show that the economic indicators, which were mentioned briefly in the Budget papers, were wrong. For the honourable member not to do that is a tacit admission of the truth of what the Government is saying.

The fact is that the South Australian economy is in bad shape. The figures on unemployment, retail sales, motor vehicle sales, the outflow of people, the level of State taxation, whatever indicators of any consequence that one examines, they all point the wrong way. The Hon. Mr. Sumner was feeble in his efforts to deny that that was the case. The Hon. Mr. Sumner referred to the figures that were used for the election campaign, and again he did not

mention once the fact that these were stated by the Liberal Party, by the employer groups and other people who were fighting the Labor Party at the election. In his introductory remarks I felt that the Hon. Mr. Sumner only underlined credence of what we had been saying about the economy—that it is going to be a long and hard road and the Treasurer's opening remarks to the Budget emphasised that point so that people do not have too high an expectation of this Government.

That has been emphasised, not only during the election campaign but in the weeks following, that one just cannot turn an economy around in a matter of months. It is not an easy task to turn around an economy that has been run down over 10 years by the previous Government. We have not pretended that we could turn it around quickly, nor should the people expect that we should be able to turn it around quickly.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You made many promises during the election campaign.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: We have honoured those, as the Hon. Mr. Sumner can see, in the Budget. The first Budget brought down by the Liberal Party Government in this State in the decade properly highlights a fundamental difference in philosophy that voters at both Federal and State level have come to recognise, namely, that the Labor Party is very long on ideas to spend taxpayers' funds but low on ability to administer adequately the efficient spending of funds, or recognise the proper priorities for spending.

The Labor Party's printing-press approach to money was perhaps best illustrated by that economic guru, Jim Cairns, who presided over double-digit inflation before deciding, perhaps quite wisely, that an alternative lifestyle was preferable and presumably less disastrous. In those days almost anyone or any group who wanted a Commonwealth grant could find a way to obtain one.

The late State Labor Government, not to be outdone, decided that an open-door money policy was the best way of writing itself into the history books, in one way or another. One can only blink bemusedly at how bad the State Budget figures would now look if the country railways had not been sold off to the Federal Labor Government in 1975 because, despite the initial injection of \$10 000 000 into our Revenue Account, and the continuing injection since then, our State taxes per capita have continued to increase rapidly and fall out of line with those of other States.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Where are we at the moment?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: We are in a position where the Liberal Party has come to the rescue. I do not wish to dwell on State taxation. I refer to the Budget papers, and the comments of the Auditor-General initially refer to the expenditure of the former Labor Government. For example, the Jam Factory Workshop received \$620 000 last year and lost \$411 000. This year it has received half of the sum involved, \$310 000, which is not to say that this Government does not have a sympathetic appreciation of culture in the arts. It emphasises a fundamental difference in philosophy: we recognise that some initiative should be shown by those people, rather than money being poured down the drain.

The Monarto Development Commission expenditure for the year involved \$1 700 000, and the State has a total indebtedness to the Commonwealth in respect of moneys borrowed for Monarto of \$13 700 000. 19 000 hectares of land at Monarto and adjoining areas is a poor second prize for the people of South Australia to accept as consolation for the stubbornness of a Government who refused to heed the advice of the Borrie Report, the State Liberal

Opposition, and even the implied dissension of the Whitlam Government.

The Frozen Food Service, according to the Auditor-General, had a deficit for the period to 24 November 1978 of \$563 103. I presume that that was from 1 July 1978 to 24 November 1978 which, on an annual basis, represents a yearly loss of about \$1 400 000. The Labor Government recognised that this food-and-mouth disease had to be cured, but not before it cost the taxpayers plenty of money.

If one conducted a poll amongst members opposite, not too many would really believe that a Government-run food factory would be more economical than a private enterprise factory. The South Australian Land Commission and the State Clothing Corporation are splendid examples of how socialism helps—it helps itself to people's taxes and ends up often hurting those people that it claims to be helping.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Have you seen the Land Commission report?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: If the honourable member has seen it, he would be aware of the factors involving the commission. If private enterprise ran like that, it would not be in business today.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: They have plenty to meet their commitments.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: They have plenty because it is Government money. If you ran private enterprise in that way you would be out of business.

This State Budget has been able to honour some Government promises made during the election campaign. I have briefly referred to some of the more obvious examples of waste by the Labor Government. By cutting back on waste and reallocating priorities, this State Budget, albeit brought down at very short notice and in difficult circumstances, has been able to honour Government promises in respect to the abolition of succession and gift duties and stamp duty on a first home. These things are incentives to individuals and underline the difference in philosophy between the two Parties. These things were not promised by the former Labor Government, but have been promised by the incumbent Liberal Government and have been honoured in this Budget.

This Budget will not only provide incentives to individuals and give them some tax relief, but it will also provide much needed confidence and will close the gate to people leaving South Australia, which is one of the things that people often overlook when assessing economic indicators. The fact that 1 734 people left the State in the 12 months ended December 1978 and that South Australia was the only State to have a net outflow, can only harm the level of business confidence and the buoyancy of real estate and retail sales. Those figures are reflected in the economic indicators.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Where do those figures come from?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Figures like that normally come from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The Hon. Mr. Sumner should be aware that those figures were quoted during the election campaign and were properly sourced. Hopefully, people will now stay in South Australia because of the tax relief given in this Budget.

Incentive to industry has also been provided through pay-roll tax exemptions with the prospect of an increase in consumer confidence, a higher level of exploration for natural resources and the recognition that the private sector had been squeezed to death by the previous Government. It is a credit to the Premier and his Cabinet that they have been able to budget for a \$2 100 000 surplus

and have also been able to honour the promises made during the election campaign.

I now turn to the general concept of budgeting and I will further elaborate on the points I made in my Address in Reply speech. Quite patently the idea of having a 12-month Budget is absurd. The continuing significant and often unexpected changes in economic trends, both nationally and internationally, mean that a nation or a State that remains inflexible in its budgeting over that period is very vulnerable. As individuals and businesses have to adjust financial plans during the year to take into account unexpected changes in income and expenditure, so, too, should Governments adopt a similar approach. The Government has stated that publicly, and it is contained in its Treasury policy document, which was prepared before the election.

Unfortunately, at the moment, the public and media commentators have come to view a Federal or State Budget as an inflexible document that sets out the economic strategy over the ensuing 12 months. This conditioned national reflex is really nonsense. Obviously, the Budget must provide a necessary base for planning, and unquestionably it is an important document. The Government should be able to review the Budget after six months, and such a review should not be seen as an admission of failure, or headlined as a "horror mini-Budget", but rather should be accepted as a sensible approach to fiscal matters and an acceptance that of the assumptions on which the Budget was based may no longer be valid.

In my Address in Reply speech I briefly referred to some of the defects that are inherent in present budgeting practice; for example, the fact that Government departments spend their full year's budget allocation, come what may, to strengthen their allocation for the next year.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How will you overcome that?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: If the honourable member listens, I will tell him. Not only did the Labor Party misjudge the mood of the electorate, but it did not bother to read the Liberal Party's proposals. If the Hon. Mr. Sumner had read them, he would not have been querying me about our proposals.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I thought you might have changed your mind, because your Party has changed its mind on so many other things.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: As the Hon. Mr. Cameron so ably pointed out, it ill behoves the Opposition to accuse the Government of changing its mind after less than two months in office, when there is a long train of disasters and broken promises over a decade of economic mismanagement under a Labor Government. Liberal Party Treasury policy, during the election, highlighted the deficiency in the present process of "line item budgeting" and the fact that it tends to result in a simplistic approach to budget planning; namely, that the existence of a line in one year will more often than not result in that line appearing in the proposed expenditure for the following year.

Although the 1979-80 Budget papers are being presented later than is normally the case, and accordingly debate on them is understandably more limited, the fact is that Parliament, in practice, has little time to scrutinise the Budget between its presentation and the ensuing debate. The Government proposals for Budget presentation, Parliamentary debate and continuing control have perhaps been obscured by the economic issues and fears which not surprisingly dominated the election campaign. However, I believe they are as significant as any other policy promise made by my Party. The Government has not put time frames on those promises because, as members of the

previous Labor Government would know, there are inherent difficulties in turning around very well established principles of budgeting and matters that involve many thousands of people. However, the Government has put forward proposals and is prepared to discuss and act on them.

First, to overcome the deficiencies of line item budgeting, the Government proposes to gradually introduce a programme of performance budgeting whereby Parliament will be told of the Government's objectives. Existing programmes will be reviewed to determine their relevance and how much each programme is costing and how well each programme is being implemented. The annual Budget, under this proposal, will not have the same meaning. Departments will have to justify expenditure in line with Government objectives and their administrative efficiencies, rather than simply opting for a percentage increase on last year's allocation. Secondly, in time, it is proposed to assist Parliament and the public to be better acquainted with the Budget. At the moment Parliament meets in Committee to consider the Budget. The Government proposes to extend the Committee consideration of the Budget and Loan Estimates over a longer period of time so that the Committee can fully consider them. Perhaps the Committee can be broken up to specialise in various areas, with Ministers, departmental heads and officers being asked to attend. No doubt honourable members are already aware that this procedure operates in the Senate.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Would that take place in this Chamber?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: That is not for me to say.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I thought you were giving us the policy of your Party, or have they not decided that yet?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: It is a policy document, not a final draft. Thirdly, Parliament and the public will be better able to keep a watching brief on expenditure through the strengthening of the Public Accounts Committee. The Government proposal is that meetings should be held in public (apart from some occasions when meetings should be held in camera) with an independent Chairman. This will encourage people to maintain a watching brief on public expenditure.

It is in line with the Liberal Party's principle of accountability and value for the taxpayer's dollar. The Labor Party could not claim to have given the taxpayer value for his dollar during the past decade.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How is the car for the Chairman cutting down on Government spending?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about when you gave Gil Langley one?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I would have thought that the Opposition would understand that the Public Accounts Committee is being upgraded to the status it has in the Commonwealth. If the Labor Party was not prepared to accept accountability when in Government, the Liberal Party is so prepared.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They increased the number of cars by about 50 per cent when in Government.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: In line with the statement made by the Liberal Government in regard to that committee, I believe that this would also encourage the Public Service to become more efficient. Certain departments feel obliged to spend their allocation each year, come what may. By setting up the system proposed, it will encourage longer-term budgeting so that credits may build up in time and so that departments will be able to carry forward

surpluses from one year to the next—something which, I believe, is worth investigating.

The Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee takes on a wide range of activities. It inquires into spending and issues reports thereon. Its operations appear boundless. It examines all aspects of departmental administration, including matters referred to in the Auditor-General's Reports, expenditure results of departments, and the form of financial statements presented to Parliament. Something else which will be emphasised by the Liberal Government in the future is sunset legislation, which will contain the spending of statutory authorities and make them accountable for the money spent, and require them to justify their existence.

Finally, I would comment on the exciting mineral and natural resource development that lies ahead in this State (the Cooper Basin development and a liquids pipeline, whether to Redcliff or in its own right, and the continued upgrading of that area, and Roxby Downs, which we all know has been said to be the most significant mineral find in the world in the past thirty years). Also, there will be an increased exploration programme that will go ahead in South Australia now that there has been a change of Government and emphasis.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You've a shock coming to you.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: That remains to be seen. Some of Australia's largest mining companies have already indicated an interest in upgrading their exploration for resources. I cite not only uranium, but other minerals which the Labor Party may have forgotten that South Australia has to offer. In this sense, I believe that we must be conscious that an upgrading may be required by such instrumentalities as the Electricity Trust's power generation.

Until recently, it has been common for State instrumentalities to borrow within Australia. After half a century of limiting State borrowing to within Australia, the Federal Government recently agreed to allow a

considerable number of State Government projects to be funded by overseas borrowing. This has already been the case with Redcliff, in respect of which a borrowing of \$186 000 000 has been approved if and when that project goes ahead. One hopes that it goes ahead and one hopes that there will be other occasions when the State Government will be able to go to Loan Council with a request for funds.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Do you approve of the project at Redcliff?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Yes, and if one believes what the Hon. Mr. Cameron says, because he was quoting from the *Advertiser* and not from the *News*, it would appear that several Labor members in the State A.L.P. voted, in 1973 or 1974, for a uranium enrichment plant.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What would your people do?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: The Labor Party promised it, and it has not been delivered. If and when that matter comes to our attention for consideration, the Hon. Mr. Dunford, showing a great interest in it, will no doubt support it. As his previous colleagues supported it, will he not support it?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: No. You disagree with what your colleague said five years previously.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I suggest that the Hon. Mr. Dunford also consult Mr. Hawke on that matter, because I understand that he will soon be a Federal colleague and will have some influence on the legislation. With the Hon. Mr. Dunford no doubt promising to support the Liberal Party's policy on mineral development, I conclude my remarks on the Budget papers and support the motion.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 25 October at 2.15 p.m.