

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 31 October 1979

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

QUESTIONS

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs a question about staff transfers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Last week, in answering questions on this subject, the Minister referred to the opening of an ethnic information office at Felixstow which he said members of the Liberal Party had not been invited to attend. The Minister said that that was an example of the way the former Government had engaged in politics in the Ethnic Affairs Branch. There was also some suggestion that that was the reason why he considered some changes were needed in the Ethnic Affairs Branch. Further, the Minister said that it was bandied around at this opening that Liberal people had not been invited, that the matter was treated as a bit of a joke, and that there was no need for the Liberal people to be there. From whom did the Minister obtain the information that it was bandied about that there was no need for the Liberals to be there and that the whole matter was treated as a joke? Was the Minister told or does he have any evidence to confirm that officers of the Ethnic Affairs Branch treated the matter as a joke or made the statements I have referred to?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not intend to disclose the source of my information. I would very much have liked to hear a denial from the Leader of the Opposition that, in fact, it was not bandied around. As to the second point about the officers of the Ethnic Affairs Branch who were invited and attended that opening, my remarks were not necessarily referring to those particular officers at all.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture declared his intention during the election campaign and subsequently that he would make a practice of consulting with industry groups and organisations before making decisions. The Minister recently decided not to proceed with legislation to set up a State Dairying Authority.

Did the Minister of Agriculture consult with the South-East Dairymen's Association before making that decision, and what advice did he receive from the association? Did he consult with the Dairying Section of United Farmers and Stockowners Association of South Australia Incorporated, and what advice did he receive from that organisation, and with what other groups did the Minister consult before making the decision? Finally, if he discussed the matter with the South Australian Dairymen's Association, did the Minister consult with its Secretary only or with the whole of that association's executive?

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

WATER STORAGES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Recently, I asked the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Water Resources, a question regarding the state of water storages in South Australia. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have a reply, which comprises a fairly lengthy table that summarises the major reservoir holdings throughout the State. The reservoirs included in the table are Mount Bold, Happy Valley, Myponga, Millbrook, Kangaroo Creek, Hope Valley, Little Para, Barossa, South Para, and several country reservoirs. The table gives capacities, details of storage at 29 October 1979, 29 October 1978, and 18 October 1979. It is indicated that the current storage in metropolitan reservoirs represents 91.8 per cent of the total capacity. I ask leave to have the table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

RESERVOIR HOLDINGS

Metropolitan Reservoirs

Storage holdings in megalitres are listed: at 8.30 a.m. on 29 October 1979; at the same time last year; and at 8.30 a.m. on 18 October 1979, which was the date on which the peak metropolitan storage holding was achieved this year.

Metropolitan Reservoir	Capacity	Storage at 29/10/79	Storage at 29/10/78	Storage at 18/10/79
Mount Bold	47 300	47 210	38 876	47 300
Happy Valley	12 700	12 093	9 622	12 738
Myponga	26 800	26 800	25 283	26 800
Millbrook	16 500	16 500	16 500	16 500
Kangaroo Creek	24 400	24 400	14 910	24 400
Hope Valley	3 470	3 045	3 006	3 381
Little Para	21 400	19 755	11 660	19 645
Barossa	4 510	4 220	4 000	4 150
South Para	51 300	37 301	30 056	37 720
Total	208 380	191 324	153 913	192 634

The current storage in metropolitan reservoirs represents 91.8 per cent of the total capacity.

Major Country Reservoirs

Storage holdings in megalitres are listed: at 8.30 a.m. on 29 October 1979; at the same time last year; and at 8.30 a.m. on 15 October 1979, which was the date on which the peak country storage holding was achieved this year.

Country Reservoirs	Capacity	Storage at 29/10/79	Storage at 29/10/78	Storage at 15/10/79
Warren	5 080	5 041	4 900	5 080
Bundaleer	6 370	6 306	6 242	6 327
Beetaloo	3 700	2 333	3 287	2 272
Baroota	6 094	5 832	5 847	6 094
Tod River	11 300	11 158	11 087	11 300
Total	32 544	30 670	31 363	31 073

The current storage in major country reservoirs represents 94.2 per cent of the total capacity.

HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question regarding health administration.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yesterday, during the Budget debate, I devoted approximately half of a fairly lengthy speech to an examination of medical and health services in this country. I complained about the very poor level of debate on this subject and the very limited and superficial areas in which debate had taken place. In what I believe was a well researched and logical manner, I defined some very important areas that previously had not been debated at all in this Parliament. These are matters of urgency that are extremely important in the health care debate. Indeed, the short-term survival of the existing system may be at stake.

During the course of that speech, I made brief reference to the Minister of Health. I lamented her superficial approach and her apparent lack of intellectual capacity to grasp the realities of her portfolio. This was the whole point of that part of the exercise. As if to vindicate my remarks, the Minister, when she read a brief report this morning, or heard a very brief report on the radio, immediately reacted by going public to say that it was a personal attack and that I should concentrate on policy.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: You should have listened to 5DN this morning.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I did. I devoted about 2 000 words of that speech to health policy and, without knowing what I had said, the Minister, as is her wont, still thinking, apparently, that she was on the back bench in Opposition, in an irresponsible manner shot from the hip—and the lip—and immediately went public to say that I had made a personal attack.

I do not know how much more I must do than devote 15 or 20 minutes, or 2 000 words, on health policy to try to get some sort of response from the Minister. I challenge the Minister to debate these issues publicly anywhere and at any time. In an effort to obtain some sort of rational response from the Minister, I ask whether she is aware of the gross abuses and over-utilisation of the hospital system initiated by some members of the medical profession, and whether she intends, as a matter of urgency, to introduce a system of peer review.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will have pleasure in referring the question to my colleague and will bring down a reply.

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Attorney-General a question about staff transfers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In answer to Questions on Notice in this Council it has been indicated that certain officers who were transferred from their position prior to 15 September to other departments could not be transferred to what were called core departments; that is, Treasury, the Auditor-General's Department, Public Service Board, or the Premier's Department. I understand, further, that other officers transferred in other departments have also been advised that this limitation is placed upon their employment in the Public Service. First, will the Attorney-General say when it is expected that the bans on the employment of certain people in given departments will be lifted by the Government? Secondly,

will the bans remain in force while the Liberal Government is in power?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not aware of what the Leader refers to as bans. Whatever procedures have been adopted with respect to the transfers of public servants have been properly undertaken in accordance with the Public Service Act, and all have received fair treatment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S STATEMENT

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: The *News*, in a statement yesterday attributed to the Hon. John Cornwall, said, *inter alia*:

It would be proper for the public to be told of the interests of people such as Mr. Don Laidlaw. Mr. Laidlaw is Chairman of the South Australian Development Corporation, a statutory body which investigates claims for Government aid in establishing industry. Recent statements by Mr. Laidlaw warranted public attention. Speaking at the annual meeting of Quarry Industries last week, Mr. Laidlaw called on the Government to remove price control.

Today Mr. Cornwall called on the Premier to state whether he thought it was right for Mr. Laidlaw to remain part of the decision-making process of Government in light of his recent statements at the Quarry Industries annual meeting. Both Quarry Industries and Adelaide-Brighton Cement would benefit immediately if price control was lifted.

This statement is incorrect in two respects. First, I am not Chairman, nor ever have been a member, of the South Australian Development Corporation. However, I have been elected Chairman of the Industries Development Committee—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I am well aware of that. The statement that you were Chairman of the South Australian Development Corporation was not attributed to me.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: The statement was that I was Chairman of the South Australian Development Corporation. The Industries Development Committee reviews proposals of the Government to make grants or loans to industry. The committee consists of four Parliamentarians, two chosen by the Liberal and two by the Labor Party, plus one Treasury representative. The Hon. Jim Dunford is also a member. If a conflict of interests arises, I shall declare such an interest as I have done in the past in this Chamber.

Secondly, when addressing shareholders at the annual meeting of Quarry Industries, I did not say that price control should be removed, nor did I advocate such action when speaking on the subject of price control in the Address in Reply debate or at the recent annual meeting of Adelaide-Brighton Cement. I said at the Quarry Industries meeting that the South Australian Prices Act set down no guidelines by which to administer price control. In South Australia there are instances where the prices set are higher than those applying in the Eastern States, and this surely is not the object of the exercise, whilst in other instances the prices set are far below those in the Eastern States.

I said that the directors accepted that, in the interests of the State economy, prices in Adelaide should be somewhat lower than elsewhere, but there is no reason to victimise a company because it happens to be efficient. The Premier stated that the structure of price control is under review, and the directors welcome that.

Price control was enacted to meet wartime conditions and has continued almost unaltered for 40 years. If the

Government deems it necessary to maintain an apparatus to control prices, surely it should be confined to a monitoring role similar to that of the Prices Justification Tribunal.

Mr. President, I repeat that I did not advocate removing price control as alleged by the Hon. Dr. Cornwall, and I suggest that he should make some effort to verify his facts before making personal attacks upon members in this Chamber and in another place.

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Leader of the Government, and it is supplementary to the question I asked previously, simply because I did not get a reply. First, does the Leader agree that some officers who have been transferred from the positions they occupied before 15 September were told in this Chamber by a Minister that they could not be employed in certain core departments? Secondly, when is it anticipated that these people will become eligible for appointments in the Public Service generally, including those core departments?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: A Minister in this Chamber has made a statement with respect to some officers not being transferred to core departments. There is no suggestion, as far as I can see, that they will not be eligible for other appointments. They have their remedies through the Public Service Board, under the Public Service Act, if they are dissatisfied.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S STATEMENT

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I want to make clear to the Council that at no stage did I claim that the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw was Chairman of the South Australian Development Corporation. It ought to be made plain that, if one reads the report in the *News* yesterday, the statement in question was not attributed to me. I also point out that the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, when discussing the annual report, might have gone a little further and told us that in that report he did express optimism "now that a new Liberal Government has been elected".

POLICE MOTOR VEHICLES

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Chief Secretary, a reply to the question I asked on 18 October about air-conditioners for police motor vehicles?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Chief Secretary has had preliminary discussions with the Commissioner of Police and also with representatives of the Police Association of South Australia on this matter. The Commissioner has been asked to carry out a feasibility study to determine the most effective way of providing air-conditioning in appropriate police vehicles on a progressive basis and to liaise with the association on the development of an acceptable schedule for the implementation of the resulting proposal.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Leader of the Government a reply to the question I asked on 23 October regarding a daylight saving referendum?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The honourable member's

suggestion will receive consideration when the questions for the referendum are being framed.

WOMEN'S ADVISER

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to ask the Minister of Community Welfare a question about the matter of a women's adviser to the Government, this matter having been mentioned in the press recently. Will the Minister say whether he has considered the appointment of the wellknown active lobbyist in this Parliament, Mrs. Gwen Tapp, to that position?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The previous Government established the position, which was created on 18 June 1979, by the reclassification of a full-time position of Supervisor, Overnight Care, so that there would be no addition to the staff. The position was advertised in the press on 28 July 1979 and in the Public Service Board notice of 1 August 1979. The position has not yet been filled. The person whom the honourable member mentioned has not applied for the job.

MOTOR BODY REPAIRS INDUSTRY BILL

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Motor Body Repairs Industry Bill.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: A Select Committee on this Bill was appointed at the request of the former Opposition to investigate all aspects concerning the industry covered by this Bill, which was before the Council. The committee met on about 40 occasions.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It was a good committee too.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes, although I do not quite know what the Hon. Mr. Hill means by a "good committee", because it brought out many aspects that I am not at liberty to divulge to the Council. Certainly, since the new Government has been in office, there has been no mention of this Bill. Government members talk about expense, but the expense of the committee has run into many thousands of dollars. We travelled to Canberra and stayed at the international hotel there, and that was at great expense to the Government. I thought at the time it was well worthwhile, because there is no doubt without disclosing the evidence given to the committee, that the consensus of opinion among members of the committee was that something ought to be done in the industry, and that the weight of evidence was sufficient to require changes and legislation concerning this matter. I do not think that the expense involved in obtaining this evidence should be ignored. First, is the Leader going to use the evidence given to the Select Committee to frame legislation for the motor body repair industry? Secondly, when is legislation likely to be introduced to control undesirable aspects of the industry?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I know that the Minister of Transport has this matter presently under consideration. I am not able to indicate whether or not legislation will be introduced, but I will ask the question of the Minister and bring down a reply. Whether or not he uses the evidence that was given to the committee is a matter for this Council, under its Standing Orders, because, as I understand it, it is confidential to that committee at the present time.

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Leader of the Government on the subject of staff

transfers. Can the officers transferred from the positions that they held prior to 15 September and told that they could not work in core departments now apply for and be appointed to those core departments?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That is not a matter under my jurisdiction. I will refer it to the appropriate Minister and bring down a reply.

FAMILY RESEARCH UNIT

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Has the Minister of Community Welfare established a family research unit in the Department of Community Welfare, as promised by his Party during the recent election campaign? What is the purpose of the unit, and what function will it have?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have established such a unit as set out in the policy. It comprises two officers who, at the time they were appointed to the unit, were members of the Department of Community Welfare. The purpose of the unit was well set out in the policy, which indicated that the emphasis of the Liberal Government would be to support the family unit. The purpose of the research unit is to research ways of doing this.

The Hon. Miss Wiese would also know that in our policy statement we said that we would establish a system of family impact statements, which will be generally similar to environmental impact statements, so that, when any legislation or major administrative action was proposed that might have an effect on the family, the impact of such legislation or administrative action in regard to the family could be assessed. The first thing that the research unit in the Department of Community Welfare has done is look at the system of family impact statements, and it has prepared draft family impact statements in draft form to assess the impact of legislation and administrative decisions on the family. It has also recommended a procedure for doing this. As I have said, the impact statements are only in draft form and are not yet entirely satisfactory. The whole purpose of the unit is to conduct research into the effect of social legislation, and indeed all legislation, on the family.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Can the Minister say whether the family unit includes single-parent families?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, I can. A definition of "family" has been proposed for this purpose. I cannot recall that definition word perfectly, because I do not have it before me, but it certainly includes single-parent families and separated families. As far as I recall, "family" is defined as any group comprising a parent and children. That definition is certainly designed to cover not only the traditional concept of the family but also single-parent families and families where the parents are separated. The definition also has regard to what has been called "extended families". The definition is very wide, and perhaps I could acquaint the honourable member with the exact wording outside the Chamber, because I can easily obtain it.

SELECT COMMITTEES

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about Select Committees.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: About 12 months ago, at the instigation, of I think, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, a Select Committee was formed in this Council to examine fuel and energy resources. Over a period of several months, a number of expert witnesses appeared before that committee and supplied a great deal of information. I

believe that the committee learnt a lot from those witnesses, and it would be a pity to see all that evidence wasted. Since the new Government has come to office, no attempt has been made, as far as I can gather, to have a report prepared on the meetings of this committee. Does the Government intend to ensure that a report is prepared?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It must be recognised that that Select Committee ceased at the time of the election and that, if there is considered to be any waste, it is as a direct result of that election. The Government is conscious that Select Committees were cut off as a result of the election, and we are currently reviewing them, but there has been no decision on whether or not they will be revived in one form or another. The Government recognises that the valuable information given to various Select Committees should not be wasted. If there is some way we can rescue that information, we will do so.

A.S.I.O.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries. Does the Fisheries Department supply to the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation information on foreign fishermen? If so, what is the nature of the information supplied to that organisation, and if such information is supplied is it reviewed by the Minister or Cabinet before it is supplied to A.S.I.O.?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Minister in another place and bring down a reply.

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs a question about staff transfers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In answer to a question last week on the transfer of officers from the Ethnic Affairs Branch, the Minister said that the reason for the transfer of officers was the more efficient operation of the Ethnic Affairs Branch, prior to the branch's transfer to the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission that is due to be created shortly. The Minister later reiterated the justification that this was in line with the Government's policy to reduce waste. Nevertheless, some officers, along with other officers in other Government departments, were told that they could not transfer to core departments such as Treasury, the Auditor-General's Department, the Public Service Board, or the Premier's Department. First, for what reason were some officers advised that they could not transfer to core departments? Secondly, given that the Minister made this decision after consultation with officers of his department and without reference to the Public Service Board, when is it expected that the ban or restriction on these officers being employed in core departments will be lifted? Thirdly, will the bans remain while the Liberal Government is in power?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Those decisions were made taking into account the factors that were disclosed last week. Whether or not those bans, as the Leader calls them, will be lifted, I do not know. To the best of my knowledge, the officers have been transferred, their classifications remain the same, and their present employment arrangements are quite satisfactory to them.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister answer the question? For what reason were some officers within the Ethnic Affairs Branch advised that they could not transfer

to core departments, whereas other officers were apparently given a free hand in their transfer?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One of the reasons for that was that the two officers involved were very friendly and very close to the Leader of the Opposition and his Party. I met a friend of mine about a month ago, and he told me of an experience—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What's the name of your friend?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That friend told me of an experience he had. As a wellknown Liberal Party supporter, he sought a position in the office of the present Leader of the Opposition in another place, Mr. Bannon. Mr. Bannon said, "We will have to put you through the political wringer before you can come in here." The utter hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition in this place in pursuing this line as he has been doing for two to three weeks completely astounds me.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is the Minister of Local Government aware that the last Labor Administration appointed an ex-Liberal Minister to a very important committee in this State, thereby giving the direct lie to what he has just said? What about Coombs? Who appointed him? Don't you know?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is common knowledge—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Don't wave your hands at me. Mr. President, pull him into gear.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I might have to pull you into gear if you do not observe the rules.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is common knowledge that Governments of every political colour, when appointing former members of Parliament, appoint members of their own Party as well as those from the opposite Party. The Party of which I am a member has done that in Government, as has the Labor Party.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question regarding Whyalla Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will read as briefly as I can from a report prepared by the Whyalla Hospital Board and directed to a Mr. A. Bansemer of the South Australian Health Commission. The letter details the Whyalla Hospital's budget, given the financial problems that the Government has imposed on it. To illustrate examples of the problems that the hospital is facing in the salaries and wages area, I will read the following part of the report:

Actual projections of the existing staff levels suggest that we will be overspent at 30 June 1980 by \$220 000. This figure takes into account the reduction of 11 staff since 1 July 1979, the non-filling of vacancies and the closing of a 29-bed ward. Some further attrition may occur, but it is felt that in most areas further non-replacement of occurring vacancies will not be possible. The 1979-80 effective further attrition will also be limited by the payment of accrued leave (not including long service leave) and the fact that savings will relate to a period of less than nine months. Consequently, we ask that consideration be given to the granting of a further \$220 000 to meet this short-fall.

Regarding medical fees for services rendered (the most important part of the report), it states:

Current spending in this area appears to be close to budget

allocation. However, there is a fee rise from 1 November 1979, and the in-patient ratio of private to non-insured is swinging in favour of the non-insured patient. This is going to cause over-spending, and extra funds should be made available to meet any short-fall. We have spoken to medical staff regarding the tight funding situation, and they are prepared to more closely monitor the admission of patients. We have closed one ward, which has reduced bed capacity by 29, and are currently negotiating with the Medical Staff Society for a change in the payment system for fee for service.

The hospital needs another \$23 000 to meet food requirements, \$13 000 for fuel, light and power, and another \$200 000 for maintenance. Regarding receipts from the State Government, the report states:

The increase in uninsured patients will be our biggest problem in this area. We feel that the current situation of free treatment for non-insured patients and the ability in Whyalla to also get one's own doctor indicates that receipts will drop. We expect a short fall of some \$200 000 on the budget allocation. In summary we ask that you consider the fact that last year we made many cuts, and that we have reduced the number of beds by 11 per cent. There is now very little margin for further cuts and, although we are still applying pressure in all areas, the hospital still has to function and provide a safe health care service to this city and the region. The cut in funds is a good incentive to make us do what we can to increase efficiency and reduce wastage, but we are not magicians. We cannot stop inflation and we cannot refuse treatment to patients. We ask that you reconsider the areas brought to your attention and provide further funds where possible.

The Minister will no doubt agree that that is a rather alarming picture of the state of the finances of Whyalla Hospital, particularly when discussions are taking place with doctors, and when it seems that doctors are being asked to consider whether, because of cost, they should send patients into hospital on other than medical grounds. That is an alarming situation, and, indeed, an improper request to make.

First, is the Minister aware of the submission by the Whyalla Hospital Board of Management to the South Australian Health Commission? Secondly, will the Minister agree to the board's request for a further cash allocation to meet the expected budget short-fall? Thirdly, and most important, will the Minister issue a general instruction to all South Australian hospitals and doctors that the criteria to be used for the admittance of sick people to hospitals are to be solely medical criteria and that no other considerations, such as whether the patient is insured privately or by the Commonwealth Government, are to be used?

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

EMISSION CONTROLS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question regarding emission controls.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: When first elected to the Ministry in the former Administration, I said that in no circumstances would I preside over the further deterioration of air quality in Adelaide. It therefore causes me much consternation to hear that the Premier is expected to announce today that his Government is abandoning support for the third stage of design rule 27A. Adelaide, which is similar to Los Angeles, experiences frequent

atmospheric inversions and, as everyone knows, is highly susceptible to air pollution. It certainly cannot afford any deterioration in this respect, as a significant smog problem already exists. Is the Government aware that a substantial and informed body of scientific opinion has proposed a modified version of the third stage of Australian design rule 27A further to reduce carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon exhaust emissions? Is the Minister aware that expert technical opinion suggests that reducing carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions only, while leaving oxides of nitrogen emissions at present standards, will not increase petrol consumption? Is the Minister also aware that such action would significantly reduce photochemical smog problems? Finally, in the circumstances, will the Government reconsider its decision and raise and support such a proposal at the next Australian Transport Advisory Council meeting?

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

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question regarding emission controls?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The matter of the introduction of phase 3 of Australian design rule 27A relating to emission control of motor vehicles is currently being considered. When a decision has been reached a public announcement will then be made.

PECUNIARY INTERESTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: There has already been talk in the Council today about pecuniary interests and their relationship to the responsibilities of members of Parliament. I noticed in a recent publication that the new Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Joe Clark, who could hardly be called a left-wing radical, had requested that the members of his Cabinet, their wives, children and senior staff members should disclose publicly their financial holdings under new conflict of interest guides. They are required either to sell all publicly-traded shares and speculative investments, or to place them in a blind trust over which they have no control. For the first time, a \$10 000 limit is placed on holdings of foreign currency. Deposits in foreign banks above that sum must be bound under a blind trust. I imagine that the close proximity of Canada to the United States of America is the main reason for the latter part of the pecuniary interests control that the Canadian Prime Minister has introduced.

The report goes on to say that, although these guidelines do not have the force of law, compliance is a condition of employment—presumably for Cabinet Ministers, their families, and also senior staff members. I understand from a question asked in the other place last week that the Premier in this State has requested members of his Cabinet to divest themselves of at least some of their privately held shares. However, there is no suggestion that he has made a similar request regarding spouses, children, and senior staff members. I ask the Attorney-General whether, in view of the example set by the conservative Prime Minister of Canada, the Premier will consider similar guidelines or identical guidelines to apply in this State.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The honourable member has indicated that the Premier has made some requirements

with respect to disclosure by members of his Cabinet of their interests. I am not aware of the guidelines set by Prime Minister Clark, but I will endeavour to have them researched and will refer the balance of the honourable member's question to the Premier and to bring down a reply.

VALUATIONS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about valuations?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government is currently investigating the method of making valuations for rating purposes which may or may not require amendments to the Valuation of Land Act but it is too early at this stage to state what changes to any legislation are proposed in this regard. However, none of the proposals presently being investigated would interfere with the statutory functions, powers and independence of the Valuer-General.

PRIVATE SCHOOL

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about the Torrens Valley Christian School Association?

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

(1) Non-government schools do not have to apply for a licence. The Education Act provides for these schools to be approved by the Minister of Education in accordance with the regulations. Those regulations have not yet been prepared, and are at present being considered by a Ministerially approved working party having representation from the non-government school sector.

(2) The association has given notice that it proposes to use the facilities of the Reformed Church, Hill Street, Campbelltown.

(3) Anticipated enrolment of 30 pupils.

(4) No details are available.

(5) Primary years.

(6) None, in line with existing policy that non-systemic non-government schools do not become eligible for consideration for funding in the first year of operation.

(7) The Minister of Education may only give his approval for the establishment of a non-government school following the making of regulations on the matter.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: When are the regulations expected? It would seem that until these regulations are put forward, anyone can start up a non-government school with no control at all from the Government.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The regulations have not yet been prepared, and one can assume that they could not have been prepared by the previous Government. My reply stated that at present they are being considered by a Ministerially approved working party having representation from the non-government school sector. If the honourable member would like me to obtain an estimate of the period from my colleague, I shall do that.

KAMPUCHEA

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 23 October about aid to Kampuchea?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Government is monitoring the situation and will reconsider the matter if the position demands change.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Is the Attorney-General aware that the Government of Queensland has given \$100 000 to the Kampuchea appeal? I compare that to our

\$10 000. Will the Attorney-General approach the Government, in view of the amount donated by the Queensland Government, and endeavour to get the donation by the South Australian Government up to something decent and respectable, which it is not at the moment?

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

ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMME

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I direct my question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Minister will be well aware of the formation of SENRAC by the previous Government. What money will be made available to that organisation for the purpose of further investigation into the following: direct solar energy for heat generation; space cooling/heating refrigeration; energy storage, batteries, solar hydrogen; architectural design for energy conservation; wind energy; technologies for more efficient use of fossil fuels; measurement of solar radiation; testing of solar equipment; development and demonstration projects; stock of energy research instruments; energy library; wind energy workshops; and, energy audit programmes?

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

OVERSEAS TRAVEL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my recent question on overseas travel?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I intimated to the honourable member a week ago that I had a reply to his question. Apparently he has not had time to ask for it. I thought he had given up.

No doubt the honourable member will have seen the statement by the Minister of Agriculture which helped clarify the remarks I made in regard to this matter. In particular, he will have noted that my colleague has no intention of travelling overseas this financial year and, in fact, can see no reason to do so until 1980-81.

As to the honourable member's contention that there was no reason to allocate funds this financial year for costs associated with his visit, I believe he should cast his mind back to the conditions which prevailed at the time the 1979-80 Estimates were prepared. At that time departmental officers had no way of precisely ascertaining what costs would be outstanding at 30 June and acted partly on the advice of the American Express Company (which the honourable member and his party used as a source of credit) that it could take upwards of three months for some invoices to arrive from overseas and be processed. On this basis it was assumed that some expenditure from the latter part of the honourable member's trip might not be processed until July-August, and a notional provision of \$3 000 was made to cover this contingency.

In light of the honourable member's premature return from overseas, that provision may have been somewhat ambitious, but, to illustrate the point at issue, about \$500 has been paid this financial year for the costs of his accommodation in London and for official telephone calls from that city and Spain.

STAFF TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs and is supplementary to questions that I have asked about staff

transfers. I ask the Minister:

1. What information and evidence did the Minister have that any acquaintance or friendship with the Opposition would have affected officers' capacity to carry out their duties?

2. Was the fact that apparently the Leader of the Opposition in another place made some statement about putting someone through a political wringer a factor that the Minister took into account in making the decision referred to?

3. Does the Minister's answer to previous questions mean that public servants who are acquaintances or friends of the Opposition will have conditions placed on them if the Government finds out by some means that this is the case?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The episode that I related to the Council concerning Mr. Bannon did not influence any decision made on this matter. Members on both sides of this Council know that Ministers and shadow Ministers have various committees that meet and discuss Party policy and other political matters. I, as a shadow Minister in this area of administration, was well served by my Party members on committees in the ethnic affairs area. Through that, one learns that certain people have strong political affiliations in respect of the other side of politics. That is their right and their private affair: I have no quarrel on that.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: But they can't work.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: What I am saying is that, as public servants, they have to be politically neutral.

The Hon. Anne Levy: In their work.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, in their work, and in the Ethnic Affairs Branch particularly, if it is to work efficiently, effectively, and in the best interests of the migrants and ethnic people. That principle must be adhered to. Under the previous Government, it was not, and I am placing the blame for that on that Government, not on the officers. Last week I quoted one instance in relation to the opening of that branch. I blame members of the present Opposition when they were in Government. They set the example and they had control of this branch. Politics came into it too much. Instead of worrying about migrants and ethnic people, the previous Government worried about politics.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I take a point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is that his answer to the question is personally aimed at members on this side and is an innuendo that I or other members on this side played political ball games with Ministers. You are a liar, Hill, and you know it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I take a point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Both honourable members will be seated. The Hon. Mr. Foster has gone a long way outside the bounds by using words that cannot be used in this Chamber, and I ask him to withdraw them.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I withdraw the word that offends the Chamber, but it can in no way offend the member to whom it was directed, because he knows it is true.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: It does offend, Mr. President, and I ask him to withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: I am not satisfied with that. I ask the honourable member to withdraw it without any conditions whatsoever.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I withdraw on the basis that there never were any conditions attached to it. It is a statement of fact, but I withdraw it.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice):

1. In how many Government primary schools is religious education being taught as a separate subject in 1979, which are they, and approximately how many students receive this instruction?

2. In how many Government primary schools is religious education being taught as part of the social studies curriculum in 1979, which are they, and approximately how many students receive this instruction?

3. In how many Government secondary schools is religious education being taught as an optional subject in 1979, which are they, and approximately how many students receive this instruction?

4. In how many Government secondary schools is religious education being taught as a core subject in 1979, which are they, and approximately how many students receive this instruction?

5. What is the estimate for 1980 of the number of Government schools which will fall into the four categories of schools indicated in parts 1, 2, 3, and 4 set out above?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I regret to inform the honourable member that I have not received replies to Questions on Notice Nos. 1 and 2, In stating that, I emphasise that the officers of my department (and I am sure this also applies to the other departments) are doing their best to cope with the huge number of questions and the huge volume of work occasioned by them. I say that with particular reference to the other place. Therefore, I ask the honourable member whether she would mind putting Questions on Notice Nos. 1 and 2 on notice for a further week.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Will we still be sitting then?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

POLICE GUNS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice):

1. What proportion of traffic policemen currently carry guns?

2. What proportion of police patrol cars currently have guns in the car?

3. What proportion of policemen on motor cycles currently carry guns?

4. What proportion of policemen at sporting fixtures or other functions where large crowds are expected currently carry guns?

5. What proportion of women police currently carry guns?

6. Will these proportions change when the police are provided with the proposed new guns, and, if so, what will the proportions then be?

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

1. With the exception of 14 members deployed on traffic control duties within the city of Adelaide, all other traffic police are issued with handguns.

2. Metropolitan Area—General duty patrol police are issued with handguns for their tour of duty. In addition, supervisors of these personnel, i.e. non-commissioned officers, also carry a shotgun in their patrol vehicles. Plain clothes police engaged in operational duties are equipped with handguns as a personal issue. Special Tasks and Rescue Force personnel are equipped with handguns and a shotgun is carried in each patrol vehicle.

Country Areas—All police stations outside the metropolitan area are equipped with handguns for issue to both general duty and plain clothes police engaged in operational duty when the need arises or it is considered necessary. Shotguns are also available at some country

stations for use when the need arises. They are not carried in patrol vehicles as a matter of course.

Miscellaneous Units—Personnel attached to certain units not engaged in operational activities are not issued with firearms as a matter of course, other than when duties or circumstances dictate or when an individual member avails himself of the option.

3. All personnel performing duties on motor cycles carry handguns.

4. This situation varies considerably and is dependent on a number of factors, the basic criteria being:

(a) Nature or purpose of the gathering.

(b) Possible or known potential of troublemakers likely to be attracted by the particular function.

(c) Known or anticipated potential of persons known to be attending the function.

(d) Whether the function is a security operation or not.

5. All women police engaged in operational areas carry handguns in both the uniform and plain clothes function. No distinction is made on the basis of sex.

6. There is no intended change in the present situation on introduction of the new handgun. The new gun is merely a replacement for the weapon currently used.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL (on notice): Will the Minister of Local Government supply to this Council a full list of all shares held by him in public companies and private companies other than family companies?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The answer is "nil".

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

1. Is it a fact that at the time houses on the route of the M.A.T.S. plan were canvassed for listing for sale with Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd., the Minister had a financial interest in that company?

2. Has the Minister ever used his position whilst 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?

3. Has the Minister as yet asked the Premier to change his portfolios in accordance with my suggestion of two weeks ago?

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

1. The Hon. Dr. Cornwall's question relates to a personal explanation I gave in this Council on 6 August 1969. Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd. had generally and in the ordinary course of business canvassed, by letterbox distribution, some 10 000 suburban homes. By accident, a few pamphlets were letterboxed in houses that happened to be on a M.A.T.S. route. No listings followed nor was any business affected as a result of such accident.

At that time I had no managerial interest in that company. My only interest was an indirect interest as a shareholder in a company holding shares in Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd.

2. No.

3. No.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is central to the Government's strategy for stimulating employment in South Australia. It is designed to provide a legal framework under which pay-roll tax concessions can be directed towards employers who expand employment opportunities. In broad outline, the Bill contains three exemption provisions.

The first of these will raise the general exemption from pay-roll tax from \$66 000 to \$72 000 as from 1 January 1980. A corresponding increase is made in the minimum deduction, raising it from \$29 700 to 32 400. The second provision proposes an exemption from pay-roll tax in respect of the wages of employees aged less than 20 years who are engaged after 30 September 1979. The third provision proposes a system of rebating a portion of pay-roll tax to those firms that increase their total employment after 30 September 1979, by engaging either one or two additional employees aged less than 20 years.

The effect of raising the general exemption from \$66 000 to \$72 000, and increasing all pay-rolls within the tapering range by a corresponding proportion, will be to "index" tax liability against the continuing increase in wages and salaries. It will mean that on any fixed pay-roll within the tapering scale (and they, it should be remembered, are the pay-rolls of small enterprises which are especially vulnerable to economic fluctuations) pay-roll tax liability will be reduced by \$500.

For larger firms, which are eligible for the flat exemption, pay-roll tax liability on a fixed amount will be reduced by \$135. The fact is, of course, that in those enterprises where employment numbers remain constant, the size of pay-rolls is continually increasing, due to wage and salary rises. The effect of "indexing" pay-roll tax liability in these circumstances is to cushion the total impact of wage rises and so reduce the level of unemployment that is caused solely by them.

On an annual pay-roll, for example, of \$100 000, existing pay-roll tax is \$2 833, but by increasing the maximum exemption level as proposed, this amount will reduce to \$2 333. The saving of \$500 can thus be used to offset a substantial portion of the extra \$750 that any employer, with a business this size, could reasonably expect to pay over the course of this year in increased pay-roll tax as a result of escalating wages and salaries.

The special youth employment exemptions proposed in this Bill are a new concept; indeed, they are the most imaginative and ambitious contribution yet made by any State Government to tackle the problem of youth unemployment. They are based upon the view that permanent job creation will be achieved only by increasing the levels of economic activity and profitability within our community; that is, by increasing the capacity of employers to engage more staff.

That view is of course rejected by the Opposition, which both now and when in Government was intent upon reducing economic activity and reducing business profitability. As a consequence, South Australia now has the highest rate of unemployment, the highest rate of youth unemployment and the highest rate of emigration amongst all the States. That record of performance is absolutely unacceptable to the new Government and, accordingly, every action will be taken to generate permanent job opportunities for the youth of the State.

The first step as outlined in this Bill will be to exempt from pay-roll tax the wages of all persons, aged less than 20 who are employed after 30 September 1979, who are employed in a full-time capacity and whose employment constitutes an addition to the total work force of their establishment.

This measure is designed to provide an immediate

stimulus to the employment of young people, and judging by the response already received, it will do just that.

One large firm, based in Adelaide, has indicated a willingness to employ a further 50 junior staff promptly, because this policy represents a saving on additional pay-roll tax of approximately \$15 000 in a full year. Another medium to large firm has indicated that an additional 24 young people will be employed over three successive weeks at a total annual saving of approximately \$7 200. Numerous smaller firms have also indicated they are willing to employ just one or two additional youths, and so qualify for the exemption from additional pay-roll tax of about \$300 per employee.

The Government will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this scheme and, at a later date and within the context of its overall budgetary considerations, will consider an extension and possible expansion of the scheme beyond 30 September 1981.

For this reason the Bill therefore allows for some details to be worked out by regulation.

This will allow flexibility of administration and enable the Government to deal efficiently with any future extensions that may be decided. As I have said, the exemption from tax of additional wages has been designed as a stimulus to further job creation. The Government is of the view, however, that youth unemployment is so chronically high that special inducements are also needed if the problem is to be tackled swiftly. Accordingly, the Bill also provides for a system of rebating pay-roll tax by means of refund.

Over a full year, any firm whose total employment is increased by engaging one full-time employee aged less than 20 will qualify for a special exemption of \$12 000 from the total pay-roll on which tax is payable. Similarly, any firm which increases total employment by engaging two full-time employees, each of whom is aged less than 20, will qualify for a special exemption of \$36 000. Over a full year any firm employing one additional youth will receive a rebate of \$600, and any firm employing two will receive a rebate of \$1 800.

The combined saving of exempting additional wages from the imposition of pay-roll tax and the special rebates I have described, amounts to approximately \$900 in the case of a firm that puts on one additional young person, and to approximately \$2 400 in the case of any firm that engages two additional young people. Thereafter, the saving is equal to the sum of \$2 400 plus \$300 for every additional employee.

In practical terms and on the basis of an average income per junior of \$6 000 a year, this Bill offers to every employer willing to engage two more young people, a subsidy in a full year that is equivalent to the payment of the first 10 weeks of employment for both employees. Moreover, the Government has decided that the exemptions proposed in this Bill shall be available to employers who are already in receipt of Commonwealth assistance, especially under the Special Youth Employment Training Programme (SYETP) and the Commonwealth Rebate for Apprentices Full-Time Training Scheme (CRAFT).

For the information of members I have prepared two tables showing the weekly cash benefits to employers, one relating to the additional employment of apprentices and the other to non-apprentices. Both tables distinguish between subsidised youth employment under Commonwealth Government schemes and unsubsidised youth employment. As the tables are purely statistical I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED PAY-ROLL TAX EXEMPTIONS ON WEEKLY PAYMENT UNDER SEVERAL AWARDS (APPRENTICES)

	Award rate of pay P.W.	Cost to employer of one additional apprentice at annual exemption of \$12 000 (\$11.54 p.w.)	Cost to employer of one additional apprentice with added craft benefit (Stages I and II)	Cost to employer of one additional apprentice with added craft benefit (Stage III)	Unit cost to employer of two additional apprentices at annual exemption of \$36 000 (\$17.31 each p.w.)	Unit cost to employer of two additional apprentices with added craft benefit (Stages I and II)	Unit cost to employer of two additional apprentices with added craft benefit (Stage III)	Pay-roll tax savings on additional wages after discontinuation of existing pay-roll tax rebate for first year apprentices who commenced indentures in 1979 (max. p.w.)
<i>Hairdressers</i>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1st year	68.30	56.76	46.57	—	50.99	40.80	—	5.69
2nd year	87.30	75.76	65.57	—	69.99	59.80	—	7.28
3rd year	108.00	96.46	—	89.92	90.69	—	84.15	9.00
4th year	136.00	124.36	—	—	118.69	—	—	11.33
<i>Hotels (Cooks)</i>								
Under 18	87.70	76.16	66.97	—	70.39	60.20	—	7.31
At 18	102.30	90.76	80.57	—	84.99	74.80	—	8.53
At 19	124.20	112.66	—	106.12	106.89	—	100.35	10.35
<i>Metal Industry</i>								
1st year	66.10	54.56	44.37	—	48.79	38.60	—	5.51
2nd year	86.50	74.96	64.77	—	69.19	59.00	—	7.21
3rd year	118.00	106.46	—	99.92	100.69	—	94.15	9.83
4th year	138.40	126.86	—	—	120.09	—	—	11.53
<i>Vehicle Industry</i>								
1st year	66.10	54.56	44.37	—	48.79	38.60	—	5.51
2nd year	86.50	74.96	64.77	—	69.19	59.00	—	7.21
3rd year	118.00	106.46	—	99.92	100.69	—	94.15	9.83
4th year	138.40	126.86	—	—	121.09	—	—	11.53
<i>Furnishing Trades (Fed)</i>								
1st year	65.80	54.25	44.07	—	48.49	38.30	—	5.48
2nd year	86.20	74.66	64.47	—	68.89	58.70	—	7.18
3rd year	117.55	101.01	—	99.47	100.24	—	93.70	9.80
4th year	137.90	126.36	—	—	120.59	—	—	11.49
<i>Construction</i>								
1st year	82.90	71.36	61.17	—	65.59	55.40	—	6.91
2nd year	98.80	87.26	77.07	—	81.49	71.30	—	8.23
3rd year	130.70	119.16	—	112.62	113.39	—	106.85	10.89
4th year	154.60	143.06	—	—	137.29	—	—	12.88

EFFECT OF PROPOSED PAY-ROLL TAX EXEMPTIONS ON WEEKLY PAYMENT UNDER SEVERAL AWARDS
(NON-APPRENTICES)

	Award rate of pay p.w.	Cost to employer of one additional employee at annual exemption of \$12 000 (\$11.54 p.w.)	Cost to employer of one additional employee with added SYETP benefit	Unit cost to employer of two additional employees at annual exemption of \$36 000 (\$17.31 each p.w.)	Unit cost to employer of two additional employees with added SYETP benefit	Pay-roll tax saving on additional wages (maximum p.w.)
<i>Clerks (S.A.)</i>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Under 16	81.00	69.46	24.46	63.69	18.69	6.75
At 17	97.20	85.66	40.66	79.89	34.89	8.10
At 18	113.40	101.86	56.86	96.09	51.09	9.45
At 19	129.60	118.06	73.06	112.29	67.29	10.80
<i>Shop Assistants</i>						
Under 17	79.10	67.56	22.56	61.79	16.79	6.59
At 17	94.90	83.36	38.36	77.59	32.59	7.91
At 18	110.70	99.16	54.16	93.39	48.39	9.23
At 19	126.50	114.96	69.96	109.19	64.19	10.54
<i>Hairdressers (unapprenticed)</i>						
Under 16	36.00	24.46	(11.54)**	18.69	(17.31)**	3.00
At 16	49.10	37.56	(7.44)†	31.79	(13.21)	4.09
At 17	61.70	50.16	5.16	44.39	(0.61)	5.14
At 18	74.50	62.96	17.96	57.19	12.19	6.21
At 19	87.30	75.76	30.46	69.99	24.99	7.28
<i>Hotels (unapprenticed)</i>						
Under 18	84.80	73.26	28.26	67.49	22.49	7.07
At 18	98.90	87.36	42.36	81.59	36.59	8.24
At 19	120.70	109.16	64.16	103.39	58.39	10.06
<i>Delicatessens</i>						
Under 17	72.10	60.56	15.56	54.79	9.79	6.01
At 17	86.50	74.96	29.99	69.19	24.19	7.21
At 18	100.90	89.36	44.36	83.59	38.59	8.41
At 19	122.50	110.96	65.96	105.19	60.19	10.21
<i>Metal Industry (unapprenticed)</i>						
Under 16	46.40	34.86	(10.14)†	29.09	(15.91)†	3.87
At 16	59.70	48.16	3.16	42.39	(2.61)†	4.98
At 17	73.00	61.46	16.46	55.69	10.69	6.08
At 18	86.30	74.76	29.76	68.99	23.99	7.19
At 19	104.20	92.66	47.66	86.89	41.89	8.68
<i>Vehicle Industry</i>						
At 17	66.60	55.06	10.06	49.29	4.29	5.55
At 18	83.30	71.76	26.76	65.99	20.99	6.94
At 19	99.90	88.36	43.36	82.59	37.59	8.33
<i>Furnishing Trades (Fed.)</i>						
Under 17	60.10	48.56	3.56	42.79	(2.21)†	5.01
At 17	73.45	61.91	16.91	56.14	11.14	6.12
At 18	86.80	75.26	30.26	69.49	24.49	7.23
At 19	104.80	93.26	48.26	87.49	42.49	8.73
<i>Bricklayers</i>						
At 17	82.90	71.36	26.36	65.59	20.59	6.91
At 18	98.80	87.26	42.26	81.49	36.49	8.24
At 19	130.70	119.16	74.16	113.39	68.39	10.89
<i>Pastoral</i>						
At 15	62.10	50.56	5.56	44.79	(0.21)†	5.18
At 16	69.00	57.46	12.46	51.69	6.69	5.75
At 17	75.00	63.46	18.46	57.69	12.69	6.25
At 18	89.70	78.16	33.16	72.39	27.39	7.48
At 19	103.50	91.96	46.96	86.19	41.19	8.63

* SYETP subsidy in this case would be \$36.00 per week

† Exemption and additional SYETP benefits exceed the award wage by that amount

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: One final point that I wish to cover, is the matter of the cost to the Government of introducing the proposals in this Bill. It has been alleged that the budgetary provision of \$2 000 000 for the total package of pay-roll tax promises is considerably less than the Government's pre-election promise of \$6 450 000. Let me assure the Council that this is not so.

There is no inconsistency whatsoever between the proposals in this Bill and the policies announced by the Government during the election campaign. There has not been and there will not be any dilution of the Government's commitment to the success of this vital policy. The fact is that any allegation of discrepancy between the amount estimated before the election and the amount included in the Budget, fails to take several important factors into account. I believe they require explanation now so that no misunderstanding exists as to the exact cost of the proposals in this Bill.

It is true, that the Government's pre-election costing document did quantify the maximum possible cost of the total pay-roll tax policies at \$6 450 000 in a full year. However, the costing document also stated that in this first year of operation, 1979-80, the maximum possible cost would be only three-quarters of this amount, or \$4 800 000. This is because the increase in the maximum exemption level will operate for only half the year, and the special youth policies will operate for only three-quarters of the year.

In addition, the costing document was at pains to avoid under-estimation. Accordingly, the figures it contained were based on an average annual salary for juniors of \$8 000, which under most awards is over-generous by at least \$1 000. Furthermore, the total cost of the rebate scheme was based upon the particular combination of jobs and firms that would produce the greatest possible exemption, that is, 3 500 firms each employing an additional two young people and so qualifying for the maximum exemption of \$36 000 in each case.

All of this was clearly stated in the costing document and the prime reason for over-estimation was stated with equal clarity. As a result, even though the costing document anticipated a maximum possible cost of the total pay-roll tax package of \$6 350 000, it also stated that the more probable cost would be \$3 050 000 in a full year.

These figures have been checked by Treasury and have been found to be accurate within the limits of toleration that apply to any such prediction. The final point in regard to the cost of the scheme relates to the specific allocation of \$2 000 000 that is provided in the Budget. Lest it be inferred from what I have said that there is still an inconsistency between this amount and the total probable cost of \$3 000 000 in a full year, I believe it is necessary to explain two further matters.

The first is simply to remind members that the Budget estimates are based, not on a full year's operation of the scheme, but on six months in respect of the maximum exception, and on nine months in respect of the youth employment initiatives. The second point is that the exemption of additional wages from pay-roll tax represents revenue forgone to the Government.

It is not, therefore, reflected in either increased pay-roll tax receipts or in a payment from Revenue Account. As far as the Special Youth Employment Scheme is concerned, the Budget appropriation of \$2 000 000 applies only to estimated rebate payments under the sections of this Bill that relate to special youth exemptions.

There is no question whatsoever, as has been implied in statements already made, that the Government has compromised its pre-election assurances by the faintest degree, nor is there any chance that the Government will

resile from them in the future.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the new Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on 1 October 1979. Clauses 3, 5 and 7 provide for the increases in the general exemption and the minimum deduction that I have outlined. Clause 6 makes a corresponding increase in the amount paid by way of wages which determines whether an employer must be registered under the Act.

Clauses 4 and 8 are the provisions directed specifically at the problems of youth unemployment. They are designed to provide exemptions from pay-roll tax in respect of young employees taken on after 1 October 1979 and to establish a more general administrative scheme under which pay-roll tax concessions can be directed to employers who can demonstrate that they have made a positive contribution towards solving the problems of youth unemployment.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for exemption of residential properties from land tax where the owners of those properties occupy them as their principal place of residence. The Government had hoped to introduce this concession in relation to the taxing of land for the present financial year. Unfortunately, for administrative reasons, this has proved to be impossible. However, the Bill will ensure, so far as it is practicable to do so, that there will be no increase in land tax for the present financial year on a property that may subsequently qualify for total exemption from land tax.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amending Act shall operate retrospectively from 30 June 1979. This is to ensure that the concessions applicable to the present financial year will apply to the assessment of tax for this financial year.

Clause 3 amends section 10 of the principal Act. This section deals with liability to taxation. A new provision is inserted to take account of the exemptions to be granted under the proposed section 10a. New subsection (3) stipulates a specific time as at which land tax is to be calculated. This is particularly important for the purpose of determining whether land is to be treated as exempt or non-exempt in the light of changing circumstances for a particular financial year.

Clause 4 enacts new section 10a of the principal Act. This new section introduces the new exemption of the principal place of residence. The Commissioner is empowered to grant the exemption either upon application or otherwise. He will notify the owner of exempted land of the ground of exemption and if it appears that he has acted on a mistaken assumption of fact, the owner must notify him accordingly. The owner must also notify the commissioner where proper grounds for the exemption cease to exist. In order to qualify for exemption, the land must be owned by a natural person who occupies it as his principal place of residence, or by a home-unit company. The new section envisages the fixing of additional criteria by regulation. For example, it is not intended that property, which is predominantly used for industrial or commercial purposes but which incidentally includes a residence, should qualify for the exemption. Matters of this kind will be dealt with by regulation.

Clause 5 introduces an amendment consequential on the proposed section 10 (3)—and the proposed amendments to section 11a.

Clause 6 introduces amendments which are designed to ensure, as far as possible, that there will be no increase in tax for the present financial year on residential property that may subsequently qualify for total exemption from land tax.

Clause 7 corrects an anomaly in the rates of tax applying to land that is partially exempt from land tax.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill implements an explicit promise given by the Government at the recent general election. It is one of several measures proposed by the Government which are designed to stimulate the economic development of the State by reducing the incidence of State taxation. The object of the Bill is to exempt completely from succession duty the estates of persons who die on or after the first day of January 1980.

The effects of the Bill will contribute significantly to the Government's overall plan for renewed economic activity and confidence. It will remove completely the inequities so often caused by the imposition of succession duty, and so often ignored by the previous Government. In particular, it will put an end to a continuation of the many genuine cases of hardship that have become commonplace in these days of inflation; cases in which the value of deceased estates and consequently the amount of duty payable on estates, bears no realistic relation to income levels or a family's capacity to pay an inheritance tax.

In one stroke, this Bill will also transform South Australia from being the least attractive State for the investment of retirement capital to being equal best. It will bring South Australia into line with Queensland and the Commonwealth, both of which have abolished death duties and probate, and will put us ahead of the other States, every one of which is still phasing out death duties progressively.

The importance of this transformation cannot be overstated, for in recent years South Australia has failed to retain or to attract considerable sums of capital that were destined to be subject to succession duty. In this respect, I refer honourable members to the Blackwood Report, prepared by a former President of the Australian Taxation Institute, and laid on the table of the Tasmanian Parliament as Paper No. 62 of 1978. At page 6 of that report, which examined the abolition of probate and death duties in Queensland, Mr. Blackwood stated:

Quite massive funds were flowing (into Queensland) from all States and particularly Victoria and South Australia.

The effect of this Bill will be to halt that massive flow of funds to Queensland or anywhere else outside the State. Indeed, the package of tax relief and business incentive measures proposed by the Government, of which this Bill is only one item, will actively encourage the migration of interstate retirement capital into South Australia. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act is not to affect the estates of persons dying on or after the first day of January 1980. The administrator of the estate of such a person is relieved from the obligation of filing a return with the Commissioner in respect of the estate of that person. Clause 3 relieves the Treasurer from the obligation to publish indexation factors in respect of the general statutory amount. These indexation factors will have no further relevance after this year.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to give a much needed stimulus to the housing industry in this State and to assist those who are faced with the expense of acquiring and furnishing their first home. Regarding the urgent need for recovery in the housing industry, let me illustrate the current position, and the events leading to it, by reference to the official figures.

Throughout 1975 and 1976, the growth in new dwelling commencements in South Australia was dramatic. In the former year, annual growth was 8.7 per cent and in the latter it was an extraordinary 19.1 per cent. In the next year, 1977, construction fell by 29 per cent to 11 340 new homes. In 1978, a further fall of 29 per cent was recorded, and the number of new homes commenced was only 8 048. This decline has continued well into 1979, with the number of commencements in the first half of the year being 15.7 per cent lower than the corresponding period last year, and 54 per cent lower than the corresponding period just three years ago.

Admittedly, there has been a decline in housing construction throughout Australia, but the intensity of this decline has been far greater and more prolonged in this State than elsewhere. In 1977, when new dwelling commencements throughout Australia fell by only 10.3 per cent, the same index in South Australia fell by 29 per cent, or nearly three times as much. In the next year, 1978, commencements throughout Australia fell by only 11.6 per cent but in South Australia they dropped by another 29 per cent. In the first half of the 1979 calendar year, commencements in South Australia have fallen by a further 15.7 per cent and yet have shown a positive growth throughout the nation of over 7 per cent.

Moreover, since 1976, when South Australia's share of new dwelling commencements was 11.1 per cent of the national total, our relative position has fallen sharply. This State's share of new dwellings declined to 8.8 per cent in 1977, to 7.1 per cent in 1978, and to a critically low 5.7 per cent in the first half of this year. So, on the evidence presented by those official figures from the Bureau of Statistics, it is unmistakably clear that the South Australian housing construction industry has fallen on hard times. Its predicament is urgent and, accordingly, the steps taken to restore its levels of activity must be both substantial and immediate.

This Bill meets those criteria. The associated problem that is of major concern to the Government, the effects of which will be relieved to a considerable extent by this Bill, is the matter of rising house building costs. Regrettably, the new Government has inherited a situation in which rising costs in this area are outstripping the increases in most other commodities.

Since June 1978, the rate of price increase of materials used in house building in Adelaide has been 38 per cent greater than the national average, and 25 per cent greater than Sydney, which recorded the second highest increase in this period. To add to this problem, South Australians in the same period received a rise in average weekly earnings that was 17 per cent lower than the national average.

Clearly, therefore, the combined effect of having the fastest rising house building costs and a lower than average rise in purchasing power has compounded the problems of the building industry, and added to the difficulties of the intending home buyer. This Bill will not solve the problem of price rises. That is not its object. But, it will offset the effect of a substantial portion of building price increases by relieving the first home buyer of a considerable tax burden.

The Bill provides for a complete exemption from duty where the consideration is \$30 000 or less. Where the consideration exceeds that amount, there will be a reduction of \$580 in the amount of duty payable. The concessions proposed in the Bill extend also to a conveyance of shares in a home unit company. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amendments will come into operation on the first day of November 1979. Clause 3 removes redundant provisions from section 71 of the principal Act.

Clause 4 enacts the new stamp duty concessions in respect of the purchase of a new home. New subsection (1) of the proposed section 71c sets out the criteria that must be satisfied if applicants are to qualify for the concession. These are as follows:

- (a) The applicants must be natural persons.
- (b) They must have entered into the contract for purchase of the land or shares to which the conveyance relates on or after 15 September 1979.
- (c) They must be the sole purchasers of the land or shares.
- (d) They must have entered into a contract for the construction of a dwellinghouse as their principal place of residence within three months of its completion, or, where there is already a dwellinghouse on the land, they must intend to occupy it as their principal place of residence within three months of the date of the conveyance.
- (e) None of the applicants may have had any previous possessory interest in a dwellinghouse.
- (f) None of the applicants is permitted to have previously received the benefit of the new provision.

The concession does not apply to a dwellinghouse that forms part of industrial or commercial premises. It will, however, apply to the conveyance of a perpetual lease.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

GIFT DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

This forms part of the Government's programme of legislative and administrative measures designed to promote economic development by reducing the incidence of State taxation. It is consequential upon the decision to abolish succession duty, for it is the Government's belief that a substantial portion of gift duty is incurred through persons dispossessing themselves of property, by gift, in order to avoid succession duty on their estates.

The object of the Bill is to exempt from gift duty all gifts made on or after the first day of January 1980. Its effect will be to enhance still further the attraction and retention of private capital funds in South Australia.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 exempts from gift duty gifts made on or after the first day of January 1980, and provides that no such gift shall be taken into account in assessing the duty on a gift made before that date.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER 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 30 October. Page 456.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have pleasure in supporting the motion. The Budget papers, of course, relate to the Budget (or the Appropriation Bill, to give it its more correct title) and the Loan Estimates for 1979-80.

Along with other honourable members on both sides who have spoken, I do not as a general rule go along entirely with the practice of considering these papers at the same time as the Address in Reply (although that debate is now over), and I do not support that idea as normal practice. However, I concede that in the present circumstances it is a wise move on this occasion.

In making a Budget speech, especially one which also relates to the Loan Estimates, honourable members may touch on almost any subject under the sun that would interest a politician or his constituents. It is possible to relate almost anything to matters referred to in such papers. So, it is possible to survey the field, so to speak, and to make a wide-ranging lengthy speech dealing with many matters of State-wide or parochial interest. I have done so on occasions in the past. However, it is not my intention to do that this time. I wish merely to deal with a few specific matters referred to in these documents, while at the same time commending this Government for bringing down what I believe is a good Budget—the best, in fact, for at least 10 years.

I want to say a few words about Education. I commend this Government for its allocation for Education through the Education Department and also through the Department of Further Education. I am very glad that we can educate our young people to the standards which many of them obtain but I do particularly applaud any emphasis which may be placed upon the basics—the three R's. A article on page 3 of today's *Advertiser* stresses the need for basic skills in primary and secondary education—a need which has been noted in our own policy—and states:

The Confederation of Australian Industry has called for greater emphasis on basics in primary and secondary education. People without adequate reading, writing and

numerical skills and those unable to communicate effectively were and would remain the disadvantaged members of society, the confederation says.

So often today one hears otherwise well educated young people unable to use the English language properly—unable to do any basic mathematics without grabbing a calculator. Certainly, advanced education is good but it needs to be on a very firm base, driven home thoroughly through primary and early secondary years.

Just as I applaud the educational opportunities provided for young people, so I approve wholeheartedly of the provision for more mature people to seek further education through the D.F.E. and I urge the Government to continue to provide adequate funding for this valuable part of the whole educational structure.

Referring to agriculture, I want to commend the Government's policy of divorcing the Agriculture and Fisheries Departments and allowing the Agriculture Department to get on with the job of doing its own thing. I believe that the policy of regionalisation and establishment of the Northern Central and Eyre regions—as commenced by the previous Government and in line to a considerable degree with the recommendations of Sir Allan Callaghan, in his most valuable report of a few years ago—is a good one, and I applaud it.

I need hardly say, following my Address in Reply speech of last week, that I support fully the Government's mines and energy policy which is in stark contrast to the "head-in-the-sand" policy of the previous Government. The encouragement of more exploration in the fields in our Far Northern areas and the positive development of these fields is also in stark contrast to the previous Government's attitude and needs the support of all thinking people.

I also refer briefly to the amount of support for the arts which I commend but the allocation of which I query. I have dealt with this matter in some detail in the past when I did not criticise the total amount provided but I did complain about what I considered to be excessive allocations in some quarters and inadequate grants in others. I do not, at this stage, propose to repeat those remarks, although to some extent they still obtain but I will have discussions with the Minister on this matter.

I pause here to consider for a moment some of the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Cornwall yesterday in what was in some ways a quite appalling speech. I will be glad if some day the honourable member is able to desist from personalities and say something sensible and constructive for a change. He spent some time yesterday denigrating the Hon. Mrs. Adamson, Hon. Mr. Hill, Hon. Mr. Cameron and myself, and also, in a statement outside the Chamber, the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, who has more than adequately answered his allegations in this place today. What right has the Hon. Mr. Cornwall to talk of incompetence when he had such a limited time as Minister?

He even complained the other day because I smiled at him—he said I looked smug and asked you, Mr. President, to "control me", when I had not said a word. He has a phobia about criticising other members. It would be very nice if the honourable member could get that very large chip off his shoulder and address himself to matters of importance and not waste time dealing in personal criticism which he does constantly. The honourable member questioned the competence of the Minister of Health. I refer to an article in today's *Advertiser* by my old friend, Mr. Stewart Cockburn, in which he states:

It would be nice to think other Ministers might follow suit and that their Labor Party opposite numbers would accept the gesture gracefully, as Dr. Cornwall has.

I suggest that, if Mr. Cockburn had read yesterday's *Hansard* pull, he would have difficulty in finding anything remotely resembling graciousness in Dr. Cornwall's comments.

The honourable member went on to give a long recital of the deficiencies in health care, medical and geriatric problems or shortcomings, as though this Government is to blame. One would think, to hear him talk, that we had been in power for the last nine years, whereas the waste and the deficiencies that have undoubtedly occurred are the responsibility of the former Labor Government—which the people have so clearly recognised.

However, no doubt members opposite would blame the "wicked" Federal Government. In nine years they never grew up as a Government; they always blamed someone else or tried to, although they were not able to escape from the probing eye of the Public Accounts Committee. The honourable member also said that we, the Liberal Party, should recognise that we are now in Government. I think it far more appropriate—and for them far more difficult—to wake up and realise that they are now in Opposition. He also said something to the effect, "The money changers in the temple should be driven out." I have to inform the honourable member, as he obviously does not realise it, that they were, in no uncertain manner, driven out on 15 September.

There are a number of other matters to which I would like to refer but I will content myself with one, the item about water resources, for which there is a total provision of \$67 600 000 out of a total Budget of over \$1 300 000 000. That is not a very great amount, perhaps, but it is a part of our development which is far more vitally important to our State than the amount of money devoted to it would indicate.

In the first instance, I wish to congratulate the Hon. Peter Arnold upon his appointment to this important portfolio, to which is also attached those of Lands, Irrigation and Repatriation, I wish him well. I am sure that it is a good appointment, also an appropriate appointment. He will do a good job.

I do not wish to dwell on the provision of filtration plants, which is proceeding, but I do want to comment on the provision of water quality as well as quantity to this State and also on the use of recycled water where appropriate. The need for further safeguards on the quality of water coming down from the other States is vital, and continuing pressure must be exercised upon New South Wales and Victoria to have more stringent controls on water entering, and all too often re-entering, the river system east of Renmark. This is vital to our survival and advancement as a State. I commend the Hon. Des Corcoran, because when he was in Government he did not neglect to exert pressure on the other States in this way. However, we did have a large quantity of poor quality water coming down from New South Wales and Victoria.

Our own house also needs to be put in order and we must take steps to ensure that water quality is not endangered by the amount of seepage back into the river from drainage evaporation basins situated close to it, causing much greater salinity and affecting very detrimentally the quality of water used for irrigation, and also used to supplement to a very large degree the domestic supplies not only to Adelaide but to large areas of the State. This salinity also affects quite markedly the efficiency of the market gardens and fruit blocks which have to use it, as the Hon. Peter Arnold would know only too well.

We have to improve the quality of water as well as the quantity and we also have to improve the efficiency of our irrigation methods. It is a long and continuing process

which cannot be achieved overnight, and plans which are afoot to rid the evaporation basins which are relatively close to the river of much highly saline drainage water, some of which, as I have said, seeps back into the main stream, will hasten the process of improving quality.

This is an important matter if this water can be drained away from drainage basins near the river and taken to an area perhaps 15 or 20 kilometres away so that the seepage will not get back into the main stream.

In a State such as ours, which is so short of water, I am also very much in favour of using recycled water wherever it is practicable and desirable to do this. If one takes the trouble to inspect the Christies Beach treatment works, for example, and examines the final product coming out of that plant, one can be amazed at the purity and clarity of the water being produced. Unfortunately, there is little or no prospect of that water being used economically in any quantity, and it is disposed of at sea a considerable distance from the shore.

However, this is not the case at Bolivar, where the surplus water is not so finely treated and is not so clear but where it has been demonstrated over fairly exhaustive tests lasting over some years to be suitable to be used particularly as a "shandy" with underground water for the irrigation of some pastures and the production of many vegetables, other than uncooked salad-type vegetables. I have mentioned this subject many times, and I make no apology for raising it again. It is a sin, in my view, to let all, or nearly all, of this water go to waste when it could be used to advantage in a country as dry as ours.

It must be 12 years since I first saw the pilot plot run by the Munno Para council and ate some of the beautiful tomatoes grown there. It is more than half that time, at least seven years, I believe, since the Hon. Tom Casey took the late Hon. Harry Kemp and myself through the trial plots conducted over a period of years by the Department of Agriculture. Very large amounts of water had been applied in some instances, with no drainage problems and very healthy plant growth.

All these trials have been carried out and yet nothing has been done and the underground basin is still very very much at risk through over-pumping, particularly in the Virginia area. This is not so, however, to anything like the same extent farther up river in the Angle Vale or Gawler River areas. To put in a large irrigation scheme covering the whole area would, admittedly, be very costly and such a scheme can be used to reject the possibility of economic use of this water, as I believe the previous Government did when it put up a large plan costing over \$20 000 000, and saying we could not afford it.

Such a scheme is not needed in the eastern areas nearer Gawler, where the water levels have been more stable and where it is reasonable to assume that they will remain so if pressure is taken off the Virginia end of the basin. It may be necessary to upgrade the water to the quality of that coming out at Christies Beach. It is most necessary, in my view, to put in a smaller scheme taking in the areas where the underground basin is most vulnerable, thus still providing relatively cheap vegetables to Adelaide on a continuing basis over many years.

How very much more costly would it be to uproot all the market gardeners and set them up on the Murray, as I had heard suggested in this Chamber, in a hot climate much more remote from Adelaide using "first time" water, that is, using more of our limited quantity of irrigation water and no underground water! It would be an enormous and impracticable cost to any Government, I suggest, and a continuing higher cost to all consumers of vegetables in the metropolitan area because of the higher costs of production and higher costs of transport. The whole of the

irrigation water would have to come directly from the Murray.

However, one day something like that could be necessary if we completely pump out the basin to dangerous levels in the Virginia area. In those circumstances, all of the irrigation water would have to come directly from the Murray River, and it would mean a further reduction in the amount of water remaining for Adelaide and other parts of the State. This scheme to set up a limited irrigation distribution in the Virginia area has been put up several times before over the last nine years and has got nowhere because of the procrastination of the previous Government. I bring it before this Government in the interests of conserving water, conserving the underground basin, keeping the costs of the Virginia area as low as possible and as stable as possible and therefore the costs of supplying fruit and vegetables to the city at reasonable levels. I support the motion.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: At page 8 of the Financial Statement by the Premier and Treasurer (Hon. David Tonkin), under the heading "State Unemployment Relief Scheme", he states:

While my Government is most concerned at the high unemployment level in this State, we do not believe that unemployment relief programmes are the most effective way of tackling the problem. We believe, strongly, that the best long-term solution in through development of the economy, expansion of the private sector and the consequent creation of permanent jobs.

Given that belief, we propose to recall to Revenue Account those funds in the Deposit Account which have not already been committed to specific projects. We expect a transfer to Revenue Account of just over \$3 000 000 in 1979-80.

This marks the death of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme and also exposes the class nature of this Budget and the hypocrisy of this Government. One does not even have to read the Premier's financial statement carefully for the intention of the Budget to become perfectly clear. This Budget is the start of the pay-off to big business for the support it gave this Government during the last election campaign.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: You do not really believe it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I believe it deeply. Not only do I believe it, but I will go on to prove it to the satisfaction of this Council. The death of the SURS scheme and the transfer of funds from that scheme into the Revenue Account will enable this Government to increase the already outrageous share of wealth that the rich have in our society.

I said that the Premier's statement exposes the Government's hypocrisy. If there was one thing that won this recent election for the Liberal Party it was the promise to take measures that would create thousands of jobs, yet the Government's first action in this Budget is to cut out a programme that actually created jobs rather than promised them. If that is not the act of a hypocrite, I do not know what is. However, I want to leave the question of unemployment and the problems that it creates in this community until a little later.

First, I want to deal with the class nature of this Budget. If one looks at the areas of the Budget that actually assist in employing people and supplying services to people, for example, public buildings, health, education, etc., one finds that there is an actual reduction in cash terms or in real terms, after allowing for inflation. It is in the areas that I have mentioned that the ordinary working people receive what has become known as the social wage.

That is their standard of living, and the quality of their lives is enhanced by a good education system and a high standard of health care. As socialists, members on this side of the Council try to raise the standards of working people in these areas at the expense of people and corporations in this State who can well afford to make some financial sacrifice in the interests of the community as a whole. We make no apologies for this, we are proud of it. Since 1965 and the start of Labor Governments in this State, we have increased enormously the standards of general services to the community, so that South Australia has gone from the position of having the worst health care and the worst education system in Australia, to having the best.

This Budget starts to reverse that process. The process for transferring the wealth of this State back to the already wealthy section of the community is the abolition of succession and gift duties. After 1 January 1980 both these taxes will be abolished. It will not matter how rich a person is or how large the gift, no tax whatsoever will be paid. This will result in a dramatic drop in State revenue and, as I have said, it will be paid for by ordinary working people through a drop in the standards of health care and education opportunities and general Government services. On page 5 of his speech the Premier states:

... we propose to hold the Public Service to a no-growth constraint in 1979-80 and to seek actual reductions in numbers of people wherever possible ... there will be a major thrust by the South Australian Health Commission to further rationalise services and reduce hospital running costs.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Premier stated:

The Public Buildings Department will be held to tight financial constraints in 1979-80. This is a first step in a longer-term plan to wind down, progressively, the activities of the department ... the Education Department and the Department of Further Education are both being held to tight financial allocations in 1979-80. The Government will be looking to a reallocation of resources, rather than to further increases in funds, to enable electoral commitments and new initiatives to be undertaken in both of these areas. So, what this Budget means to the majority of South Australians is that the long-term education prospects of their children will be damaged, and this will have an effect on their ability to lead a rich and full life and their ability to find employment once they leave school. Workers and their families who suffer from illness will find it harder to get admitted to hospital and will get poorer services when they get there. Members of the Government will not be affected, of course, because they can afford private education for their children and private hospitals for themselves and their families if they get sick.

Also, I would like to know how much will be saved by the families of members opposite through the abolition of succession and gift duties. I bet that they have in fact voted their families hundreds of thousands of dollars at the expense of the ordinary working people of South Australia. No wonder they have not stopped smiling since the election!

This Budget is a disaster for ordinary working-class people in that it does nothing to increase the availability of employment; in fact, it is quite blatant in the way it actually decreases employment opportunities. The Premier stated:

First, we propose to hold the Public Service to a no-growth constraint in 1979-80 and to seek actual reductions in numbers of people wherever possible.

He went on:

The Public Buildings Department will be held to tight financial constraints in 1979-80. This is a first step in a longer-term plan to wind down, progressively, the activities of the department.

Clearly, that illustrates the concern of the Government for jobs. It is reducing job opportunities through this Budget wherever it possibly can. At least the Government has been frank; it is going to reduce employment opportunities in this State when there is already a horrendous unemployment problem. I want to deal with the unemployment problem in some detail, because it is without doubt the biggest problem faced by the whole of the Western world, and unless something is done about the problems it is going to destroy this society as we know it. This Budget does not even recognise the problem, let alone do anything about it, except to make it worse.

Without a doubt the most impressive publication I have seen for a long time on the problems of unemployment is the booklet *Beyond Unemployment, a Statement on Human Labour*, prepared by the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace for the Catholic Bishops of Australia. No-one can suggest that this particular commission is under left-wing control or some such nonsense.

I will quote extensively from this publication because I believe it sets out the problems very well, and more importantly it gives some answers. I do not know how many members have read this booklet, but for those who have not I will read the introduction in full, which is as follows:

Unemployment is the most serious social problem in Australia today.

Long a problem in Third World countries, widespread unemployment is now a reality here as well. As in poor countries, it strikes hardest at those already disadvantaged. Its persistence and its unequal impact give rise to many questions about the way we live and work in Australia and about the way in which our society is organised. We must, then, go beyond unemployment.

We seek in this document to raise some important questions on the nature of work which have not been sufficiently examined in Australia and to make constructive suggestions for the future quality of life.

Too often the question of unemployment is spoken of as if people, ordinary men and women, were not involved. But fine-tuning an economy cannot make any human sense unless the related questions of the effects on people, wage earners and dependants, are examined. In this document we make suggestions for reform. We believe that these are minimum suggestions—the least that needs to be attempted if those in our society who seek paid employment are to be satisfied.

The suggestions we make are directed to all Australians. There is a danger that the problem of unemployment will seem so vast that the individual will feel powerless and grow apathetic. We must all care: we must all change.

The burden of the changes we advocate falls on the Government. It is our belief that only firm economic direction by the Government and firm leadership in legislation can support the victims of the unemployment crisis. Only a willingness on the part of the Government to take positive action, to marshal resources—the wealth and abilities of everyone—for the construction of a just and equitable society can rectify the misery which unemployment causes.

I want members to bear in mind that this booklet has been published by a Catholic organisation for the Catholic Bishops of Australia, and the way in which the commission has outlined the problem in that introduction is to my mind brilliant. The booklet then goes on to present us all with a challenge under the heading "Building solidarity with the unemployed", where it says:

This challenges us with the task of refashioning relationships among the different groups in society, developing a new "social contract", where account is taken of alternatives to paid employment, where the realities of the newly emerging technological age are recognised and where real consultation with different sections of society takes place to ensure that social change is not merely the aggression of one section against the other.

The background from which we speak is that of Christian belief stemming from revelation and experience. In accordance with this the Catholic Church has repeatedly insisted that the members of society are entitled to a just share of society's product. Fundamental to this is the availability of properly paid work.

The widespread unemployment which marks our society today can rightly be called a situation of great injustice. *It has been rendered worse by other injustices*—the inequitable distribution of wealth, the unplanned introduction of employment-reducing technology and the powerlessness of people to affect decisions that change their lives. What is more, *the unemployed often have to bear other injustices*—media attacks, family tensions and poverty.

For the sake of a more human society the forms of economic organisation which have been with us for a long time must change to allow access to the work force for all who want a job and a just distribution of society's wealth for everyone.

Can any member opposite say, with any honesty that this Budget does anything whatsoever to meet that challenge that unemployment presents to us all? What does this Budget do about the great injustices that the Catholic Commission points to? What does the Budget do about the unplanned introduction of employment reducing technology? Nothing whatsoever. What does it do about poverty? It increases it and the effects of it by increasing unemployment and reducing services to those who are unemployed through its cuts in education, health and welfare in general. But, most of all, I would like honourable members opposite to look at this Budget and examine it with the Christian consciences that they claim to have. When they have done that, I want them to tell me how this Budget improves the greatest injustice of all that the unemployed face, and that is what the Catholic Commission describes as "the inequitable distribution of wealth". If honourable members are honest and have any conscience at all, they will have to agree that this Budget does precisely the opposite. Through its policy of eliminating succession and gift duties, it takes wealth from those in the community who have the least, and gives it to those few people who have built up personal wealth to obscene proportions.

For people who consider themselves Christians, as members opposite do, to be associated with this kind of greed makes a mockery of the prayers they say at 2.15 p.m. each day the Parliament sits. The booklet goes on to detail who the unemployed are and what the social cost of unemployment is to them. The booklet says:

Unemployment is the most urgent social problem in Australia today. It is a problem which has a serious impact on all Australians and a destructive impact of those who are unemployed—and their dependants.

There is widely expressed concern in the community about the economic problems facing Australia; unemployment is seen as one of these economic problems. But the social dimension of unemployment is even more important than the economic dimension. For it is in the social dimension that we consider the needs and problems of people who are real and not just statistics. The social dimension is not concerned with the economics of budget deficits, money supply and gross domestic product but with the actual suffering and hardship

experienced by individuals and families in our community, those who have to bear the burden of unemployment. This social dimension is our first concern.

If members opposite agree with that statement why did they not show more concern when they drew up this Budget? Where was the Hon. John Burdett when this Budget was being discussed? As the Minister for Community Welfare, why did he not point out to his more mercenary colleagues the class nature of this Budget, and what it would do to ordinary working people by reducing jobs and Government services?

Where was his concern for the welfare of the community? No wonder, when people heard that the Hon. John Burdett was to be Minister of Community Welfare, the great cry was "God help the poor". If this Budget is any indication of the Minister's concern, then the poor are going to need all the help they can get. The booklet gives a very graphic illustration of the size of the unemployment problem in this country as follows:

Although we know these facts, it is difficult to comprehend the extent of the suffering that these statistics represent. It is difficult to visualise 446 200 unemployed Australians (January 1979 figures, ABS).

If all those people were gathered together, they would form the sixth largest city in Australia.

It is difficult for the mind to grasp that, if we had all the unemployed and their dependants in Australia living in the one place, we would have a community of people larger than Adelaide. That is today, in 1979, in one of the richest countries in the world, and all that this Government can come up with to help solve that problem is this miserable document it calls a Budget.

Although I concede readily that the scope for State Governments to do anything about the unemployment problem is limited, this State Government has, in this Budget, made the problem worse because, in the Premier's words, it is the Government's policy to reduce job opportunities. Never mind the rhetoric and all the nonsense about 7 000 and 10 000 jobs: one should look at this Government's actions. Its actions expose the words of the Government's words for what they are: lies.

The total figure relating to the unemployed fails to show that unemployment does not affect all Australians equally. Some publicity was given last week to a breakdown of where the State Unemployment Relief Scheme money went. It was claimed by the Minister of Industrial Affairs that the money was directed, in the main, to Labor-held electorates. I am sure that that is indeed how that scheme worked, but it did not work that way for political purposes. It is obvious to anyone that those Labor-held areas are the areas of greatest need. They are the areas in which the unemployment rate is highest.

I know that Opposition members would be delighted to have no unemployed people in the electorates held by them. Indeed, I live in Whyalla, and I assure honourable members that it is no fun representing people who, through no fault of their own, cannot get work. Rather than the distribution of SURS grants being political, I charge that its abolition is political. What difference will it make to the people of Mitcham, where, for example, Murray Hill lives, if there are no more SURS projects? What difference would it make in Mr. Tonkin's Bragg District or in Davenport, the seat held by the Minister of Industrial Affairs? It would make no difference whatsoever because, in the main, a wealthy section of the community lives in those areas and those people are not worried about jobs. They want SURS money transferred to them by way of the abolition of succession and gift duties so that they can pass on their wealth intact. A

political decision taken by this Government will transfer that wealth to them.

This involved a political decision in which the Hon. Mr. Hill, who in the Council has proudly admitted involvement in at least 11 family companies, participated. The Hon. Mr. Hill was a part of the decision-making process that stopped SURS and transferred that money back into Revenue Account. By that means, gift and succession duties will be abolished, and this will put much money into the pockets of people like the Hon. Mr. Hill, his family and colleagues, such as the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and the Hon. Mr. Cameron, both of whom are wealthy rural producers. Both of those people have become wealthier, because a decision taken by the Government of which they are a part transferred money from the unemployed directly into their own pockets and those of their families as a result of the abolition of succession and gift duties.

The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw is probably, along with the Hon. Mr. Hill, the most wealthy industrialist in this Parliament. That gentleman was a party to the decisions taken by the Government to cut out SURS and to stop payments under that scheme to the unemployed. I should like to know how much the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw will gain by the legislation introduced into this Council to abolish succession and gift duties.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: He will gain nothing while he's alive.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is not correct; it is possible with the gift duty abolition. I am sure that his family will be thousands of dollars better off when that legislation passes in the Council next week. This is being done at the expense of the unemployed people in this State. I should like to read a few more extracts from this remarkable booklet to which I referred and which has touched me deeply. Members opposite should obtain a copy of the book. It is so good that it may even prick their consciences, however slightly. When discussing unemployment amongst young people, a particularly hard-hit section of the community, the Catholic Commission said:

Unemployment also presents particular difficulties for young people. The emotional and mental health threats associated with unemployment come at a most critical time for young people, a time when they are attempting to establish their independence, when they are entering a new relationship with society at large, when aspirations for career and self-fulfilment are greatest. They become adults in a society which defines status and success in terms of occupation and possessions. It causes increased pressure on young people within the home: many parents have difficulty in accepting that their son or daughter simply cannot find work; consciously or unconsciously, they speak and act as if the young person were to blame. Indeed, young people are often ignorant of the true cause of their own unemployment and accept this blame.

The families of unemployed young people therefore face a difficult responsibility to reach out in love and understanding and to provide support, emotional and financial. In this, however, low income families experience greater difficulty than high income families because they do not have the means to cover the added financial burden.

So, if one really wants to feel rejected by society, one should be young, poor, and unemployed and, one could add, black and a migrant as well, as the commission shows how those people suffer disproportionately in our society.

I know that members opposite will say that the Bill now before the Council to amend the pay-roll tax provisions will help the young unemployed but, if the actions of employers are anything to go by in relation to other schemes, the main beneficiaries under this new scheme will be the employers, with their profits. The Catholic

Commission said the following regarding the type of scheme that the Government is implementing:

While considerable attention is directed to criticism of the unemployed, very little public attention is given to preventing abuses of programmes established to assist them. The Special Youth Employment and Training Programme (SYETP), for example, was designed to encourage employers to train young people, by subsidising the salaries of those newly employed for a period of four months. It appears that the subsidies are sometimes being used not to create new positions but to employ young workers in vacant positions. Some employers dismiss their young employees when the subsidy period ends and then hire a subsidised replacement. The Government is to be commended for its efforts to halt this practice by withholding subsidies from such employers.

Although this and similar practices are quite legal, they are morally reprehensible; they are worse than "dole cheating" because they not only abuse a Government benefit system but also exploit young workers with no regard for their well-being.

These employers are large and small businessmen, who are united in squeezing the system for all they can get, and in supporting the gang opposite at the last election. When such employers have made their profits out of Government hand-out schemes, they then go on to squeeze the Treasury by bludging on the rest of society by not paying their fair share of taxes.

Again, the Catholic Commission has something to say about this, as follows:

Similar comments also apply to practices of tax evasion and tax avoidance. *Complex artificial schemes which are aimed at reducing or even eliminating taxation may well be legal but they cannot be considered acceptable:* they result in increased taxation for those who cannot use such schemes, usually employees rather than employers, and in decreased revenue for the funding of government services and initiatives for the unemployed.

I will bet the proverbial London to a brick that the majority of members opposite use such schemes, and I will also make the same bet that the fact that this particular organ of the Catholic Church condemns them will make not the slightest difference. They will continue to legally cheat the State and will go their pious way to church on Sundays.

I would like to read the whole of this booklet to the Parliament, because it is well worthy of that; or perhaps it would be wasted on this Government, because it is precisely the attitudes of this Government, as illustrated by this Budget, that it is attacking.

I will not read it all, but I do want to finish with just two more quotes, because, in these two quotes, it gets right to the heart of identifying the cause of the problem and the solution. On page 11 of the booklet, it states:

The *social costs* of such large numbers of people permanently out of work in our society are compounding. The effects build upon themselves to eat away at the self-respect of the unemployed, to worsen tensions in the family and to create a gulf between the individual and the family, the family and its neighbour.

These social costs are not widely recognised. As a result, the community comes to accept short-term measures where long-term planning is needed. The problem is so vast and the power of the individual to influence outcomes so small. There is a tendency, then, to overlook the fact that attitudes, and the social behaviour which these give rise to, entrench the problem or take the cutting edge off measures aimed at reform.

Chief among these attitudes, perhaps, is the sheer greed of a large minority in this country who year by year seek to

control a larger and larger proportion of society's income. With more than half the total wealth of Australia owned by 10 per cent of the population it is not surprising that large numbers of men and women feel that they have little interest in the reform of social structures.

And who can blame them for having little faith when they see a Budget such as this which compounds the already unequal distribution of wealth in this society? My final quote from the book is this:

It is unfortunate that a system has been constructed which considers profit as the key motive for economic progress, competition as the supreme law of economics, and private ownership of the means of production as an absolute right that has no limits and carries no obligation.

That does not come from any Marxist or any Marxist journal—

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: Ha!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Dr. Ritson laughs. I suggest that he wait a moment until I tell him who said that. It was said by a previous head of the Roman Catholic Church—Pope Paul VI. I do not see the Hon. Dr. Ritson laughing now. If members opposite broadened their outlook and looked a little further than their *Financial Review*, they would appreciate that some people do have concern about those matters. That article is published in this booklet that has been praised by the Vatican. This praise was published in the *Australian* on Tuesday 30 October. It is on the front page and amongst other things the article states:

In a letter to Mr. Pollard released yesterday, the Vatican praised the commission—which is funded by bishops but is not answerable to or representative of them—for a “helpful” and “meaningful” document.

The letter calls the report “a positive contribution to the consideration” of the unemployment situation.

The letter goes on: “Your attempt to redefine the meaning of work as the meaningful service which each person renders to the community is very helpful in advancing people's reconsideration of their own attitudes towards work.

Then, your invitation to all Christians to participate in the task of fostering God's reign is a good integration of a basic Christian insight with some real, practical challenges.

If by chance some bishops visit here in Rome and express concern about this problem (unemployment) in their own jurisdiction, then we might be able to help them by sharing your statement with them.”

I would not have thought that that was any laughing matter.

The booklet says quite strongly that the way society is structured today is “unfortunate”. A masterly understatement, but we all know what it means. It means that capitalism as a way of ordering society has had it. It no longer meets any of the needs of the mass of ordinary people in the world. I have been saying that for 25 years with little effect and I am delighted that a group as conservative as Catholics are saying the same thing.

Budgets such as this will be the death of this Government. I see it as rope with which the Government will hang itself. It is increasingly unacceptable in society to take from those who have little to fatten the wallets of those who have plenty. There is no doubt that the A.L.P. annoyed a large section of this community by calling an early election and we are paying the price. Not only are we paying the price, but also this Budget will ensure that the majority of South Australia also pays the price of this Government's anti-working class policies. After three Budgets like this one, I am sure the people of this State will say that the price of Liberalism is too high and return the Labor Party to office to ensure a more humane and

compassionate administration of this State during very difficult times.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I rise to speak to the motion that this Council take note of the Budget papers. However, I am unable to avoid commenting on the remarks just made by the Hon. Mr. Blevins. This Chamber has witnessed the constitution of a Marxist theory out of the mouths of a lot of non-Marxists. It has been an exercise in cutting up the Bible and gluing the sentences together in order to make something totally different. We have seen bits of the commission's report read to the Chamber very piously. They are very good aims, but the conclusion that the honourable member has come to is that the aims are achievable only by Marxism. One can look at the issues he has dealt with. If one owns a copy of the Communist manifesto and reads it, one will see that it is all there.

I refer to the appropriation of income from lands to the State, the abolition of all rights of inheritance, and a heavy and progressive scale of income tax. Karl Marx wrote this in 1848. The Hon. Mr. Blevins has made quotes from his Holiness the Pope and has stuck them all together to produce the manifesto. We all know that the aims of the Hon. Mr. Blevins, the Labor Party, the Liberal Party and the Catholic Commission are good and just. We want to help the people to achieve the social justice that is their right.

However, I believe that Marx, although he cared about people, was wrong, and that Marxism did not work, as it has not worked in many socialist countries that have had political purges of millions of people. I do not like long and complicated arguments that are put up into different sentences, shovelled together, and put as the Communist manifesto, but that is what we have heard. Unfortunately, despite the strong point of most religious people that they wish to do good, they have a weak point. That is that in their goodness they are susceptible to package deals by people like Marx, who do evil.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Are you saying that the Vatican is stupid and has been taken in?

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: No, you are saying that. In speaking to these Budget papers, I will centre my comments on one part of the Premier's statement. At page 4 he stresses the importance of the development of Roxby Downs. The State Liberal Party published a very clear policy prior to the recent State election which proposed to permit the mining and export of uranium. As I understand it, further action on this matter is dependent not so much on legislation as on Executive action, so the matter is not all that relevant to the legislative function of this Council.

However, as we all know, Parliament has other functions, including expressive, educative and propaganda functions, and, because the Opposition has continued to use this place to mount the most irrational and confusing propaganda against Government policy, it is necessary to defend that Government policy and elevate this debate to the plane of right reason, where it belongs.

Mr. President, in evaluating the various arguments, it is terribly important to understand the thought process known as value judgment. Uranium mining is dangerous and, of course, nuclear power stations are dangerous, the electricity derived from them is dangerous, motor cars are dangerous, and coal mining is dangerous, but, in view of the fact that almost everything is dangerous and nothing is absolutely safe, the vital question is what value do we gain from uranium mining at what risk.

By way of example, value judgment is involved if one has to decide whether \$10 is too much to pay for a meat pie or whether \$20 is too cheap for a tweed suit, and the

judgment is never as simple as it first appears, because a meat pie at \$10 might be good value in a starvation situation and a tweed suit might be worthless in the Sahara Desert.

In our society we seem to accept the dangers of a hydrocarbon economy with an almost blase indifference. Mr. President, imagine picking up your newspaper to see the headlines "Nuclear Power Station Accident; 30 killed, 300 injured", and four weeks later seeing the very same, and again and again, a similar accident occurring once a month in Australia alone. That is how bad the nuclear industry would have to be before it would be as dangerous as the Australian roads. To be as dangerous as the motor car world-wide, the nuclear industry would have to produce a reactor melt down somewhere in the world several times each week.

So far, I have compared the nuclear industry only with road crashes. What about the other hazards of the hydrocarbon economy? An oil tanker explosion devastates a town in Ireland; a gas tanker incinerates dozens of holiday-makers in Spain, and literally tens of thousands of people die each year as a result of industrial atmospheric pollution. We seem to think it is worth the price.

I grieve very much for the people who were killed by the nuclear accident at Three Mile Island. I know some people will say that no-one was killed or injured in that accident, but there were some deaths. I grieve for the miners who will die, the oil-workers, the divers on off-shore rigs, and the people with bronchitis: all those good people who will die to replace the electricity lost by the closure of Three Mile Island. The demonstrated safety record of the nuclear industry and its attendant mining operations puts to shame the safety record of other established heavy industries.

All this, of course, has absolutely nothing to do with the issue of uranium mining in South Australia, because we are not proposing to build a nuclear power economy. The population trends and degree of industrialisation do not warrant that in South Australia at present. All we are proposing is to sell uranium to friendly nations who, by virtue of their greater dependence on industrial sophistication, already have established nuclear power stations.

By offering to sell uranium to countries such as Japan, North America, France and Britain, we are merely offering to trade on favourable terms and give these nations some of the cost advantages of our quality ore, and at the same time gain very significant economic advantages for this State. I can see from some of the Questions on Notice that the A.L.P. is trying to downgrade and deny the magnitude of the advantages of mining Roxby Downs. I can see this from the statement that few jobs will be created directly in the industry in relation to the size of the investment.

It is terribly funny that A.L.P. politicians are so devoted to worship of the multiplier effect, and always remind people to this effect in relation to increased Government spending, but just do not want to know about it in relation to the influx of overseas money, and the multiplier effect of mineral royalties is enormous, as anyone living in Queensland and Western Australia will agree.

To summarise thus far, we have a situation in which our overseas friends are seeking favourable trade with us to assist their peaceful industry, which has a safety record demonstrably better than thermal power production, and a small section of our community is mounting a vicious attack to the detriment of our economy and that of our trading partners. Unfortunately, the propaganda and, in some cases, lies of the minority of political agitators have managed to unsettle and disturb a large number of sincere

people who genuinely wish to assess all the risks before proceeding with uranium mining, and it is not to these sincere doubters that I direct my criticism. After all, an essential part of any value judgment is the assessment of risk.

However, I do want to attack some ideas that I believe have been spread abroad by a small band of political activists who have no concern for the truth and every concern for the seduction of the minds of the innocent doubters.

What are some of these false notions? The first falsehood is that the uranium miners will get cancer. The truth is that, as a result of surveys of miners who worked with uranium in the 1950's, it is arguable but not certain that, due to exposure to radon gas, they may be subject to increased risk of lung tumours in later life. The risks of radon gas were not understood 20 years ago, and it does not follow that in future miners will be subject to the same risk.

The second falsehood is that by selling uranium we are encouraging overseas countries to adopt a nuclear economy. The truth is that these countries will use uranium from whatever source they can get it. They are already committed but would prefer to "buy Australian".

The third falsehood is that Australia is somehow involved in a waste disposal problem, but the truth is that the majority of scientific opinion is that the synroc process will be safe. The main reason why it is not yet in use is that the nuclear countries do not yet have enough waste to warrant drilling a hole. Australia does not yet have any high level waste and will not have any problem unless we expand immensely, and only in fantasyland and after half a century, might we find ourselves closing down dozens of spent reactors in the twenty-first century, thereby requiring deep burial of wastes.

The fourth falsehood is that our export uranium could somehow be stolen by a terrorist and turned into bombs. The truth is that only a few kilograms of purified uranium are required to make a bomb.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Surely you mean plutonium.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: Yes, you are right. Only a few kilograms of the products of purified uranium are required to make a bomb. The techniques of refining the ore to "weapons grade" material are so sophisticated and require such an immense engineering and technological organisation that it would be easier for a terrorist group to steal an existing nuclear weapon than to steal some uranium and refine it and make a weapon.

The fifth falsehood is that third world countries might steal our ore and make weapons. The truth is that once a country has the technology to refine uranium to "weapons grade" it does not matter where it gets its uranium from. Uranium exists in every part of the world. Japan is extracting it from seawater. Availability of uranium is the least limiting factor in weapons technology.

I could go on and on about the falsehoods but I must move on now to examine the question of those who are spreading these fibs. What are their general political beliefs and what is their ultimate motive?

These people are not specifically identified with the A.L.P. because, as we all know, a number of highly educated, highly intelligent and well respected non-Marxist members of the A.L.P. have taken a realistic attitude and advocated mining of Australian uranium. Mr. Bob Hawke's attitude is well known and realistically in agreement with uranium mining.

I am sure members of the Opposition will recall Mr. Hugh Hudson's valiant attempts to persuade his Party to be objective on this matter and, as the Hon. Martin Cameron pointed out in the Address in Reply debate, the

newspapers of yesteryear were full of the most favourable pro-uranium pronouncements by our former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, before he had his mind changed by other elements within his Party.

Where does the anti-uranium lobby come from? I submit that it a derivation of Marxist-Communist ideology. In a socialist magazine appropriately called *Pink*, a former Labor Attorney-General, subsequently turned Health Minister, and now a mere member of Parliament in another place, advocated, as legitimate agents of the left, the women's movement, coloured people's movements and the anti-uranium lobby.

Again, in mid-1978, writing in the Communist newspaper *Tribune* this same person left no doubt as to where his political allegiance lay. The politics of uranium is the politics of the left, and the people who oppose our uranium mining do not really care about safety. They are vociferous about disposal of British and European nuclear waste but silent about Russian nuclear waste. They are the same people who pretend to care for Aborigines but they are not busy caring for Aborigines: they are busy finding a new sacred rock in the middle of each mining lease. They are the same people who filled our streets with concerned rioters out of compassion for the sufferings of the Vietnamese people under the heel of the American oppressors.

Now that the Communists control Vietnam, it is apparently a much nastier place to live, as judged by the rate at which Vietnamese are fleeing their country, but the Marxists are silent. The politics of uranium is the politics of Marxist-Communist ideology and has nothing to do with the wellbeing of South Australia, but has everything to do with the disruption of the economies of the Western capitalist nations.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I, too, support the motion. First, I wish to make some remarks about the abolition of succession duties, which is indicated in the Budget and evidenced by the Bill introduced in this Council today. I regard this as a backward step, and one with many implications that we will live to regret.

On a financial level it is obvious that this measure will have little effect this year. Last year about \$16 000 000 was raised and the amount raised this year is expected to be only \$1 000 000 or \$2 000 000 less than last year, because the abolition of that duty will not take place until half-way through the financial year, and it can take even longer than six months to settle most estates after death.

I agree that the Government mentioned the abolition of succession duties in its policy, but I am personally opposed to that policy in principle, both on theoretical and practical grounds. On a theoretical level I still maintain that equality of opportunities between individuals is impossible if one has large inherited wealth. A basic definition of democracy provides that every person, every citizen, is of equal worth and should have equal importance in the community.

This is impossible if a certain proportion benefit from large inheritances. It is anomalous to me that many people do not oppose the principle of income tax, yet they oppose inheritance taxation.

Income tax applies to all workers in the community, whereas inheritance tax applies only to those with considerable assets. In any case, inheritance taxes have started at a much higher level than income taxes, and their abolition will be of great benefit only to a small wealthy section of the community. I have mentioned some of these facts in a previous debate in Parliament, but they are so important that it is worth repeating them.

A United Kingdom Royal Commission was established

to inquire into the distribution of wealth and income. Amongst other things it looked at the whole question of inheritance and the distribution of wealth in that country. I intend to refer to the appendices of that report.

In 1973, which is not long ago, they found that 25 per cent of all the personal wealth in the United Kingdom had been inherited or received as a gift. It was not the result of personal exertion on the part of the people concerned. Further, the distribution of this inherited wealth was extremely unequal. The top 1 per cent of the population in the United Kingdom, in terms of ownership of personal wealth, inherited 75 per cent of their wealth. The top 2 per cent to 5 per cent of the population in the United Kingdom, in terms of ownership of wealth, while they owned 22 per cent of the personal wealth of the country, had in fact inherited or been given 52 per cent of the assets that they own. Again, that was not the result of personal exertion. It can be seen quite definitely that most of the wealthy people in the United Kingdom are not wealthy through their own personal exertion, but because of inheritance and gifts. However, people here argue that it is necessary to abolish succession duties to maintain incentives for personal exertion. The figures that I have quoted indicate that that is utter nonsense.

No such study has been conducted into inheritance and wealth in Australia, but Raskill's work indicates that about half of the wealthy men in Australia have inherited or been given a large proportion of their wealth. I remind honourable members that the sex ratio of wealth distribution in this country favours men 2:1 in the older age groups, and it is even more unbalanced in the younger age groups, where it is 8:1.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Where did you get those figures?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Raskill's study, which appears in the *Journal of Political Economy*, 1978, No. 2, published in April 1978.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have never heard Raskill's figures challenged by anyone.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You just did.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That is, challenged with evidence. In South Australia 64 per cent of estates pay no succession duty at all. Another 11 per cent pay succession duty of less than \$500 each. Therefore, 75 per cent of estates pay nothing or a trivial amount, and that is hardly a great imposition on the vast majority of people. During the recent State election campaign the Labor Party said that it would raise the exemption levels for certain types of succession duty. That exemption level would have been \$20 000 for adult children and up to \$50 000 for children under the age of 18. (All members would be aware that the Australian Labor Party abolished succession duty between spouses in 1976.) This proposal, if implemented, would have meant that at least 70 per cent of estates in South Australia would pay no duty at all, and a further 10 per cent pay a trivial amount only. Therefore, most of the succession duty raised would have been paid by the top 20 per cent of the population, who are the people best able to afford it. Unfortunately, the current proposal before us will mean that succession duty is abolished and it should be made quite clear that the benefits will go to the top 20 per cent of the population only, which for the vast majority of the population will not change the situation at all. Therefore, 80 per cent of the population would have paid virtually nothing under the Labor proposal.

It should also be noted that we are implementing proposals that make us different from all the other O.E.C.D. countries. In all European countries, except Ireland, and in North America there are not only income

taxes and inheritance taxes but also either a capital gains tax or a wealth tax, or both. Australia is really the odd man out in not getting the wealthy to pay their share of the tax revenue. Consequently, a greater proportion of revenue is raised from the low income groups, either through income tax, regressive sales taxes or other similar measures. I believe the Government's proposal will make South Australia a sort of banana republic and a paradise for the wealthy few who do not pull their weight in contributing to community services. Fraser certainly looks after his friends, and Dr. Tonkin is doing likewise in South Australia, while trying to con people into believing that all the community will benefit through the abolition of succession duties, instead of only a wealthy few.

There has been a lot of talk about tax revolt in this country and in the United States. I am certainly not surprised that those people on lower or middle incomes are revolting against taxation when such a large proportion of the tax burden is being borne by them and not by the wealthy who could afford it far more easily. We should agitate for our Federal Government to shift the tax burden to the wealthy few, and we should roundly condemn the Tonkin Government for abandoning one of the few progressive taxes available. The result of this proposal will mean a decrease in community services or increased regressive taxes or double taxation schemes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What do you call double taxation?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: By double taxation I mean two taxes imposed on the same income. Your comparison of a State surcharge on income tax with land tax and other such methods is quite invalid. Double taxation means two lots of taxes on the one income.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why income? Why not have two taxes on something else? Isn't that double taxation, too?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The State Government does not tax income, as is being proposed by Fraser, but I would not be surprised if we see it in next year's Budget in South Australia. I would now like to put forward for consideration a novel way of considering taxation, which was discussed at a meeting I recently attended. The speaker at that meeting suggested that personal taxation should not necessarily be regarded as providing services for others; that view can lead to selfishness and stinginess by certain people. Rather, he said that we should regard taxation as payment for services and support for oneself in non-earning years. The taxes that we pay while we are working can be regarded as returning to the community what has been paid for our education and maintenance when we were young and can be considered as an advance payment on our maintenance, pensions, medical care, and so on, when we are old. The higher the standard of education that we receive, and the higher the standard of care we expect when we retire, the more taxes we have to pay while working. We should pay those taxes willingly as our own standard of living is involved. Further, our taxes would have to be a much higher proportion of our income now and in the future than in past decades.

Not long ago the average person left school at the age of about 15, worked until he was 65 and died at about 68. Therefore, the taxes that were paid during the 50 years of working life were a repayment for a total of 18 years when the community supported the individual. However, education now extends for longer periods, and often until age 20. Retirement will increasingly occur at younger ages of perhaps 60 and even 55. Life expectancy is increasing and many people live to be 75 or 80.

It is predicted that we may all suffer periods of unemployment throughout our working lives. So, we may

well arrive at a situation where, for 40 years out of 80 years, we are earning and paying taxes as a support for perhaps a total of 40 years of non-earning. Viewed in this light, it is inevitable that taxation will affect a larger proportion of our earnings, and generally we should welcome this as a provision for our own standard of living when we are not earning. I wonder whether such a view could generally be accepted in the community, thereby removing all the silly talk about tax revolts occurring in this country.

I turn now to the unemployment situation, and endorse the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Blevins in this regard. This must surely be a problem that causes much worry to anyone who has any spark of humanity in him. The September 1979 unemployment figures show an increase on the situation that obtained 12 months ago. The latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show 398 000 people unemployed compared to 384 000 people unemployed 12 months ago. Furthermore, hidden unemployment has been estimated at about 300 000 people. Surveys have shown that between one-quarter and one-third of housewives come into the category of hidden unemployed. They are so beaten and demoralised by knock-backs when looking for work that they give up trying. They do not register with the Commonwealth Employment Service because they are not eligible for the dole. They do not look for work because they have been unsuccessful so often. Therefore, they are not counted as unemployed by either the Australian Bureau of Statistics or the Commonwealth Employment Service.

We know, too, that the time out of work for unemployed people is increasing. Three years ago, the average unemployment period was about three months. Now, it is over 6½ months. Among the O.E.C.D. countries, only Canada has a higher unemployment rate than Australia at present. Any study of the figures shows that the problem of unemployment is even more important for young people and women. In September, 4.4 per cent of people over 20 years of age were unemployed, but there was 18.8 per cent unemployment for those aged between 15 and 19 years. There was a 6.2 per cent overall unemployment rate, which hides the tremendous problem experienced by young people. We say that 6.2 per cent are unemployed, ignoring the fact that for young people the unemployment rate is 18.8 per cent. Mr. Viner's attempts to make parents support their children until they are 19 or 20 years will certainly improve the unemployment figures, but it will do nothing for the desperate young people who are looking for work.

Regarding the differences between the sexes, the figures show that overall in the month of September this year 4.9 per cent of males and 8.4 per cent of females were unemployed. The female rate is nearly double that for males. This was despite the hidden unemployment related mainly to females. For the young people, the situation is even more pronounced. One month ago, the unemployment rate for males between 15 and 19 years was 15.6 per cent, and for females in the same age group the unemployment rate was 22.9 per cent. Nearly one-quarter of all young females are unemployed!

For overseas-born young people in this country, the situation is even worse. The unemployment rate for males in this category was 21.6 per cent compared to a rate of 25.9 per cent for females, which approaches the sort of figures that applied in the great depression. Truly, it can be said that, to be young, overseas born, and female in this country is a recipe for disaster.

The cost to our community of this unemployment is enormous, not only in monetary terms, in waste of production, but also in human terms. It is a social

catastrophe, with the destruction of idealism and enthusiasm destroying all feelings of self-worth for young people and of their being a part of the community. These young people will feel that they are social outcasts rejected and spurned by their society. We must expect a steep rise in anti-social behaviour, and sever maladjustment and psychiatric problems in future.

The solution to these problems obviously lies mainly with the Federal Government, which is evading its responsibilities. It does little but mouth platitudes and cut grants for programmes like CYSS and SYEPT, which try to alleviate problems for the young. However, at the State level, much can be done, too. I do not mean in this respect the cuts of \$3 000 000 in pay-roll tax that will apply when the Bill now before the Council becomes law. I am prepared to predict that these incentives to get private employers to take on young people will not do much. No-one in his right mind would suggest that this would result in anything like 7 000 extra jobs being created for young people, as promised in the Liberal Party's election campaign. I am certainly pleased to see that the CITY scheme is being continued.

However, I am appalled at the abolition of SURS, which has done so much to help the unemployed and which has, incidentally, benefited everyone by the worthwhile projects that have been undertaken. I remind honourable members that the South Australian Labor Government was the only State Government in this country to have such a scheme. The Federal Government would not even reimburse the State Government for the dole payments that it saved as a result of that scheme.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Why did we have the highest unemployment?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Because we had the highest percentage of the work force in the manufacturing sector, which was the hardest hit. The sum of \$50 000 000 has been spent on SURS, and last year more than \$9 000 000 was spent on it. I cannot help but compare this with the \$3 000 000 cut in pay-roll tax, which will result from a Bill now before the Council. It is obvious that the Liberal Government is doing less than the Labor Government did to help the unemployed. We can predict that the number of new jobs created by the pay-roll cuts will be less than the number of jobs created through SURS, as a result of which unemployment in South Australia will increase.

It is relevant also to mention the position of homeless teenagers, whose plight has already been discussed in the Council this session. A Melbourne survey showed that there were 15 000 homeless teenagers in that city. On a *pro rata* basis, we might expect between 4 000 and 5 000 such people in South Australia. We do not know how many such people there are in Adelaide, and the Minister does not even want to find out. The Melbourne survey showed that most of these homeless teenagers were unemployed and, as most of them were also under 18 years, they were trying to exist on \$36 a week. That pitiful dole payment has not been increased since 1975.

These young people have been thrown out by their families or are unable for various reasons to live at home. They are sleeping in parks, and are living a miserable, hungry existence. Various people to whom I have spoken in Adelaide do not know of any homeless teenagers sleeping in the parks and doorways of this city.

I am astonished that the Minister is so unconcerned that he will not even do a survey here to find out the extent of the problem. I point out that, in general, the treatment of unemployed people in this country is shocking. A few international comparisons should drive this home to us. Our Government is neither doing anything to get jobs for them nor looking after them adequately while they are

unemployed. A few surprising facts emerge from a document which I read recently. It expresses the standard unemployment benefit as a percentage of the average weekly earnings for various countries. In Italy the unemployment benefit is 67 per cent of the average weekly earnings; in Canada it is 63 per cent; in West Germany it is 60 per cent; in Japan it is 60 per cent; in the United States it is 50 per cent; and, in the United Kingdom it is 38 per cent, although it is increased by supplementary benefits after a period so that it would often rise above 38 per cent of average weekly earnings. On the other hand, in Australia the unemployment benefit is 24 per cent of average weekly earnings—a shameful proportion when compared with that given in most civilised countries. I realise that average weekly earnings may be higher in this country than in some countries I have mentioned. However, the unemployment benefit is a mere 24 per cent, whereas other countries can provide up to 67 per cent of average weekly earnings as an unemployment benefit.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Fifty per cent of the average English wage would not be very much, would it?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It would be a lot more than the 24 per cent of Australian average weekly earnings, which is all that is given in this country. We are really grinding down the unemployed in this country and making them suffer inordinately relative to the rest of the community, and all for something which is not their fault. We must appear to be one of the most callous and uncaring societies on earth. I blame the Liberal Party, particularly those at Federal level, but also those at the State level for encouraging this attitude to casualties of their mismanagement.

[Sitting suspended from 5.33 to 7.45 p.m.]

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Before the dinner adjournment I was discussing unemployment in the country at present and the serious effects it is having on our community, both social and economic. Now I would like to consider briefly some aspects concerning the future. I am sure we would all realise that one of the big worries and threats to our society is technological change. A French Finance Ministry report to President Giscard d'Estaing states that 30 per cent of jobs in banking, insurance, and the clerical Public Service will go in the next decade, and the Siemens Corporation study in West Germany agrees that one-third of all office jobs will vanish in the next 10 years.

The implications are frightening, particularly for females, who already have nearly double the unemployment rate of males and who have had a large proportion of jobs in these areas that are predicted to be reduced so significantly. There has been little study done in Australia on the effect of technological change, but there has been one study by the New South Wales Institute of Technology on the effects of computer use, not on all technological change.

This study estimates that already 282 000 full-time jobs have been obliterated by computers and that 15 per cent of office workers have already been displaced. The study also predicts that this will increase to 30 per cent of all office jobs. True, 77 000 new jobs have been created in servicing and programming computers, but we have a net loss of about 150 000 jobs due to computer use in Australia. It certainly is very serious to replace tertiary sector jobs by technological change. No international pressures are involved, as there is no trade in the products of the tertiary sector.

I can understand the world market situations requiring technological change in the primary and secondary sectors, but that is not true of the tertiary sector, which has

absorbed and created so many jobs in the past two decades. This sector of the economy could well remain labour intensive for the sake of the jobs it creates, as there is no international competitive market for its products. I am not against technology *per se*, but it needs to be controlled and we need to get our priorities right.

In Japan, I understand, there are 1 900 000 people in the food retail sector, and many of these could be replaced by technology, but they have not been. There has been a conscious decision not to replace people with machines in a sector of the economy that does not face international competition. Meanwhile, Japan manufactures and exports machines that are destroying jobs in the tertiary sector in other countries. In Sweden, it is conscious Government policy to create jobs in the services sector as technology replaces workers in the manufacturing sector. The result is that there is only 2.5 per cent unemployment, with many more positions created mainly at local government level in the services sector.

However, in Australia, automation is occurring mainly not in the industries that should increase their exports (that is according to the Crawford Report) but in areas like banks and insurance, where there is no overseas competition. That is a crazy set of priorities or the *laissez faire* attitude of the Fraser Government. A.L.P Governments have promised to monitor and guide technological change. At the recent election, the State A.L.P. policy contained a promise to establish a Technological Division in the Department of Labour and Industry to tackle the problem at State level. What, if anything, will the Liberal Government do in this area?

One proposal I heard put forward at a seminar last weekend dealt with how to restructure Australian industry in a way that was efficient and desirable. Doubtless, this will come as a surprise to honourable members. Professor R. Blandy, of Flinders University, put forward the notion that in South Australia we should fence off the Peninsula, with Outer Harbor on it, throw in Torrens Island and Garden Island for good measure, and make this a free trade area or a tariff-free zone such as exists in several Asian countries, like the Philippines, Taiwan, and South Korea. Industries would set up on this 20 square miles of largely vacant land, and market forces alone would determine what industries would be established.

Tariffs and quotas would apply to any goods imported to Australia from this area, so one might expect mainly export-oriented industries to be established. Professor Blandy gave few details of how he expected such a customs-free zone to operate, except that he said that it would cost us nothing (the power, railway lines, etc., being there already), that Australian award wages still would apply, and that there might be environmental and pollution problems to solve. He also said that it might be difficult to persuade the Federal Government to establish such an experiment.

He certainly did not say a word about what the reaction might be from workers, unions or the public to this proposal. Most of the audience at the seminar were horrified at the proposal, as indeed I was. Recently, I read in *Nation Review* of 30 August of the operation of such a customs-free zone in the Philippines. It was written by Russell Rollason, of the Australian Council of Churches, and I will quote some of his article. It states:

The Bataan Export Processing Zone (BEPZ) is the show piece of the Marcos Government's industrialisation programme for the Philippines. Established in 1969, the BEPZ is "a modern industrial complex designed for export-oriented industry".

That is the same aim as Professor Blandy had. The report continues:

The long list of incentives aimed at enticing foreign investment to the BEPZ includes admission of 100 per cent foreign owned or controlled enterprises, tax-free and duty-free importation of capital equipment, exemption from export tax as well as local taxes and licences, and low-cost land, power, water and other service utilities.

But it is cheap labour that gives the Philippines the edge over its neighbours in South-East Asia. As President Marcos stressed in a speech to the Central Bank in 1974: "Our country has one of the lowest wage levels in this part of the world . . . We intend to see to it that our export programme is not placed in jeopardy at an early stage by a rapid rise in the general wage level."

He is proud of it! Is Professor Blandy really suggesting that we allow such conditions in a portion of South Australia, giving an open invitation to multi-nationals, who would naturally export their entire profits? Duty-free importation of capital equipment would in no way help Australia's heavy industry; rather, it would further depress it.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Australian companies could do it.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: With duty-free importation? It would be cheaper to import. With no local taxes or licences, those industries would repay nothing to the South Australian community, even at as lowly a level as council rates. Low-cost land, power and water would mean that the South Australian community would be subsidising the profits of multi-nationals, but with no return to us at all.

I could quote much more from this article on the exploitation of workers in the Philippines, and refer to how they are paid starvation wages, have appalling living conditions, are not allowed to belong to unions, are hired as apprentices for six months on even lower wages, and are then sacked to avoid payment of miserable full award wages. I could refer to how they have only five days annual leave, of which no two days can be taken consecutively. What sort of annual leave provision is that? And so it goes.

I am sure that Professor Blandy did not envisage such conditions applying to Australian workers on Torrens Island in his customs-free zone, but it is also clear from what one reads that it is the open invitation to treat workers in that fashion that makes such zones attractive to international capital in Asia.

With proper conditions for workers applying in Australia I doubt whether such a project could get off the ground, no matter how much the Government might wish to sell its soul (and ours) in the other "incentives" mentioned. I am sure our community would never stand for the loss of nationhood and self-respect inherent in the proposal.

I only mention what to me is such an unacceptable and horrendous idea because Professor Blandy has been appointed since the election, I believe, as Chairman of the South Australian Committee on Manpower Planning. Let us hope that his committee does not start adopting proposals of this nature, or attempting to persuade the Tonkin Government of their spurious worth. Otherwise, we will have divisiveness and dissension in the community, if not civil war. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I support the motion. It seems that the Budget of the new Government has got away to a sound beginning, the previous Labor Government having left a surplus of \$600 000; indeed, this is a sign of most successful and sound management of the State's economy by Des Corcoran's Government.

The Corcoran Government never denied that the State was under some strain, mainly as a result of actions of a Federal nature and from other influences outside the control of any Australian Government. There were signs that the economy was improving, but they did not surface

until after the election. In fact, what has happened in South Australia in the past year or so has happened previously in all the States in turn. It took other States some time to work their way out of their problems, and it will take South Australia some time to work its way out of its problem, but that improvement will not result because of this Budget's provisions. The Liberal election slogan was "Let's make this State great again". What is in the Budget to make South Australia great again?

When I look at the Budget I can see nothing that favours the people of South Australia, although I can see favours for the capital that flees the State; at least, that is what the Liberal Party said was happening when it was in Opposition. In those days they had the capital, and the owners of capital were fleeing in large numbers to the oppressive weather (for a least part of the year) in regressive Queensland.

If there was any truth in what was then said, Queensland deserves those people and they deserve Queensland. The stated aim of the Budget is to lead a recovery in all sectors of the South Australian economy, but the intended payroll tax exemptions are a favour to the employers that will have much the same effect or result as some of the previous subsidised schemes that benefited the employing fraternity.

I am surprised how naive many people are (I know that they want only to see the best in everyone). Certainly, it takes some time to realise just how ruthless and merciless some employers are. Some employers give little or no thought to the satisfaction or happiness of their employees: profit is the main element of all business enterprises.

Under previous employment encouragement systems, it was common practice for industry to engage people who were unemployed because the Government was willing to subsidise their training for up to six months. Of course, it was expected that employers would then be willing to employ those trained in a full-time capacity at industry's expense. Instead, those workers were fired and employers looked for other unemployed people to exploit and then proceeded to go through the whole rigmarole again. The only sufferers and the only people disadvantaged were the employees.

Certainly, the new scheme is a little different, but it serves the employer to more advantage than previous schemes. It has a little additional stability built in, as it will get several years' work out of the employees with minimum disturbance to factory regimen. Honourable members should take into account that in many cases factory managements claim that their factories are working at much less than full capacity, and others claim that their products spend too long in storage. Shopkeepers complain about slow sales, and the Chairman of David Jones was reported in last week's *Advertiser* as saying how dead the whole industry was. He laid the blame fairly and squarely at the foot of the Australian Government in Canberra.

If South Australia is unable to sell or barter what it is already producing, it is hardly likely that an employer will reap the benefits of the new tax incentives, unless he sacks employees over 20 years of age in order to employ people under 20 years of age. The Liberal Government has an obligation to its outside masters. The employers did not subscribe to all that pre-election advertising without being promised some reward. It is a crying shame that that reward has to be at the expense of the already underprivileged people in our community.

Where the unemployed are concerned, we believe in a different principle. It was our object to spread the benefits as widely as possible. It may not have been the "be all and

end all" of the employment problem, but it certainly brought hope to those people who had been constantly seeking employment and who seemed to be permanently disappointed. It was not permanent employment, but it raised them above the level of relief or the dole, as it is commonly called, if only for a short time. It gave them hope and experience so that they could seek employment in the future with confidence. Not only that, the community gained a great deal from those funds and many valuable and progressive schemes were carried out, resulting in more pleasant and satisfying living areas. There would have been little hope of funding such schemes in other ways.

I consider the withdrawal of SURS funds as a major blow to the community. The Government made a number of election promises and said that it would help solve employment problems. Among those promises was the development of Roxby Downs, and it led the people to believe that that project would happen the day after the election. It has not happened yet, and it will not happen for quite a few years. Even though it is some years off, it will probably do more for unemployment than what will eventuate from the intended scheme.

Of course, the withdrawal of those funds is not the only blow to the community that becomes apparent with the election of the Liberal Party to Government. The Minister of Local Government has declared his intention to disband the Department of Community Development, and that is another serious blow to the community. I do not believe that local government can find the money to service the facilities provided by the department through local government. I have a great deal of sympathy and understanding for local government, but it would be unable to handle the administrative costs associated with such a scheme, resulting in a deterioration in local government. It is not much good giving new laws and new independence unless subsidies are provided that will assist in bettering the community. Local government will fall back into the same old pattern that was its burden in all the years prior to 1970.

The Federal Government found that it had to provide some funding for local government and consequently we now have a Grants Commission which disperses these Federal funds, which were first granted by a Federal Labor Government, to councils. Councils have made good use of these much needed funds, yet the present Government has said that in the future it hopes appropriate bodies in local government will be assisted by local government authorities themselves, using funds from the Grants Commission. I wonder to what lengths this Government will go. What is it doing with the money it collects in taxes? With its concessions on death duties, gift duties, pay-roll tax and so on it is certainly giving something back to the wealthy, but in other things this Government wants the community to pay again over and above moneys already paid in taxes.

In this morning's *Advertiser* I read that Mr. Hill was out begging for \$100 000 for the Constitutional Museum. I believe that the Government itself should provide the museum for all of the people and that, if people have money to subscribe to charitable concerns or needy causes, then let them offer it to hospitals, schools and welfare institutions, because this Government has been busy depriving these organisations of the entitlements that allow them to operate efficiently and for the benefit of the whole community.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I support the motion to note the Budget papers. The Government has been very fortunate to have the opportunity to present its first

financial measures at a time when South Australia's economic position is basically sound and improving. All the economic indicators show that our economy has been undergoing an upturn during this year. For example, the Australian Bureau of Statistics Civilian Employees Bulletin states that private employment in this State rose by 1.17 per cent from January to June this year. During the same period overtime in South Australian factories rose by an average 46 per cent compared to the same period last year, according to the Commonwealth Employment Service monthly bulletin. Another important indicator is the number of job vacancies. According to the Commonwealth Employment Service, unfilled job vacancies seasonally adjusted rose by 18.5 per cent during January to June this year. And they have risen by another 13.5 per cent in July and August, making an overall increase of 34.5 per cent since the second half of last year. Job advertisements in the *Advertiser* have risen by 8.5 per cent seasonally adjusted since the second half of last year.

During the election campaign the Government stated many times that it was committed to a policy of lower taxation. But this Budget is in fact a high-tax Budget. Tax cuts amount to about \$7 000 000, but the Government expects the total tax collections to rise by \$16 600 000, which shows that not only is the tax cut below that promised by the Government, it is more than wiped out by the increased anticipated tax revenues.

Next we come to the famous pay-roll tax cuts. Total pay-roll tax collections exceed \$160 000 000. The promised pay-roll tax cut was \$8 300 000, a fairly insignificant fraction, but the Government is not even going to make cuts of this size to this tax, the actual payroll tax cut will be between \$3 000 000 and \$3 500 000.

If the Government thinks that tax cuts of this magnitude are going to create 7 000 jobs, its economic expertise is laughable. The amount of the tax cuts amounts to less than \$3 per South Australian. There is no guarantee that the savings made through these small pay-roll taxes will not boost employers' profits rather than boosting employment. It is noticeable that under questioning on the issue of the famous 7 000 jobs due to be created by the pay-roll tax, Government answers have been increasingly evasive.

I turn briefly to the issue of succession duties, and I endorse the very fine contribution by the Hon. Miss Levy earlier in this debate. The Government anticipates a greater effective tax cut than promised in the Budget—\$2 000 000 rather than \$1 000 000. The abolition of this tax is typical of this Government. It is a very regressive move. It benefits the rich and not the poor. It means a reduction of overall taxation revenue which will have to be found from some other source—most probably from the pockets of ordinary South Australians. The abolition of this tax is particularly obnoxious because it confers benefits on people who have done nothing to earn them. Why a Party like the Liberal Party, which claims to reward personal effort and believes in providing incentives for work done, should support the abolition of a tax which will have the effect of rewarding people for doing absolutely nothing, is not clear. In fact, of course, this is just another example of the Liberal Party pandering to the interests of its affluent supporters.

I turn now to the abolition of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. The Government claimed it was going to provide 7 000 jobs through cuts in pay-roll tax, which we now find amount to \$3 000 000, but at the same time the Government has abolished SURS, which in 1978-79 had \$12 500 000 allocated for creating employment. As the Leader of the Opposition said in another place, "The Government is abolishing a major unemployment relief scheme, but can point to no definite jobs which will be

created by business to stop unemployment rising as a result of the abolition of that programme."

The State Unemployment Relief Scheme, which began in 1975, provided for local government and community groups to put forward applications for financial assistance where the labour component was at least 60 per cent of the total cost of any project. SURS has been important for at least three reasons. First, it enabled many young people to obtain valuable work experience that they would not have had otherwise. This in turn assisted many of these young people to secure permanent jobs later. SURS also provided a source of hope and temporary salvation for those people who lost their jobs suddenly as a result of Federal Government economic policies. Many of these people with families and huge mortgages would otherwise have faced financial and sometimes emotional ruin through unemployment.

As Personal Assistant for the former member for Peake for some six years, I saw at first hand the crushing social effects and the severe loss of confidence and morale suffered by people unable to find work for any length of time. Finally, SURS has been important because it has provided many worthwhile community facilities which otherwise could not have been funded by local bodies. The abolition of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme is a severe blow to unemployed people in South Australia.

Another matter seriously affecting the provision of jobs is, as the Hon. Anne Levy said, the introduction of technological change. There is nothing in the Government's Budget to indicate that any thought has been given to this issue at all. Before the election, the A.L.P. promised to set up a technology section in the Department of Labour and Technology, which was to be the new name for the Department of Labour and Industry. It also planned to establish a standing committee on technological change to monitor changes in the public sector and minimise the social impact of such changes. The Government has not indicated any support for these proposals.

Some of the most sweeping changes through new forms of technology are likely to occur in the white collar industries. A large proportion of our work force, particularly women, work in these industries, and the impact will be devastating if some control and regulation is not implemented. This is Government's responsibility, but this Government has shown no willingness to grapple with the issue at all. Unless it does, we will be faced with social problems of mammoth proportions.

I now turn briefly to the matter of health expenditure. The Hon. Mr. Cornwall and members in another place have dealt with this matter in some depth. I wish to refer particularly to the plight of the Women's Community Health Centre at Hindmarsh. This centre was established in 1976 and was the first of its kind in South Australia. It was funded by the Federal Government through the State Health Department. It took some time to establish mutually acceptable methods of operation, as the centre was a new concept in health care in South Australia.

Eventually, the building at Hindmarsh was acquired. Over a period of months, teams of enthusiastic men and women who were committed to the project spent many hours renovating and upgrading the building, until it was transformed into a very pleasant, welcoming place where women could obtain quality health care, information and education geared specifically to their needs.

The centre was well situated primarily to serve women from the western suburbs, many of whom were disadvantaged and unable to afford existing medical services. As the centre's reputation grew, women from all

over the metropolitan area started using its services as well.

I have followed the centre's development with great interest, first, because I believe that a service, especially for women, was necessary and, secondly, because it was situated in the electorate of Peake, where I was working. I have also visited the centre as a patient, and have found the staff very helpful and sympathetic. I was therefore distressed to hear some time ago that the future of the health centre was threatened because the building it occupied in Mary Street, Hindmarsh, had fallen into serious disrepair. Apparently, it had been seriously affected by white ants, apart from anything else. Attempts were made to carry out repairs, although I understand that the Public Buildings Department has declared the building unsafe and repair costs to be prohibitive.

Since then, the health centre staff has located, although not without considerable difficulty, other suitable premises in the area and approached the Health Commission to purchase it on their behalf. I believe that the previous Minister of Health was sympathetic to this request and agreed to the relocation. But, since the change of Government, I understand that the new Minister has indicated that the alternative building will not be purchased after all.

I understand that about 122 women visit the centre each week and that there is a need to expand services, particularly for Aboriginal women, in order to assist a greater number. The Women's Community Health Centre provides an excellent and necessary service to the women of Adelaide, and I sincerely hope that the Minister of Health will reconsider the matter and provide the funds necessary to allow this service to continue and grow.

Finally, I want to say a few words about Roxby Downs. The first thing that should be made clear is that all that is happening at present is a feasibility study as to whether or not the uranium at Roxby Downs can be extracted and sold. This study was expedited by the previous Government.

During the election campaign, the present Government claimed constantly that the development of Roxby Downs would provide 25 000 to 30 000 jobs, but it has given no indication of how these figures were arrived at. However, it has continued to talk loudly about the economic bonanza that Roxby Downs will provide for this State. The Government does this without even being sure that a settlement at Roxby Downs can proceed. For example, it is not clear that sufficient water can be provided to allow even mining, let alone any settlement, and, even if this can be achieved, the whole project is based on the assumption that there will be a profitable market for uranium when Roxby Downs comes on stream. As I said in my maiden speech, it is far from certain that future levels of demand will be sufficiently great to provide the sort of economic bonanza about which the Government speaks.

A senior executive of General Electric, one of America's four makers of nuclear reactors, has been reported in *Business Week* as saying that the nuclear industry may collapse altogether within 10 years. Orders for reactors have dropped dramatically during the last five years all over the world. Add to this the increasing number of uranium deposits being discovered and the growing glut of uranium on the world market and we find that the Government estimates of the revenue which the uranium mine at Roxby Downs will provide are based on very flimsy foundations. There is growing public disquiet throughout the world about the safety of the nuclear fuel cycle. Opposition to nuclear power is increasing considerably in Australia and particularly in South Australia. The anti-uranium rally and march sponsored by

CANE and attended by several thousand people last Saturday in Adelaide gives a clear indication that the people of this State are unhappy with the Government's uranium policy. I predict that opposition to the Government's policies will grow and become more vocal as people begin to realise what they mean. When that happens I hope that this Government will be big enough to heed the warnings and reconsider its precipitate decision to proceed with uranium mining.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I support the motion to table the papers relating to the Budget. I am aware that the grounds I am covering have been covered by other members on this side of the Chamber. It appears that it does not matter—one has the choice of logic or numbers, and I will take the numbers any time.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I express concern at some of the Government's policies that are to be implemented. I do not blame the Government for these policies, as they were stated election promises. However, inherent in these policies is the danger that greed and not need is the criterion that the public have supported in voting for this Government. On the second page of the Financial Statement by the Premier and Treasurer, we are advised that cuts amounting to \$29 100 000 are to be granted during the balance of 1978-79 and 1979-80. This is in five areas: namely, succession duty, gift duty, stamp duty, payroll tax, and land tax.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: The sort of things Mr. Wran has done.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: That does not say that it is right. I am not committed to Mr. Wran's policies. The Government is committed to a policy of lower taxation on the assumption that the incentives so given would be taken up by the private sector. They have more faith in the private sector than I have. The private sector is dedicated to making a profit, and it cannot function without it. There is no room in the private sector for charity. This Government seems to think that, by assisting companies with pay-roll tax deductions for unemployed 20-year-olds, it can create a pool of new employment.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Mr. Bannon said that it wasn't a big enough reduction in pay-roll tax.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: If one is going to abolish it, abolish it altogether rather than just provide enough to transfer the incentives. The companies that take up this offer will do so at the expense of other employees, and this will result in the loss of jobs in other areas. I see it as a transfer of unemployment to those people who cannot give pay-roll tax relief to their companies. I have seen the practical side of business before where organisations could employ unemployed youths for the first time and receive a subsidy from the Federal Government to go towards wages. I believe that that lasted for about six months, and, as the time grew near when the subsidy was to cease, correspondingly the complaints against the young workers grew in magnitude until the subsidy ceased and the person was advised that he was a no-hoper and would never be any good at the job, and that his services would therefore have to be terminated. There is no charity in the private sector. That the private sector is going to take up the unemployment and spend millions on employment is just a fallacy.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you saying that there is charity in Governments?

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: There should be. What is the dole if it is not charity? I would sooner see the dole cheque

supplemented by taxation and unemployed people given a job.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you saying that the only place that has any charity is the Government?

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: No, but there is room in Government for compassion. There is no room for compassion in the private sector—people are in it for profit. On the third page of the Financial Statement, we see the following:

There will be a major thrust by the South Australian Health Commission to further nationalise services and reduce hospital running costs. This move will be undertaken in a proper and responsible manner to ensure that the presently high standards of patient care are not undermined. It sounds good and deserving of support but how does one equate it to the report in the *Advertiser* on 30 October, under the heading "Long wait for dentures," which states:

The waiting time for dentures at the Royal Adelaide Hospital's dental department is more than three years. The department finds, however, that some patient pensioners have not lost their sense of humour. Here are extracts from two letters received in reply to the department's current circular:

"I would like to give my turn to a more deserving pensioner. On your past performance, it would be a dead heat between you putting them in and the undertaker taking them out."

"I hope they arrive before I get my wooden overcoat. I won't need them then, as I understand they exist on fresh air up above."

They are saying that there is a three-year wait.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would you like us to quote Mr. Banfield's reply to a question on that?

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Just because the previous Government said that it could not do anything about it, are we supposed not to criticise it?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Bruce will resume his seat. I point out that it is the right of every member to be heard but not all members at the one time. Although some members seem to be in good voice at this time of night, I ask them to listen. The Hon. Mr. Bruce.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I do not mind the interjections. The areas of rationalisation will no doubt mean the dismissal of staff and cut-back on services in certain areas to the detriment of the public. I wonder how many members have had the misfortune of being on the waiting list for semi-emergency treatment at the larger public hospitals. I have had that misfortune and I spent 2½ or three hours waiting for treatment, which did seem very long. Time is no object in these hospitals. I do not know how it happens but everybody seems to have the same appointment time. The staff seem to be busy enough but, with three or four doctors to treat dozens of people, it makes one wonder where the rationalisation and the reduced running costs for hospitals will occur. Let us hope that it will not be in the out-patients department or the dental department.

I do not consider myself to be a financial genius, but so far the hand-outs referred to, including those to the private sector, will cost the Government about \$25 000 000 in the first year.

If we take \$8 000 as a person's wage and divide it into \$25 000 000, we find that 3 125 jobs could be given by the Government in the public sector if it so desired. That could be done with the retention of those taxes. I realise that the infrastructure to support this number of people would cost much more than the \$8 000 per year I have suggested that people would earn, but I am sure people expect the Government to give leadership and assist in the

employment of people or in a decent living standard if they are unemployed (and I do not mean the dole). However, it cannot be done unless the public foot the bill for such actions. Hence my first statement that greed, not need, is the criterion now.

To support this theory, I mention that last night the Willessee show touched upon the area where health insurance for the young and healthy could be obtained on the cheap, but, if it continued, the chronically sick, aged and disadvantaged in the community would not be able to afford their health benefits, because everyone would be a claimant. The attitude of the young and healthy was "Bad luck about that, but I still want the cheap benefits for myself", which was not a very enlightened attitude, I would suggest, in this day and age.

Eventually, of course, Government would be forced to pick up the tab and that would then be paid through taxation, as a shared burden, as it should be. I do not believe in doing away with taxation. I believe that there should be more of it. The Hon. Miss Levy put her finger on the matter when she said that up to 40 years of a working person's life depended on the Government, whether by way of age pension or something else.

I see that the Government is concerned at the present depressed state of the building and construction industry and the need to support that industry through abolition of stamp duty. I would suggest the hardship that a young married couple have to go through to buy their house is part of the reason why the industry is depressed, not the stamp duty involved. I will bet that it is not as depressed as are some of those couples who are battling to retain their dream home.

A typical example I know of is that of a couple buying their home, with payments of \$290 per month over 30 years, or \$67 per week. There are no fences, no clothes line, no garden: nothing but a house on a block of land. The wife has to work at part-time employment (not by choice but through necessity) to make both ends meet. The dream of owning a home can become a nightmare, and the threat of unemployment adds to the depressing burden for the young of owning a home. The abolition of stamp duty will do little to alleviate that problem. What will happen to these people if the part-time job held is given to some junior because of a pay-roll gain for the company concerned? I suggest it would mean disaster for the venture.

I have briefly looked at the succession duties. To me, they did not seem unduly harsh. Admittedly, there was room for improvement and no doubt all members have been lobbied in relation to brothers and sisters living together, etc. I believe amendment of the Act would be a better alternative to the complete abolition of succession duties, which have been in force in one way or another since the 1800's. To me, it would appear to be a case of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer, with this legislation. The public sector, I believe, has to be maintained and upgraded; the continued no-growth factor is a disaster. In this time and age, when the private sector is seeking to cut employment through computer technology and any other means, it is much better to have a strong viable public sector to take up this slack than to have people going on unemployment benefits.

We all like to have good education facilities, health care, police services, councils, water and sewerage services, highways, and all of those infrastructures that make living in our society more equitable and favourable than occurs in other comparable countries in the world. Recently, after having gone overseas, I came back through Manila. There one sees what happens when taxation is not paid. People have not the money to pay it, and a 5ft. fence

has been built around the slum area in which they live. Half a mile away, one comes to "Millionaire's Row", and there are guards around the area.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: The slums are terrible, and the problem has been solved by building a wall! I suggest that there is no equity in a system like that, but members opposite are seeking to further such a system.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Along with Mr. Wran.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I do not care if Mr. Wran is doing it. The services I have mentioned can be obtained only through taxation. By all means, let us have value for our dollar in the way our taxes are spent, but in my view people employed, wherever that may be, are better equipped to face community living than being given an unemployment cheque. I see that the Government, in co-operation with private enterprise, is to accelerate the exploration programme in the Cooper Basin and elsewhere to locate further urgently needed resources of hydrocarbons. That is commendable, but surely, after the Santos debacle, the Government of South Australia should be seeking equity in the ventures instead of flogging everything off to the private sector.

I guess one could go on and on expressing concern at aspects of the Budget that I cannot agree with, but I realise it would be to no avail. However, one area that the Government would be anxious to see corrected if it was genuine about value for the dollar in the public sector would be in attachment III. The Auditor-General's Report states:

However, I should point out that there are still many areas which require examination and upgrading and that there is a continuing need to review systems to assess their effectiveness.

In last year's report, the Auditor-General made much the same comments. It would appear that there is a real need for expertise and proper accounting in many departments so that those needs and wants can be gauged accurately.

I realise that honourable members in Government have different viewpoints from mine, and Sir Mark Oliphant sums it up very well in the report in the *Advertiser* of 30 October 1979, as follows:

Sir Mark raps 2-Party "dogfight". Australia's two-Party Parliamentary system is a "rowdy dogfight", says former South Australian Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant. Sir Mark said last night respect must be restored to Government. Parliaments were voted in by the "haves" who voted Liberal and the "have-nots" who voted Labor. "Almost always they look after the interests of the people who put them in power," he said. Australia had aspired to be, but had not yet become a classless society. Wealth was still a class distinction.

Once acquired, wealth—even very moderate wealth—is more jealously guarded here than anywhere else in the world, Sir Mark said.

This is where the Liberals cater for the greedy people and not the needy people. Certainly, I concur in those comments. The Hon. Dr. Ritson referred to uranium as the cure-all and saviour of South Australia. There are two viewpoints on uranium, although members opposite do not think that there is any view apart from their own. The *Nation Review* of 4 October, under the heading "Uranium: mineral without a market", states—

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Who is the author?

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: John Hallam. Honourable members would not agree with this article because it does not agree with their views but, as they believe that uranium will be the saviour of South Australia and the whole world, I will read them parts of this report, as follows:

Until recently, arguments against uranium mining were couched in moral and political terms. Nobody doubted that uranium mining would be profitable to those who did it. Australia was said to be selling its soul to the devil (in the shape of overseas uranium users), for a profit. Nobody doubted that the devil would be eager to come up with the thirty pieces of silver to clinch the deal.

The report then refers to what we can expect in respect of the mining of uranium and states:

... a glut of 20 000-30 000 tonnes of uranium a year will exist, forcing prices down from the present \$43/lb., to about \$28/lb.

It further states:

Yet the most recent, official, A.A.E.C. estimates say there will be a market for only 10 000 tonnes a year at that time, under half the projected capacity. Food for thought if you happen to be in the industry.

The report goes on:

Finally, let's look at the Ranger sellout—er, divestment. The Government's decision to sell its share of the Ranger project, while no doubt motivated by its passion for the principles of free enterprise, seems to have been at least partly motivated by worsening market prospects and one has the impression that the Government may be cutting its losses. According to the *Financial Review*, "One important factor in the Government's decision is this very marketing problem. In a slack market, with few expert bureaucratic resources to manage marketing, the decision to make a profitable divestment is an attractive one."

The report concludes:

The Ranger sellout, while it may end with Japanese utilities buying a share of the project, will not necessarily guarantee markets. The Japanese will be polite, and will bow and smile, and tell Anthony he is "sincerely welcome", and will say ever so politely that they have no use for our uranium.

The nuclear industry is dying, due partly to the efforts of anti-nuclear activists and critics, and partly to its own economic problems. With it are dying the prospects for a uranium bonanza in Australia. But the sight of corporations behaving in a completely irrational manner even from their own narrow point of view, pouring money into holes in the ground on the basis of myth and hope, is more than entertaining.

It certainly gives the lie to those who think that companies, however immoral/amoral, can at least see their own interests, and suggests that the real reasons decisions are taken by the most conservative part of society has little to do with rationality, however narrowly defined.

The author of that report is saying that, irrespective of other circumstances, the market will not be there and the bonanza that the Government is looking for will not exist. It might not be the gold mine in the sky; rather, it might be pie in the sky.

The Government is cutting back on education, or at least it is holding it. We now have a situation where teachers are graduating from teachers college, yet only one in five will be offered employment in the teaching service.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: You were in Government then.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I am not arguing about that—I am worrying about the situation now.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not think that the honourable member needs any help.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I will be watching the Government's promises with interest. This is a Budget of greed, not a Budget of need. The Government has

pandered to the wants of the community and, because the community at large has accepted that greed, it has voted the Liberal Government into office, and now the community will pay the price, because there is no way I can see the Government delivering the goods, such as employment from the private sector, especially as technology is moving in, and there is no way to take up the slack. The employment issue is crucial. Initiatives should be taken by the Government, not abandoned by the Government. I support the motion.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 8.50 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday
1 November at 2.15 p.m