

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 1 November 1979

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

QUESTIONS

WINE GRAPES

The **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON**: My question relates to the answer that the Minister of Consumer Affairs gave recently regarding the review of prices legislation as it applied to wine-grape growers. If the Minister is reviewing the legislation, he cannot predict what the result of that review will be. As a number of growers have expressed to me concern regarding the next vintage, will the Minister give the Council an assurance that any changes to the wine-grape legislation will not be made before the next vintage?

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: Yes.

RURAL LAND BANKS

The **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Lands, a question about rural land banks.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL**: Recently, I was approached by the Australian Council of Rural Youth concerning the establishment of rural land banks in South Australia. This is one of the many promises made by Mr. Fraser in his 1975 policy speech, and it has not been honoured. Indeed, I understand that while the present Federal Government remains in office it is most unlikely that it ever will be. The Rural Youth Movement showed very commendable initiative earlier this year in bringing David Miner, Chairman of the Saskatchewan Land Bank, to Australia. Members of the Government would know that rural land banks are to encourage young farmers on to the land with an initial low capital investment and have been very successful in Saskatchewan and other parts of the world. Apart from direct Federal funding, other schemes which have been suggested would involve using rural industries assistance money or money from the rural assistance grants scheme.

I understand that Mr. Michael Young, of the Land Resources Management Division of the C.S.I.R.O., is also working on proposals for privately funded schemes. It has also come to my attention that there is a suggestion box going around Cabinet at the moment and a "What will we do with Monarto?" competition being run, with Mr. Wilson strongly supporting a new airport at the site, and Mr. Chapman suggesting, among other things, that much of the site be used as a land bank. This latter suggestion seems to have very little to commend it, as the area is marginal wheat country with a relatively low rainfall, capable of virtually no diversification and supporting fewer than 20 properties.

Does the Government consider that rural land banks are a desirable and viable proposition in South Australia? Is the Government considering the introduction of a rural land bank and, if so, in what form? In the event that it proceeds, will the Government diversify the operation through the total agricultural spectrum to minimise investment risk?

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: I will refer those questions to the Minister of Lands and bring down a reply.

DEPARTMENT SEPARATION COSTS

The **Hon. ANNE LEVY**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries, a question about costs.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. ANNE LEVY**: One of the first actions of the new Government six weeks ago was to split the previous Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries into two separate portfolios, namely, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Fisheries. Doubtless, this creation of a separate Fisheries Department will add to the cost to the taxpayer in administration, duplication of facilities, and so on. Can the Minister state the exact cost of alterations to office accommodation planned or undertaken because of the creation of a separate Fisheries Department?

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: I will refer the question to the Minister of Fisheries and bring back a reply.

CONTAINER LEGISLATION

The **Hon. G. L. BRUCE**: I direct the following questions to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment:

1. Has the Minister of Environment received a report following the review of the Beverage Container Act?
2. Does he agree that it is working very effectively with regard to cans and achieving its original aims?
3. Has the South Australian Brewing Company met the Minister?
4. Has he been asked to repeal the Act?
5. Does he intend to refuse in the strongest possible terms?

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

RADIATION BOARD

The **Hon. BARBARA WIESE**: I direct a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health. Has the Minister established an Ionising Radiation Registration Board as promised during the recent election campaign, and will this board be responsible for investigating the radiation hazards associated with uranium mining at Roxby Downs?

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

LAND TRANSFERS

The **Hon. N. K. FOSTER**: I seek leave to make a statement before directing a question to the Attorney-General regarding certificates of title.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. N. K. FOSTER**: Changes made by the previous Government (and I say this without boast or seeking the favour of the electorate) sought to alleviate the financial burden on people involved in land transactions and changes in name, etc., whereby people, instead of going to the legal fraternity or being ripped off by a charge that is not necessary or indicated in other areas—

The **Hon. C. M. Hill**: The costs are the same.

The **Hon. N. K. FOSTER**: One could accept that from Mr. Hill—the costs are high, and it is always the same, as far as he is concerned, when doing land transactions on behalf of himself or his family. I ask the Minister to

contain himself so that his colleague may be able to reply on this matter. I am asking the question on behalf of people who have been to solicitors and have met this situation. I ask the Minister to please keep quiet and have a little patience, if not manners. Will the Attorney-General say whether a change of name by marriage can be registered on a certificate of title directly through the Lands Titles Office, without involving the costly service of a solicitor or land broker? Further, can a registration of both persons be likewise registered upon death in the case of joint tenancy of a property?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The honourable member has suggested that a Labor Government introduced the provision that enables land brokers to undertake real property transactions, instead of that function being the sole preserve of solicitors. I think that most of those who are in practice know that land brokers have been able to undertake work with respect to transactions affecting land for nearly a century: that has been a long established practice. Land brokers may do that work in the same way as solicitors.

There are regulations under the Real Property Act that regulate the scale of fees that may be charged for work undertaken by either land brokers or solicitors. As far as I am aware, any person may register a change of name by marriage or note the death of a joint tenant on a certificate of title, provided the form meets the prescribed forms and regulations of the Registrar-General. As far as I am aware, there is no requirement that the documents be prepared by either a land broker or a solicitor, but they must be in a form that is required by the Registrar-General of Deeds.

LAW AND ORDER BOOKLET

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about a booklet on law and order.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: During my all too brief tenure of office as the Leader of the Bar and Chief Law Officer in this State, as Attorney-General, there was (and still is) considerable controversy about the question of crime, violence and law and order generally in this State and indeed in the whole of the Western world. As a result of this situation, a number of matters were proposed by me that we would have been implementing had the Labor Government been returned to office. In addition to developing these proposals, I was concerned that much of the debate and discussion in the community on this issue was not particularly well informed and that there was much misunderstanding about the sentencing process and the whole issue generally. Accordingly, I asked the Director of the Office of Criminal Statistics, Dr. Grabosky, to prepare a small booklet which, I think, was entitled *Law and Order in South Australia—An Introduction to Crime and Criminal Justice Policy* and which was printed, I believe, a few days before my unfortunate demise.

I was able to distribute the booklet to some groups in the community but was not able to distribute it widely. First, is the Attorney-General aware of the existence of this booklet? Secondly, has he arranged for the distribution of the booklet to the public so as to enhance public awareness and understanding of the issue of crime and law and order in this State?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am aware of the existence of material with respect to crime and punishment, law and order and of the work of the Office of Criminal Statistics.

The book to which the Leader refers is a matter on which I have not as yet made a decision with respect to its further circulation.

PRESS COUNCIL

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Leader of the Government a question about the media.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: The Leader of the Labor Party in another place recently announced that he was looking after the media as one of his responsibilities in the new Labor Party Executive. One hesitates to suggest in what way the media will be looked after by the Labor Party, especially after its comments about an Adelaide evening newspaper, suggesting that its proprietor was not his father's son. First, does the Liberal Party have or intend to have a Minister shadowing the media? Secondly, does the Liberal Party agree with current Labor Party policy, which is to have a press council with State jurisdiction, in spite of the fact that the National Press Council already exists?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The answer to the first question is "No", and the answer to the second question is that that is a matter which I do not believe is necessary, but which, when some firm decision has been made, will be reported to the honourable member. My view, and I am sure it is the view of the Government, is that there is no necessity for a Minister to have any responsibility for shadowing or looking after the media, because I am sure that it is capable of doing that itself.

FISHING

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries, a question about fishing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Minister of Fisheries recently compared the benefits to South Australia from the development of the 200-mile fishing zone with the development of Roxby Downs. Up to 15 September the South Australian Government's involvement in the area concerned (based on research and exploration of the resource by State/Commonwealth financed programmes) was several trawlers and three or four squid fishery feasibility ventures. Can the Minister tell the Council the extent of the recently discovered resources of fish stocks that enabled him to make his claim that the estimated value of the resource was \$2 000 to \$3 000 million? Will the Minister say when these explorations were made and who carried them out? In what manner were they carried out? How were they financed? How many South Australian fishermen will be assured of entry to the new fishery? Finally, what is the estimated number of new jobs in South Australia that will be created by the exploitation of this resource?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Minister of Fisheries and bring down a comprehensive report.

LAW AND ORDER BOOKLET

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Attorney-General and is supplementary to my previous question. Will the Minister give consideration to

distributing the booklet at the earliest opportunity and advise me of the decision made?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Yes.

WINE GRAPES

The Hon. B. M. CHATTERTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, and relates to the reduction in brandy excise. Can the Minister say whether the Department of Agriculture has carried out an investigation into the increased demand for wine grapes that will result from the reduction in brandy excise, and will he make those figures available to me if they have been calculated?

Will the Minister also ascertain whether the increased demand for wine grapes will be sufficient to compensate for any surplus of wine grapes that might exist next year? If it is not sufficient, will the Minister make representations to the Federal Government for a further reduction in excise, perhaps to the pre-1978 Budget level?

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

AIR QUALITY

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about air quality.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: In this morning's *Advertiser*, the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, is quoted as having said yesterday, while opening the Chrysler Australia new Lonsdale plant:

While taking into account the need for a close watch on our environment, it must not overrule all other considerations. Development, particularly industrial development, must be given every encouragement, within certain environmental bounds.

From this report, the Premier apparently in no way attempted to spell out what those certain environmental bounds should be, and that causes me very considerable distress. Yesterday, I asked a question about emission controls, and in the explanation I gave prior to asking that question I made clear to this Council that, contrary to the stories that are being peddled about at the moment, the Adelaide airshed cannot stand further pollution.

It has reached a situation which caused me some concern in the brief period that I was Minister of Environment and which should be causing every citizen in Adelaide concern, because we are already starting to run into photochemical smog problems. I was heartened to read recently that the transfer of the Air Quality Control Unit from the Health Department to the Department for the Environment had been completed and that the Minister planned to introduce a Clean Air Bill at some stage. However, it seems to me that, given the current attitude of most Cabinet members, the Minister may well have grave difficulties in being taken seriously in relation to his initiatives.

First, has the transfer of the Air Quality Control Unit to the Department for the Environment been completed? Secondly, does the Government intend to introduce a Clean Air Bill in the present Parliamentary session? Thirdly, will it place adequate restrictions on the burning of industrial and domestic waste? Finally, will restrictions

on burning during periods of air pollution potential alerts be made compulsory?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult with my colleague and bring back a reply.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I notice on today's Notice Paper that a Question on Notice that I directed to the Attorney-General has been incompletely printed. If the question was out of order, I should have been consulted before a portion of it was deleted. If indeed a portion of the question has been deleted, I should like to know why.

The PRESIDENT: I apologise to the honourable member that he was not told that his question had been slightly altered. It may have been a matter of presumed irrelevance. If the honourable member would care to re-examine the question I should be pleased to look at the matter again for him.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I should like to have the question put on notice for next week in the way in which I asked it and as it is reported in *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: I will look at the question and deal with the matter as I see fit for next Tuesday.

BEER PRICES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question regarding beer prices.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On 23 October an answer given by the Minister to a question that I had placed on notice regarding beer prices indicated that from late August, when initial recommendations were made by the Acting Prices Commissioner on the application for an increase in beer prices, to the period early in October, when a final determination was made (that being a period of slightly over one month), there was a considerable difference in the prices recommended. Although the price of a butcher of beer remains the same, the increase in price for a schooner was up from 1c to 2c, that for a pint from 1c to 3c, and that for small bottles was 2c on both occasions. On large bottles, the recommended price increase went from 3c in late August to 4c in early October, with cans remaining at 2c on both occasions.

In his reply to me, the Minister said that at the end of August the Acting Prices Commissioner had rejected certain cost element claims made by the brewing company and the industry. He then went on to say that, if the rejection of these cost elements had been allowed, it would have reduced substantially the appropriate profit margins of the brewers and licensed resellers. He also said that the margins requested did not appear unreasonable to the Government, so the initial recommendation was reviewed.

It causes the Opposition concern that a recommendation was made by the Acting Prices Commissioner in late August, and that a further decision was made on increased prices early in October, just more than one month later. It seems to me that the only significant thing that could have occurred during that period was the election, as a result of which there was a substantial increase over and above the prices originally recommended. That has disturbing implications, particularly as there is no doubt that the Liberal Party, before the election, received support from certain groups in the community. For that reason, I believe that the issue needs to be clarified.

I asked what representations the Minister received in relation to this matter, in reply to which he said that, as was normal when considering price increases, the Government received representations from a number of people associated with the industry. The point that needs to be made about this is that, before the election, representations were presumably made and a price was recommended by the Acting Prices Commissioner. After the election, the Government apparently received further representations. Because the election was held shortly before the Government made these adjustments to the price increases, I believe that the Minister should have specified from whom those representations were received.

First, what individuals or groups made representations to the Government on this issue, and to whom were the representations made? Secondly, was a further independent inquiry carried out by the Acting Prices Commissioner, or did the Government, as it was the Government's view that the margins were not satisfactory, instruct the Acting Prices Commissioner to accept the Government's view that the margins claimed were not unreasonable?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The representations were, as far as I can recall, made on behalf of the brewing industry, the A.H.A. and the Consumer Affairs Association.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Did they want an increase?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Leader did not ask that question. I am answering the questions that the Leader has asked. In reply to his second question, the Acting Prices Commissioner was further consulted, and he did not object to the proposed outcome.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Proposed by whom?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I think I have already answered the questions. There was no direction.

OPERA

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Arts a question regarding opera.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Australia Council Review indicates that a total of 41 per cent of the allocations for its Music Board is currently going to finance the Australian Opera. I know, too, that the Australian Opera receives a grant from the South Australian Government, presumably as its contribution for when the opera travels to Adelaide and performs here.

The Australia Council Review indicates that the Music Board is having further discussions with representatives of the State Government to establish the best way to meet opera's growing demand from the limited funds available. They are funds that are unlikely to be increased because of a growing opinion that a significant proportion of the arts money is going to opera. Despite those comments, I read in the press recently that the Victorian State Opera, apparently with the encouragement of the Victorian Premier, Mr. Hamer, is undertaking an investigation as to whether there should be a second opera company established in Victoria with the idea that it could service Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania, leaving the current Australian Opera Company, based in Sydney, to look after New South Wales, Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory. I realise that this inquiry, which is occurring in Victoria, will be primarily involved with the Victorian Government. I do not know who is undertaking the inquiry. It was to be Mr. Hemmings, who had a contract with the Australian Opera which was suddenly terminated recently. This inquiry will have

obvious implications for South Australia. If such a proposal got off the ground, it would be a different company coming here and presumably, if it was a company looking after the interests of opera in three States only, its appearances here would be more frequent than those of the Australian Opera based in Sydney which cannot give Adelaide more than a certain proportion of its time. There must be financial implications for the South Australian Government in connection with this Victorian inquiry as to how the South Australian Government's contribution to the Australian Opera might be affected: first, whether it would be transferred to the second national opera company in Victoria and withdrawn from the company based in Sydney; and, secondly, what relationship the proposed new company would have with the State Opera Company in South Australia, which is largely financed by the South Australian Government. Will the Minister give an indication of what attitude the South Australian Government intends taking on this delicate question of investigations in Victoria into the question of a second opera company?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Much of the background information which the Hon. Miss Levy has provided for the Council states the true position of the problems that are facing opera generally in Australia. Opera can be said to be the most expensive of all art forms that we enjoy. The cost of opera is a worry to both State and Federal Governments. The cost of the opera company in this State is \$800 000 per annum, and it is rising all the time. I also confirm the Hon. Miss Levy's point concerning the problems in regard to the Australian Opera Company. There have been administrative problems. South Australia makes a donation to the Australian Opera Company. That donation is connected with the policy of the company in giving performances in this State for the benefit of South Australians. We in South Australia are not happy with the situation that is occurring at present with the Australian Opera Company.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Is opera self-supporting anywhere in the world?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, and it never will be. That fact of life has to be accepted.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about in Italy?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: At a performance I attended I counted 132 players on the stage at the same time.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: How many were in the audience?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I can assure the honourable member that there were no empty seats.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is replying to a question. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There has been talk of Victoria looking into the possibility of establishing what it would like to see as another national company. We in South Australia have not been part of that planning in any way at all. The time will come probably in a few years when the various opera companies as well as the various States and the Commonwealth might have to get together in an endeavour to rationalise operatic resources throughout the land. In South Australia we have already joined with Victoria in a rationalisation scheme associated with the Australian Dance Company, and the scheme is proving to be successful. That is evidence of where the States can and should get together. Parochial attitudes and State boundaries are not the "end all" of the problems of financing opera. We are taking no part at all in what Victoria is planning or doing. Only a slight possibility exists that Victoria will launch a venture of this kind entirely on its own. It might well make approaches to the

other States and the Federal Government. For Victoria to launch a scheme of this kind and to go it alone would involve considerable financial problems. We are not involved in any way in discussions with Victoria, but we will certainly watch the progress of any plans that the Victorian Government may announce. If at any time overtures or discussions arise concerning rationalisation, at least of artists, so that the very expensive sector—the orchestra—can remain in the State in which it is established, we will be happy to go as far as to join in such discussions.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on the Bank of Adelaide.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Recently the Leader gave me an answer to a question in which I requested information about a report prepared by Mr. R. H. Allert on the proposals by a group of Adelaide businessmen to maintain the Bank of Adelaide as an independent entity.

The reply was that the report provided by Mr. Allert to the Government was of a confidential nature and that it was not intended to release it. My question was not about whether the Government was prepared to release the report, and I am fully prepared to accept that in that report there may be matters of a confidential nature that the Government does not wish to release, as they involve financial arrangements between institutions.

I think the Government ought to see its way clear to go at least this far for the people of South Australia and the many people who supported the notion that the Bank of Adelaide should remain an independent entity: will the Attorney say whether the report indicated that F.C.A. could trade out of its present predicament, with the Bank of Adelaide thereby remaining as an independent entity in South Australia, if some guarantee of assistance was given by the Government?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Consistent with the reply I have given previously to the Leader's request, I am not prepared to indicate whether the question to which he has referred is answered in that document.

URANIUM

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about uranium.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I understand that the former schoolteacher, now Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Goldsworthy), who refused to table certain documents regarding the disposal of waste—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: We'll get them in the Select Committee.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes. One area in which this Minister, who has little knowledge of what is involved in uranium in the full cycle from when it is mined until it can be used, has knowledge is the Beverley discovery in South Australia. He has said much about that, having "discovered" it a few weeks ago. I am interested to know who owns that deposit, because I understand that one of the Minister's closest political colleagues in Australia, none other than Joh Bjelke-Petersen, has a huge interest. I understand that the project is majority owned by the Phelps Dodge Corporation of the U.S.A., with the

Queensland-based public company Oilmin No Liability having almost 17 per cent interest. Will the Minister check whether these two companies are owners of the Beverley deposit in South Australia?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The question is closely related to the one I intend to look at for the Hon. Mr. Dunford. It will appear on the Notice Paper next Tuesday.

DEPARTMENT FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment. Has the divisional structure of the Department for the Environment been finalised, when will permanent directors be appointed to all divisions, how many applications were received for the recently advertised position of Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Division, when is it expected that the Director will be appointed, and when will the new Director commence his or her duties?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult my colleague and bring back a reply.

RURAL ADJUSTMENT

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ascertain from the Minister of Agriculture what funds were made available to the State Government from the Commonwealth Government under the rural adjustment programme for 1978-79? What funds will be available to the State Government under the programme for 1979-80? What proportion of funds lent to farmers under the programme came from recycled funds in 1978-79? What proportion of funds disbursed to farmers under the programme will come from recycled funds in 1979-80?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult my colleague and bring back a reply.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Community Welfare on the matter of unemployment benefits and restraints.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I think one Minister in this Chamber—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will you contain yourself, please?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: A Minister attended a CITY meeting held in this building between 12 noon and 1 p.m. today. That Minister was Mr. Hill. During the course of the discussion, Mr. Hill registered absolute amazement when one person at the meeting conveyed to us what would have been commonly known by any responsible person in this Chamber for some time who was involved in community work. That is that, if people seeking employment and social security benefits earn six lousy dollars a week, they are hounded by the department and are denied the benefits. Mr. Hill was shocked at this, but the matter has been raised several times. I refer to the document entitled "Beyond Unemployment, a Statement on Human Labour" prepared by the Catholics. That document was issued a long time ago and it draws attention—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He thinks it's a communist plot.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is a wonder if he does not. Attention is drawn to work severity tests. Speeches are quoted, directly attributing the term "dole bludger" to the present Federal Minister, Mr. Viner. Mr. Hill also has parroted that term and referred to the unfortunate unemployed as dole bludgers. The document states:

There is also a need for an increase in the permissible limit on additional earnings by recipients of unemployment benefits. At the moment, recipients may earn only \$6 a week before the level of benefit is reduced; this limit is too low to be of benefit to unemployed persons. Further, for each dollar of earnings above \$6 there is a reduction in benefit of a dollar; this provides no incentive for unemployed to seek occasional work to supplement their income. Recipients of unemployment benefits should be permitted to earn up to \$20 without reduction of benefit and earnings above that level should result in reductions on a sliding scale, for example, a reduction of one dollar for each two dollars earned.

Will the Minister try to prevail on Cabinet to urgently demand that the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser) immediately treble the amount payable to people who are in the unfortunate position of being denied work because of his general policy and also demand that the minimum be not less than \$40 a week? I ask the Minister to remember who wrote that document before he answers the question: it was written by the bishops.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Regarding the meeting with CITY this morning, I sent an apology, because I was speaking to a group of social welfare students at the Institute of Technology.

Secondly, I would say that, in so far as the Department of Community Welfare is concerned, there is a procedure No. 13, which I have mentioned twice in recent weeks and which applies to anyone, whether unemployed or otherwise, who is in urgent financial need. Whether Cabinet will recommend to the Federal Government that the payments to unemployed persons be trebled, that is entirely a matter for the Federal Government and quite outside my jurisdiction.

COAL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about coal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister inform the Council what studies are currently being undertaken on the ranking and characteristics of South Australian coal? Can the Minister tell the Council of any research being undertaken concerning improved combustion techniques relative to South Australian coal? If such research is being undertaken, how is that research being financed?

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My question to the Minister—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Blevins has the call.

PESTICIDES

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My question is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture. During the election campaign the Minister of Agriculture made a clear commitment "to rigidly enforce the Pest Plants Act". Will the Minister now enforce the section of the Act that allows the forced proclamation of a Pest Plants Board in spite of protests from individual councils concerned? Can we expect a rapid formation of boards in the areas of the State that have not so far joined the system? When can we expect to see the result of the fulfilment of this election promise?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult my colleague and bring down a reply.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CITY

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I seek leave to make a personal explanation as a result of a question asked by a member opposite.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You'll not get it during Question Time. That's not fair.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: You tell him not to tell lies about me.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is leave granted?

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Not until after Question Time.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Leave is not granted.

MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my recent question about maintenance payments?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: On 26 October 1979 the department's Receiver of Revenue was instructed to close his accounts for that day at 12 noon, and to regard any payments received after that time as being received on 29 October 1979. A computer system for handling the receipt and payment of maintenance moneys is being installed. In the initial stages, the computer system and the old manual system are being operated in parallel. The early closure of receipts on 26 October was to enable officers of the department and the Auditor-General's Department to satisfy themselves that the information held on both systems was the same. There is no general policy within the department of forward-dating receipts. However, it might be necessary to follow a similar procedure on other occasions until the computer system is firmly established.

The PRESIDENT: As Question Time has now finished—

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: As there are some answers to questions previously asked that have not yet been given by Ministers, will the Attorney-General move to extend the length of Question Time?

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

That Question Time be extended by five minutes to enable the questions to be asked and answered.

Motion carried.

Mr. I. KAEHNE

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question of 18 October about Mr. I. Kaehne?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Minister of Agriculture informs me that he intends to utilise the services of Mr. Kaehne in exactly the same manner as he would those of any specialist departmental officer.

PLAGUE LOCUSTS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question of 16 October about plague locusts?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: An acute shortage of 100/130 octane Avgas will remain until Christmas. Only one of the four aircraft chartered for locust control uses 100/130 octane Avgas. Adequate supplies are in store at Port Pirie for this plane. The two other spray planes use 80/87 octane Avgas which is not in short supply. Similarly, the helicopter uses AVTOR JET A1 fuel which is not in short supply. The Department of Agriculture has established a locust control organisation involving 33 officers assigned to locust control duties since the beginning of October. Twenty-one designated control districts in the hatching areas are each manned by a departmental officer. These officers are directing control operations, the supply of insecticide spray and application equipment on a seven day week basis. Co-ordination of aerial operations and general supply together with the use of relief staff enable counter measures to continue seven days a week wherever required. The assistance of the armed services has been engaged to provide further assistance to pastoralists where large holdings and minimal manpower severely limit the effectiveness of control programmes. The control operation is running smoothly and more efficiently than has been possible in previous plagues.

DAY CARE CENTRES

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my recent question about day care centres?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: From January 1980 the Supervisor of Aged Care Services in the Department for Community Welfare will be relieved of the day-to-day administration of the Magill Home for the Aged. He will then undertake detailed planning of programmes designed to maintain the independence of aged people from institutions. This planning, which will be undertaken in conjunction with the Health Commission which has already established a policy and planning group on extended services, will include expansion of the number and role of day care centres as well as services to socially isolated aged people in the community. It is hoped that greater use can be made of existing buildings, including the department's Community Welfare Centres for aged persons. One of the priorities for grants from the Community Welfare Grants Fund this financial year will be projects providing services to the socially isolated aged. This can include day care centres. The Department for Community Welfare already has approximately 800 people working with it in a voluntary capacity and a considerable number of these people are providing services to aged persons in the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CITY

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My personal explanation is that I was misrepresented by the Hon. Mr. Foster when he explained his question a few minutes ago. He said that, at this morning's meeting of young people in the CITY group which both he and I attended, I expressed astonishment at the problems that they brought to that meeting. I want to make it perfectly clear that I went to the meeting, I listened, and I did not interject or comment whatsoever.

Indeed, I was most concerned and sympathetic to their cause. The honourable member said that I expressed astonishment, but I did not and he knows that I did not. The honourable member also said, in his explanation, that some time ago in this Council I had referred to unemployed people as "dole bludgers". He has made that claim before, and I have denied it before. I have never used those words in that sense in this Chamber, and I urge the honourable member to refrain from telling blatant lies in Parliament.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

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

1. Does the Minister currently derive any direct or indirect income in the form of capital repayments or interest from the sale of the firm of Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd. and, if so—

(a) what are the details of that income and from whom is it derived; and

(b) does this income constitute a direct or indirect financial interest in Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd.?

2. Does the Minister currently derive any direct or indirect income in the form of capital or interest from the sale of the shares in Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd. divested by the holding company and transferred to his son on 31 October 1977 and, if so—

(a) what are the details of the income and from whom is it derived;

(b) does this income constitute a direct or indirect financial interest in Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd.; and

(c) does any direct or indirect financial gain derived by the Minister involve a conflict of interest with his portfolios of Housing and Local Government because of any applications from Murray Hill & Co. Pty. Ltd. currently before the State Planning Authority, the Planning Appeal Board or any local government body or council in South Australia?

3. Does the Minister have any income-sharing arrangements for accounting or taxation purposes which may involve or be seen as involving a conflict of interest or possible financial advantage?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The answers are: 1. No. 2. No. 3. No.

URANIUM

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Mr. President, Question No. 2 on Notice is the question I referred to you. I will not ask this Question on Notice at this time, because I want to be assured that it is inserted in *Hansard* correctly. Mr. President, you said that you would give a ruling on this matter next week.

The PRESIDENT: Do you wish the whole question to be deferred?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes, and I will ask it next Thursday.

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Consumer Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Transactions Act, 1972-1973. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to replace section 35 of the Consumer Transactions Act with a more effective provision. Before the enactment of that Act, it was possible for a credit provider to protect himself against the delinquencies of a person to whom he had provided credit either by retaining title to goods for the acquisition of which the credit had been provided, or by registering a bill of sale over those goods. But while this system afforded the credit provider adequate protection, it occasionally resulted in great hardship to purchasers of secondhand goods who subsequently discovered that they had failed to acquire good title to the goods and had parted with money to a person from whom they would have little or no prospect of redress. The Consumer Transactions Act alters the balance very much in favour of the innocent purchaser by providing that, subject to certain exceptions, an innocent purchaser of goods, subject to a consumer lease or a consumer mortgage, acquires a good title to the goods. Obviously, if a provision of this kind is not to be abused, there must be an effective deterrent for those who might be disposed to sell mortgaged or leased goods, pocket the proceeds, and then default under their credit contracts.

Section 35 was therefore designed to impose a heavy criminal penalty on those who sell or purport to sell mortgaged or leased goods without the consent of the credit provider. The present difficulty is that the section requires the prosecution to prove an intention to defraud at the time of the sale or purported sale. This is a difficult onus to discharge for in many cases the consumer will allege that, at least initially, he intended to keep up the payments under his credit contract. The Bill therefore proposes to remove the onus of proving *mens rea* from the prosecution, but on the other hand to provide a defence for the accused if he proves that he did not know and could not by the exercise of reasonable diligence have ascertained that the goods in question were subject to a consumer mortgage or consumer lease. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals and re-enacts section 35 of the principal Act in the form outlined above.

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

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 31 October. Page 546.)

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I support the Bill, which gives effect to one of the Government's election

promises. While I support the Bill, because I believe the Government has a mandate from the electorate for its passage, I express concern about its implications. With this Bill this Government and future State Governments are losing an important source of revenue and, in doing so, the State Liberal Government is allowing a situation where the Commonwealth Government will now get much of the lapsed tax into its own coffers. This is because, previously where a person was eligible for an income tax deduction based on the amount of land tax he paid less income tax to the Commonwealth, that person will now pay more income tax to the Commonwealth and less tax to the State.

Of course, this is yet another example of the more wealthy in the community getting more of a fair go than the less fortunate. After all, we know that most people in this State would not exceed the \$300 limit on rates and taxes that can be claimed against income taxes. However, the affluent minority exceed this figure and are not able to offset part of the cost of land tax against income tax. Therefore, the abolition of State land tax is of greater financial benefit to them.

It is interesting in this context to draw parallels with what is happening in Margaret Thatcher's Britain. A recent report into poverty written by Professor Peter Townsend shows how the true cost of housing is heavily biased against both the person renting and the new home purchaser, particularly the low income earner. In other words—against the less wealthy in the community. I would be surprised if the situation is different in Australia, and there is no doubt that the relative position of the wealthy *vis-a-vis* the low income home owner or lessee will continue to deteriorate as conservative Governments (such as the Liberal South Australian Government) substitute regressive taxes for progressive forms of taxation.

The major justification for lifting this tax put forward by the Liberal Government is the conservative myth that money can easily be found to replace the revenue lost by eliminating "Government waste and extravagance". This thesis is a myth because large savings cannot be made without substantial cuts in the effective provision of Government services. Of course, there is always some waste within Government departments, just as there is in any large organisation, either public or private.

To contend, however, that the revenue losses of this package of Bills before the Council can be met from improved efficiency alone is sheer nonsense. Any Minister who manages his department effectively will be able to improve efficiency and reduce costs. For instance, I can recall the inquiry that I initiated into herd testing in South Australia and the changes that resulted from that inquiry. They saved the Treasury more than \$250 000 a year. There were changes in the pipeline within the Rural Assistance Branch that would have reduced costs by 25 per cent, and I could go on to quote many other examples that have been achieved over the past four years.

In a well-run department, savings in redundant or inefficient areas go to provide new services in response to the changing needs of the community. They are the sort of measures that any responsible Minister would undertake to keep the Government services under his management flexible enough to keep pace with these changing needs. Suddenly to cut off a fairly large tax revenue (as the Liberal Government is doing) and expect other areas of Government service to be cut to pay for it says volumes about the paucity of understanding among Liberal Ministers of how Government administration is managed.

They will find that it will be inescapable that some services will have to be run down to pay for the loss in revenue from these Bills. This is particularly so because

the State Treasurer does not have much freedom to run a deficit in his Budget. I am sure that the Liberal Government would not run a deficit even if it had more freedom of action to do so, because of its fanatical adherence to the Friedman monetarist theory, a theory that they follow in the face of all reason and experience. Fortunately for this Government, it is relatively difficult to measure the performance of many Government services, so the insidious run-down of standards will not be immediately obvious.

For example, in the area of fisheries, fewer fisheries inspectors will result in less enforcement of fisheries management policies, but how much and what will be the effect on stocks and incomes? No-one can tell accurately at this stage. In the area of agriculture, will fewer fruit fly inspectors and inspection points result in more outbreaks of fruit fly at considerable cost to the fruitgrowers in this State? In the short term, this will be difficult to quantify. No doubt, in the interim the Liberal Government will make great claims that it has got rid of great areas of waste when, in fact, it will merely have decided to provide a poorer quality of service and to take greater risks on behalf of the community.

Another area where cuts will be difficult to pinpoint in terms of immediate effects on the community is that of agricultural research. Undoubtedly, we have a considerable bank of basic technological research on which we can coast along, and I have advocated on a number of occasions that we should draw on that bank. The surplus that exists in the area of basic production research does not, however, compensate for the huge, largely untapped area of applied research that is required (and urgently needed) in the area of fuel conservation for farms and farmers. I have written elsewhere about the urgent need to direct considerable research effort and funds into this area of need, but I cannot see any likelihood of this happening.

Presently, the Department of Agriculture in this State is digesting the unpalatable cuts in Commonwealth Extension Services Grants funds.

Perhaps the State Government should now (in the light of the benefits in extra income tax that these Bills will accrue to the Commonwealth Government) make representations for some of this largess to come back in the form of increased C.E.S.G. funding. However, this is a highly unlikely occurrence, so the Department of Agriculture will have to take up the slack as best it can. It will have to forget any worthwhile involvement in research into farm fuel conservation, and then face other cuts in funds as the decline in State revenues filters through the system into next year's Budget.

This package of Bills (the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill, and those relating to succession duties and gift duties) represents the new style of conservative politics in South Australia. It is not an original style (conservative Governments are not known for their capacity for initiative) but one adopted by conservative politicians in many countries. The days when conservative Parties competed for the middle ground of politics is over. One has merely to ask the late members of the Liberal Movement now on the Government benches about that. Conservatives have now settled into an outright reactionary viewpoint—reactionary in the true meaning of the word—and they intend to roll back the progress of the past 100 years for the benefit of a wealthy minority. These measures are not repealing radical new legislation introduced in the last few years, but are repealing forms of taxation that were introduced nearly a century ago.

I support the Bill because of the Government's mandate, but, in doing so, I express deep concern for the

effect this will have in undermining the quality of Government services in this State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Listening to the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, I wondered to which Bill he was speaking. However, having looked at the Notice Paper, I see that he was speaking on the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He did very well, too.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I did not know to which Bill he was speaking. The honourable member spoke of a reactionary Bill and the reactionary attitudes of this Government in taxation matters. However, the Bill merely abolishes land tax on the principal place of residence as from 30 June 1980. The honourable member spoke about wealthy minorities being assisted by the Bill and about regressive and progressive taxes. Although I asked the honourable member to define a progressive tax, he could not do so.

A regressive tax is that which is imposed on people who have no ability to pay. That is the most regressive form of taxation that can be designed. Most of the capital taxation that we impose today is based not on an ability to pay but on the fact that someone happens to own something, even though that ownership may be totally and absolutely mortgaged. Many people own their own home, but they also have large bank overdrafts to service. So, this Bill is not helping the wealthy minority, and it is not reactionary or regressive. It is a reasonable change to our land tax laws.

The Hon. Anne Levy: What about its effect on people who pay rent?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As far as I know, it will have no effect on people who pay rent.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That shows how much you know.

The Hon. Anne Levy: They'll have less money to—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We should encourage people to own their own homes and not to rent. If one looks at the imposition of capital forms of taxation, one finds that the whole of local government is financed largely by taxes on ownership. This is a tax not on the wealthy but on something that someone happens to own. Although that person may not have any equity in it, he is forced to pay the major cost of local government throughout Australia. One finds exactly the same provisions in relation to State taxation. With land tax, for example, there is no tax upon wealth: that tax is based on the fact that someone happens to own something, even though the person involved may have only a small ability to pay. I approve of the Government's move to remove the imposition on ownership.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: How much will it put in your pocket?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Not very much at all.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: How much?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The land tax payable on my residence in Adelaide is \$70 annually. If I was living on the farm, it would mean nothing extra in my pocket.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It will be \$3 in mine. It is \$3 in the pockets of the workers and \$70 in the pockets of people like you.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That would be a fair comparison of the difference in our abilities. The Bill fulfils a promise made at the election that land tax on the principal place of residence will be abolished. In the election promise there was no guarantee that the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence would take effect from 30 June 1979. Indeed, one would assume, as it

is now November, that the abolition would take effect from 30 June 1980.

Therefore, I am at a loss to understand the criticism of the Opposition to this proposal. There are administrative difficulties in this question which anyone can foresee. First, there is a difficulty in identifying the properties that will be exempt from land tax.

That, in itself, is not an easy matter, particularly, as I mentioned earlier, as the assessed period has already entered its fifth month. There will of course be other administrative difficulties, as with a husband and wife, both owning a house, each of which could be claimed as the principal place of residence. I am unsure how the Government will handle this problem, because there are cases where husband and wife have separated and each property is genuinely the principal place of residence of each one.

However, I daresay the regulations will have to handle problems such as the one I have cited. To criticise the operating date of 30 June 1980, therefore, is quite unjustified. As far as the election promise is concerned, there is really no need for the Government to take the first step it is taking in the Bill at all: that is, that there will be no increase in land tax for the present financial year on a property that may subsequently qualify for total exemption.

The Hon. Anne Levy: If they can identify them for that purpose, why can't they identify them if they're removed?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am certain that there will be some who will not be identified even there. If one reads the Bill, one will find that a person will make that application himself. The onus is on that person to do so. If one is going to make an exemption totally from tax, it is a much more difficult proposition from what we are talking about here.

If criticising the Bill, this provision is the one to criticise, because it could be said that the procedures are a little complicated for a relatively small amount of tax revenue—and there is no need for the Government to offer such a first step at all—to still remain within the bounds of its election promise. But I do not take that point, nor do I offer any criticism of the proposal.

It is more a first step that admits that the timing of the election makes the immediate fulfilling of the election promise difficult, and that some alleviation should be made as quickly as possible. In the Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment Bill, I did criticise the extent of the regulation-making powers, but I am satisfied that those powers are satisfactory, because the basic policy to be followed has been clearly spelt out in the Bill.

There will be difficulties, one of which I have already pointed out, and the regulation-making powers are the way to iron out those particular problems. I would ask the Attorney-General to spell out more clearly the explanation of clause 7.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why would he do that? You'll be lucky!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is no reason why the Attorney-General will not do that. I find him to be quite co-operative—more so than the Attorney-General we had a short time ago. The only reference to this clause in the second reading explanation is to the effect that it corrects an anomaly in the rates of tax applying to land that is partially exempt from land tax. I think it is reasonable to ask for an explanation of the anomaly.

I support the second reading and congratulate the Government on this particular move. In Australia over the years, we concentrated our tax burden too much upon the fact that a person happens to own something. It is not a tax upon wealth; it is a tax upon a person because he happens

to have some piece of property in his name, his equity in which may be nil.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Would you approve of a wealth tax?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not agree with double taxation. The point is that this move is being made to provide some relief in that capital taxation area which is long overdue in this State.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I make several comments in answer to the matters raised by the two speakers on this Bill. The first is that the Hon. Mr. Chatterton has suggested that the Commonwealth Government will reap a harvest as a result of the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence as proposed in this Bill. It is my belief that that harvest will be a very poor one, because, whilst the limit for deductions for council rates, water rates and land tax is \$300, there are many individuals in the community whose rates exceed that limit. In any event the amount of land tax assessed on the principal place of residence is relatively small.

Taking into account the fact that there is not a full deduction but an amount of rebate calculated on the amount of land tax that would be claimed, there is likely to be only an insignificant increase in revenue to the Commonwealth. The honourable member has suggested that we as a Government believe that we are going to make up any lost revenue by improving efficiency, and that that is the only way we are going to make up the alleged loss of revenue. I remind the Opposition that the Government's proposal is a package of Bills, all of which are directed towards restoring confidence and encouraging increased activity in this State, whether it is in the business or commercial field, or otherwise in the private sector.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: If you'd expected to win, you wouldn't have done this.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: We have always had a policy of lower taxation—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You had better tell Fraser about it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:—and getting value for the taxpayer's dollar. We believe (we put it to the community at the last election and we will constantly maintain) that there will be increased confidence and activity in South Australia which, in itself, will generate the necessary revenue to finance those areas of Government responsibility in which the Government ought to be involved and for which it ought to be responsible.

The other aspect of this is that we believe that it is not the responsibility of Government to do all those things which the previous Government undertook and which should more properly be undertaken by the private sector. We believe that the private sector has the capacity to do more effectively and more efficiently, and at less cost to the community, many of the things that the previous Government has undertaken. In that respect, we believe there will be considerable savings to the Government, which will enable us to maintain services to the community in those areas that are truly the responsibility of Government.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has covered well the philosophy behind the Bill. I commend him and thank him for his contribution. He asked whether I would give further information about clause 7. The Act provides for the present rate of tax for partially exempt land to be in the following form:

- (a) if the taxable value of the land does not exceed \$10 000—1 cent for each \$10 or part thereof;
- (b) if the taxable value does exceed \$10 000—\$10 plus 2

cents for each \$10 or part thereof over \$10 000. The rate in paragraph (b) is for land valued at between \$10 000 and \$20 000 in excess of that applying to land that is not exempt. That anomaly is corrected in the amendment. I commend the Bill to the Council.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

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 31 October. Page 564.)

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: As other members have pointed out, this debate is a departure from normal practice, in that, in effect, the Budget is being debated in both Houses simultaneously. While we do not have the Appropriation Bill before us, the effect is the same. Some members have said that the Address in Reply debate should take precedence, and in normal circumstances this would be the case. However, these are not normal circumstances, and it is essential that the Budget be passed as quickly as possible to enable the State to continue to function and all departments to plan for the coming year. It is a pity that the Opposition in another place is not as co-operative as the Opposition here, because apparently in the other place it has indulged in time-wasting practices.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Rubbish! You want an exhaustive examination of the Budget.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes, but the Opposition in the other place is continuing for far longer than has been the case in other years. The Leader of the Opposition has said that the Opposition has agreed on this occasion to follow the practice that we are following. I hope that he will look again at this, because I see no reason why this should not become standard practice. By that, I do not mean that the Address in Reply debate should not take precedence.

Normally, Parliament commences the sitting in July and the Address in Reply debate takes about three weeks, with the Budget being presented about the end of August. It is at this stage that this practice could take effect and we could debate a motion that the Council take note of the Budget papers. This would do away with the ridiculous situation we have had in the past, when we have done nothing while waiting for the Budget debate in the other place to conclude. I understand that what I have suggested is standard practice in Western Australia and that it works satisfactorily there.

I commend the Government for moving swiftly to implement most of its major election promises. We already have before us evidence of this in the papers we are debating and in Bills that have been presented. We see in the Estimates of Receipts that the Government is budgeting for reduced income from land tax, succession duties, and gift duty. For pay-roll tax, although the exemption in certain areas shows an expected increase of almost 8 per cent, this reflects increases in wages, and receipts would have been much higher if Labor had remained in office. Pay-roll tax is a growth tax, the only true growth tax that the State has, and this is why the McMahon Government gave pay-roll taxing rights to the States in 1971 or 1972.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Pay-roll tax is a growth tax, and it is the only growth tax that the State has, although I have not taken out the figures to see the increase in receipts since this tax was instituted in 1962.

Apart from the areas mentioned, those areas where the Government is moving to fulfil the promises made during the election campaign, this is basically a similar Budget to the one that would have been brought down by the previous Labor Government. Obviously, the departments would have submitted their requirements for the coming year to their Ministers, and I assume that the Budget would almost have been in its final draft, because normally the Budget is introduced at the end of August and the election was announced on 22 August.

From 18 September, when the new Ministry took office, to 11 October there simply would not have been time to do a complete redrafting of the Budget. For that reason I imagine that the Government was forced to accept broadly what had already been done. Next year there will have been time to implement the major changes that will be necessary if this State is to overcome the stagnation that has taken place over the past nine or 10 years. The new Ministers will have had an opportunity to examine the administration of their departments and to learn where and how savings can be effected. I can assure the Council that I will be as critical as any member of the Opposition if cuts are not made in administrative costs. I have no doubt that cuts could be made.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Madam Acting President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am sure that cuts could be made in administrative costs in various Government departments. A big percentage of excess costs is in labour itself, and many departments have staff in excess of labour requirements, but this Government has given an assurance that there will be no retrenchments. That assurance will be honoured.

It takes time to reduce staff by attrition and, although this is one area where costs could be cut, it will take time to witness any significant effect. However, mismanagement could be corrected now. Honourable members recall the Public Accounts Committee report on the Hospitals Department. In fact, I believe that report was a significant factor in Labor's defeat on 15 September, because I have no doubt whatever that the public thought the same way that I did: that if there was such waste and mismanagement in one department, it was probably going on in other departments. I hope that the committee will eventually examine all departments of the Government and, in particular, I would like to see it examine the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department and Education Department, because I believe there is massive waste in these three departments in particular.

If, as is suggested by the report, \$14 000 000 could be saved in the Hospitals Department, it seems obvious that right across the board all departments could be involved in huge savings, and I would not be surprised if investigations showed that at least \$50 000 000 could be saved throughout the Public Service by more efficient management. Far too many departments are being propped up and expect to continue to be propped up by the Government.

The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust is one such department, and the Jam Factory is another. The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust deficits have been steadily

escalating for some years. In 1975 the operating deficit was \$813 000, in 1977 it was \$1 900 000, and in 1979, according to the Auditor-General's Report, it was \$3 700 000. True, it was down on the previous year, which I hope indicates that some effort is being made to reduce costs and institute more efficient management.

I recognise that if we are to have any sort of artistic life in South Australia there must be some measure of Government support, but there must also be a limit to this support. Grants such as the one last year of \$3 600 000 to the trust simply cannot continue. Some time ago the trust entered into entrepreneurial activities with a great fanfare of publicity at that time. Last year the losses on that project amounted to \$319 000, and in the previous year the losses were \$424 000. If a private entrepreneur incurred such losses he would be out of business, yet the trust expects the Government to continue to prop it up in this sort of activity.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The Federal Government props up the Australian Opera Company; there's nothing wrong with that?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: No. I was saying that there must be some measure of Government support, that there must be a limit, but the Festival Centre Trust seems to think that the well is bottomless.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What did it lose on its entrepreneurial activities?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Obviously, the Leader was not listening. Last year the trust lost \$319 000 and in the previous year it lost \$424 000 on entrepreneurial activities alone. The Jam Factory is another case in point. It was established some years ago with the stated aims, as described by the Auditor-General, being:

to promote and encourage the development of craft industries in South Australia; make grants or loans to craftsmen for the promotion and encouragement of craft industries; provide workshops and workshop advisory services; and market the products of craft industries, to improve and extend retail and wholesale markets, and to hold exhibitions.

I now refer to the operating costs in comparison with the sales from the various Jam Factory Workshops:

	Gross Cost	Sales
	\$	\$
Glass Workshop	96 201	16 484
Jewellery Workshop	96 026	31 179
Leather Workshop	64 089	15 588
Pottery Workshop	21 894	743
Weaving Workshop	26 698	7 060

The total cost of all the operations of the workshops and other shops at the Jam Factory was \$502 000, with sales amounting to \$198 000, leaving a net loss of \$303 000. With other expenditure added, it finished with a total operating loss of \$411 000. However, because the State Government last year gave the Jam Factory a grant of \$620 000 the books were able to show a surplus for the year of \$208 000.

I am pleased to see that this year the grant to the Jam Factory has been halved from \$620 000 to 310 000, and now we will see what sort of management there is, whether it can cut its cloth to fit what should be done. The fact is that we simply cannot afford to pour money into such projects, particularly projects to enable the friends of the former Premier to indulge their hobbies at the State's expense.

The grants to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, the Jam Factory and the South Australian Film Corporation in the Premier's Financial Statement are less than last year, and in his speech the Premier stated:

While contributions to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and the Film Corporation, at \$2 300 000 and \$1 100 000 respectively—

and I mentioned earlier the cut in contributions to the Jam Factory—

are less in real terms than in 1978-79, they reflect the positive efforts being made by those bodies to improve the efficiency of their operations and to rely less on Government support.

As I said earlier, the Government should support the arts generally. At the same time, the arts must show the Government that it is willing and able to work for itself and reduce costs as much as possible. The future energy needs of South Australia remain a major problem for any Government. I give due credit to the previous Government for recognising this fact and for directing funds to research for hydrocarbons. Naturally, this Government is continuing that research. This is of vital importance, to South Australia, and I have no doubt the research will continue to intensify. As a member of the Select Committee on energy in the last Parliament, I was extremely pleased to see an amount of \$300 000 granted for energy research.

I now wish to refer to some points made in the speeches of the Hon. Miss Wiese and the Hon. Mr. Bruce. During her contribution, the Hon. Miss Wiese said:

During the election campaign, the present Government complained constantly that the development of Roxby Downs would provide 25 000 to 30 000 jobs. But it has given no indication of how those figures were arrived at.

Certainly, the Government has given no indication as to how those figures were arrived at, because the Government did not state those figures. What was said was that when Roxby Downs goes ahead, there could be a town of 25 000 to 30 000 people at that site, with jobs of 3 000 to 5 000—not 25 000 to 30 000 as stated by the Hon. Miss Wiese.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Where did the figure of 16 000 come from, as was stated in all your election advertisements? Those advertisements stated that 7 000 jobs would be created through the pay-roll tax scheme and 16 000 from other projects?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am talking about Roxby Downs, as was the Hon. Miss Wiese when she mentioned specifically that Roxby Downs would create 25 000 to 30 000 jobs. The Hon. Miss Wiese also said:

The whole project is based on the assumption that there will be a possible market for uranium when Roxby Downs comes on stream. 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.

Obviously, the Hon. Miss Wiese feels that there will be a glut of uranium on the market, in which case there is probably nothing wrong with us mining it, anyway. Western Mining Corporation is one of the largest and most successful companies in Australia. I am sure that the Hon. Miss Wiese and all other honourable members would agree that it would not have achieved that success by being silly. That company would have properly researched, and will continue to properly research, the feasibility of these markets.

The Hon. Mr. Bruce referred to the fact that teachers are graduating from teachers colleges, but only one in five will be offered employment. I take issue with that figure. I do not have the exact figures, but I do not believe it is as high as that. I have a feeling that 1 500 teachers in this year's—

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: That is what is circulating around teachers colleges.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: That could well be and I am not arguing that that is not a disastrous state of affairs; I

quite agree with the Hon. Mr. Bruce. The honourable member is being a little simplistic in blaming a Government that has been in power for two months for this particular state of affairs.

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: I am not blaming the Government; I am asking it to rectify the situation.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I agree, I hope the Government does try to rectify it. The decline in numbers should have been foreseen several years ago, and the intake of trainee teachers should have been curtailed accordingly. However, this was not done, with the unfortunate result referred to by the Hon. Mr. Bruce. I am sure all honourable members deplore this situation. I sincerely hope the present Government looks into this problem and curtails the intake of trainee teachers accordingly. Hopefully then we will not have the heartbreak of teachers graduating from teachers college with no jobs to go to. I am sure honourable members know of several people who have been faced with this situation. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I support the motion that this Council take note of the Budget Papers, and I do so with a great deal of reluctance because I have had the opportunity of reading the Liberal Party's policy speech, and it seems to me that the \$20 000 000 that the Government has given to the rich in doing away with succession and gift duties is going to have a large impact on society as a whole. The Liberal Party has increased the rewards of the wealthy people in the community and in certain areas has promised to extend Government facilities, but decrease the expenditure. One area that I might mention in this contribution is that in 1978-79 in the area of libraries \$3 832 615 was spent on the State Library and \$3 481 072 on municipal libraries, making a total of \$7 313 687. The proposed expenditure in 1979-80 is \$7 288 000, a decrease in expenditure. However, we find in the policy speech of the Liberal Party that Mr. Tonkin had this to say:

Immediate steps will be taken to expand the free public library system. Local government will be offered additional capital grants to assist in the establishment of free libraries. Mobile and special services will be provided in those areas of high population density not served by a library. Book-mobiles, regional libraries, school libraries, country lending service will be provided in local council areas. The services of the state libraries, and school and college libraries will be co-ordinated.

Despite all the co-ordination in the world, with a proposed rate of inflation by the Federal Government estimated to be a conservative 10 per cent, how can Mr. Tonkin carry out his election promise of increased library service with a lesser amount of something in the vicinity of \$150 0000. It can be seen that spending can be cut in real terms of approximately 7.8 per cent.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Madam Acting President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Liberal Party policy document on libraries promises that immediate steps will be taken, and I stress the word "immediate", to expand the free public library system and the two key words it seems are "immediate" and "expand". Also local government will be offered additional capital grants to assist the establishment of free libraries. Mobile libraries will be provided in areas of high population density which do not have libraries. That library service in non-council areas will be improved. How is all this to be done in the context of an overall cut in spending?

The Liberal Party has promised a better deal for local

government, yet it has not budgeted for any allocation through the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, other than the money to complete existing projects. Now, in total, about 50 per cent of all SURS money went to local government inspired projects.

Over the past three or four years, this amounted to about \$28 000 000. What is to replace this source of revenue for local government expansion to help the unemployed? It is possible that other funds, such as community welfare and miscellaneous funds, could be used, but I understand that most other sources were almost fully utilised in addition to the SURS money. In fact, the Community Welfare Fund mentioned has been cut from \$964 995 in 1978-79 to \$635 000 in 1979-80, and would not seem a fruitful source of money. The Liberal Party's policy will mean a decrease in local government activity. This is obvious from the figures to which I have referred.

I now turn to the area of community welfare. The Budget papers show the amount of spending on the aged in 1979-80 compared with 1978-79. In 1978-79, \$1 689 283 was spent on salaries, and \$261 300 on operating expenses, other salaries and maintenance, making a total of \$1 950 583 for aged care. The Budget provides that \$1 702 200 will be allocated for salaries, and a further \$261 300 on operating expenses, other salaries and maintenance, making a total of \$1 963 500 for aged care. Allowing for inflation, this amounts to a cut in real spending of 6 per cent in 1979-80, yet the Liberal Party's policy on the aged states:

We will extend programmes designed to maintain independence of the elderly. From institutions, we will expand the number and the role of limited day care centres. How is this to be done—in the context of decreased spending on the aged? The Liberal Party also promised in the community welfare policy document to establish multi-purpose information centres in key areas. I can find no separate line in the Budget for this project. It is an item that could be hidden under the general heading, but it is noticeable that there is no total increase in salaries for community welfare, and that the total of the community welfare budget has been increased by only 6.2 per cent, which is also less than the rate of inflation. Therefore, if there is an increase in service by provisions of these information centres, spending in other areas will have to be cut.

In my contribution in the debate on the Address in Reply, I mentioned the cuts for the Adelaide Children's Hospital. I should like to refer to other hospitals that will feel the sting of the Government cuts.

I now refer to a report in the 28 October issue of the *Sunday Mail* that will give the lie to the Hon. Mr. Carnie's statement that the Government had promised no retrenchments. The report shows that the Government itself will not be making the retrenchments. However, because of the directions that it gives to hospitals, retrenchments will occur. Of course, in the next three years the Government will argue that it did not sack people and, indeed, that the statutory authorities did it themselves. The report, headed "Cash slash hits hospital staff", states:

To save money we will be forced to get people off the payroll. This was the grim warning from Royal Adelaide Hospital administrator, Mr. Ron Hooper, yesterday.

The R.A.H. board is considering cuts in beds, which means reducing the number of wards by two, and drastically cutting domestic cleaning staff. All Adelaide's major public hospitals face cuts in costs and services amounting to millions of dollars because of cash clampdowns by the S.A. Health Commission.

If the Government has its way (and it will not, if I have anything to do with it) the South Australian Health Commission, and not it, will get the flak in relation to this matter. The report continues:

The cuts come in the wake of the State Budget. The R.A.H., the State's main public hospital, faces a huge cut of \$3 400 000.

Mr. Hooper told me, "Patients will not be directly affected, but it looks as though the waiting list for non-critical cases will lengthen. There are 1 000 beds at R.A.H. and that number may be reduced by 45."

"This would mean closing two wards and with it the retrenchment of nursing staff. Cleaning staff have already been reduced and the massive cuts will mean numbers will be drastically reduced on weekends. This will effectively mean only basic domestic chores like sweeping floors, making beds and cleaning toilets will be undertaken on weekends."

Mr. Hooper said the reduced funds would mean mean 70 to 80 cleaning jobs would go . . . Last financial year the R.A.H. spent \$73 000 000 on costs and services. It has only \$70 000 000 this year.

After allowing for inflation and wage increases, the shortfall probably will be more than \$3 250 000. Queen Elizabeth Hospital faces a \$3 000 000 shortfall in funds for 1979-80.

The report continues:

Adelaide Children's Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre are in the same position. Last week, A.C.H. President Mr. A. W. Crompton warned that if the commission stood firm with its cuts the hospital would have to reduce staff and services.

He said the A.C.H. board was prepared to work with the commission but not for it. "Our shortfall on the 1979-80 budget is near \$1 000 000 taking inflation into account," he said.

If one saw *Nationwide* this week, one would have seen the General Manager of the Adelaide Children's Hospital state that, in the past year, in order to cut costs, between 70 and 80 people had been retrenched. So, it is not as though under the Labor Government hospitals were not trying to make cuts and save money. When Government members were in Opposition, we heard continual blasts from them about Flinders Medical Centre and the need for a hospital service to be extended to the South Coast. However, one sees that Flinders Medical Centre has a shortfall of \$3 000 000. Its spokesman said:

But if the commission remains firm we may be forced to reduce services and close wards and then staff will become redundant.

So much for the Hon. Mr. Hill's influence on the Liberal Cabinet in relation to hospital requirements on the South Coast.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Flinders has double the staff of the other hospitals.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I wish that the Liberal Party had been truthful to the electorate before the election. However, in the past few weeks all its promises have been turned into lies, and we are now seeing cuts being made in relation to hospitals, the aged, poor and underprivileged.

This report gives fair warning to the people of South Australia who must use hospital facilities for the next 12 months. They may find that the times they previously waited will be doubled. Also, as a result of staff cuts, employees will have to work much harder. As a consequence people waiting for service at hospital outpatient sections, and those waiting to be admitted to hospitals, will now have to wait a considerable time for attention. Indeed, some will have to wait a full day for treatment.

Mr. Tonkin was quite clear in his policy speech when he

dealt with hospitals in general. Regional co-ordinating committees representing all concerned in health care will be established. I hope that the people running hospitals such as Adelaide Children's, Queen Elizabeth, Royal Adelaide and Flinders Medical Centre will be represented on these co-ordinating committees.

The recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee regarding the Hospitals Department will be instituted and expenditure reduced by \$14 000 000. No wonder Mr. Tonkin could give his rich industrialist and farming friends a way out in death duties, gift duty, land tax, and so on. He went on further in his policy speech to say that greater autonomy would be given to hospital boards. However, autonomy without money is not very satisfactory.

I take the opportunity in this Budget to talk about the procedures and conditions relating to the transfer of departmental and weekly paid employees working for the Government. Mr. Brown has met people from the trade union movement. In fact, Mr. Dean Brown gave John Lessees, the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council and Mr. Alan Begg, Secretary, Australian Workers Union, a document when they presented a deputation on his policy. I am pleased that Mr. Begg has been quick enough to circulate all representatives in Government departments with this document, because I am sure that as a result of that circulation workers, and especially those who voted for the Liberal Party, will realise just what is in store for them. However, it does not detract from the tragedy of the Government policy on transfers of departmental employees. No worker is entitled to be uprooted in his employment by the method in which Mr. Brown proposes.

The article is dated 4 October 1979, and it is a very comprehensive document that answers some of the questions which I previously asked in this Council and to which I have not yet received a reply. I asked a question recently of Mr. Brown as to the Government's policy of the old depression days of firing but not hiring. Now that I have got the document, I suppose the question has been answered, because after the introduction of section 2 of the document he states that:

(a) No replacement policy for weekly paid employees whereby any employee retiring or resigning from a department shall not be replaced by persons not employed by a Government department.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In fact, the article I am referring to is a five-page document and, for the benefit of those people working in Government departments, I seek leave to have the document printed in *Hansard* and make a few brief comments on the document.

The PRESIDENT: Not unless it is statistical.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It is Mr. Brown's policy speech.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member will have to read it.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The points I would like to make relate to page 2. It states that the employing department shall make every effort to place the employee within that department in vacant positions which have duties and skills identical or similar to those applying to his original contract of employment and which carry identical or similar rates of pay. That is going to be a very difficult task because of the many and varied classifications in Government departments.

Where the crunch comes is what happens when a transfer does not give that person a similar type of job or classification, and, in fact, he would have to transfer to a

position of a lower rate of pay. Mr. Brown has made some provision on page 4 of his document for that occurrence. He says in his document that an employee who accepts a transfer to a position of a lower classification shall be entitled to receive income maintenance amounting to the difference between his ordinary weekly rate of pay in his former employment and his ordinary rate of pay in his new employment. That means, in effect, his pay is made up to his previous earnings, but it will not go on forever. He has certain restrictions, and they are as follows:

One years continuous service or more, but less than five years for a period of six months.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: That means his pay might amount to a \$20 differential, and for six months he will receive that \$20 per week, provided he has had one year's continuous service. If he has had five years and less than 10, it will go on for eight months. If he has had 10 years service and not less than 20, it will go on for 10 months. If he has had 20 years continuous service or more, he will have a higher rate of pay—his pay made up for a period of 12 months. So, here you see a person with one year's continuous service; he will retain his classification and rate of pay for six months, yet a person with 20 years continuous service will receive that rate of pay for only a 12-month period. It shows the recognition of a man with one year's service and a man with 20 years service, but after a period of 12 months they will lose \$20 a week or more, depending on fluctuations in the rates of pay. This is something to look forward to as a result of Liberal policy.

The proposition which I am very concerned about is: should the employee be dismissed from, or voluntarily leave, the position to which he was transferred, income maintenance payments shall cease from the date of termination. I would like to know what happens when long service and annual leave entitlements are made up on a person's termination. Will he receive his classified rate of pay or the income maintenance rate of pay? Of course, the unions will be asking this question, but they are certainly not answered in the document that I am referring to.

Of course, he goes on further to say that no employee who refuses suitable employment or retraining shall be eligible for income maintenance. There will be a lot of refusals. All that Government workers will look forward to will be a reduction in their pay packets, depending on the period of employment.

It is all very well for Mr. Brown to say that unions will be involved in all aspects of the Government's new policy, but let us see where wage disputes exist. On page 5, subclause 4, the interdepartmental committee on transfers is to be responsible for co-ordinating income maintenance arrangements between departments. Should a dispute arise between the employee and the former employing department with respect to income maintenance, the interdepartmental committee shall decide the matter. In all the experience I have had with Government departments, if a worker wants me to represent him as a trade unionist on his rates of pay, I have always had that privilege, and it has not been a matter for the special committee set up by the Government to decide the correct rates of pay that an employee should receive.

One of the worst features of Mr. Brown's proposal is relocation expenses, and it worries me that the relocation will affect families. I think the effects would be enormous, because people who are situated in the metropolitan area are paying off homes and mortgages; children are settled at school; wives are sometimes working part-time; teenage daughters (if they are lucky enough) have jobs; sons may

be apprenticed in various industries, while, if the department so desires, they will be relocated in country areas where houses are not available.

The person concerned may not be able to sell his home. However, if an employee has to transfer and accept another position, it is proposed he will receive expenses for moving his household goods. It provides that furniture removal expenses be the lowest of the three removalist quotations. He gets depreciation of furniture and he gets travelling expenses for the employee's dependent spouse and dependent children, and those allowances shall be those applicable to Government weekly paid employees, whatever they are. Stage 2 of the document on transfers provides:

The employing department shall make every effort to place employees with that Department in vacant positions which have duties and skills identical with or similar to those applying to his original contract of employment and which carry identical or similar rates of pay. In all cases—

- (a) the convenience of employees should assume major importance in the decisions relating to transfers;
- (b) the following procedures shall be adopted:

- (i) Step 1 (as outlined in Section III) shall have been implemented and affected employees and their union representatives shall be advised of available vacant positions including duties, pay rates and location.

- (ii) Where possible arrangements should be made through consultation to transfer surplus employees to positions of the same or similar classifications appropriate to their skills (with or without re-training) and at locations which do not unduly inconvenience the employee. If such employees refuse to accept positions which can be shown not to unduly disadvantage them, the employing department should be entitled to terminate their employment as provided for in the appropriate award.

There is no mention of the wages a man could lose as a result of the transfers. It is not always possible to move on a weekend. It is not always possible to get alternative accommodation in a short period of time. He could lose anything up to a week's wages, and there is no provision for reimbursement of a week's wages. The rent of an alternative house could be higher than the rent he is already paying or the amount of the present mortgage he is paying off. There is no compensation for this nor is it suggested in the relocation expenses. The other thing that we have, as everyone in the Council would know, is a depressed market now for the sale of homes. It is very difficult to sell a home, unless he accepts a depressed price. A person relocating who has not paid off his home could have two mortgages on his home and find it very difficult to sell it in order to take on his new position with the Government.

I believe it is very important that relocation should be looked at and the matters that I mentioned taken up with the trade union movement and the worker. No worker with the Government should be asked to sell his home to relocate himself, outside where he normally resides, because of the Government's policy.

I have mentioned in the Address in Reply debate, Mr. President, that employees who work with Government departments could also lose, by being seconded into the private sector, their security of employment, because some private contractors only get one or two contracts a year. Many go broke and often many do not pay award wages. This is something that ought to be considered and reconsidered by the Minister concerned.

I believe that the policy ought to be that men should be offered the job and should have the choice of retaining their occupation in the Government department. One thing that concerns me further is an article in the Budget which convinces me that the Government means business when it talks about relocation of Government employees. I believe that it is the Government's policy to sack weekly paid employees in the Government departments by stealth. To prove my point, I refer to that part of Mr. Tonkin's policy speech regarding public works where he said a minimum work force only in the Public Buildings Department to maintain public buildings and minor repairs will be retained to ensure that the Public Buildings Department does not operate to the detriment of the private sector.

If what he says is the truth (and I have no doubt that it is), hundreds of workers who work for the Public Buildings Department could be retrenched or, in the words of Mr. Brown, seconded to the private sector. I know from talking to tradesmen who have learnt the trade as carpenters in the Public Buildings Department that they are workers of very high standard and quality, because of the very comprehensive apprenticeship training in the Public Buildings Department.

It appears that Mr. Tonkin intends only to maintain a work force that will do minor repairs, so the jobs of apprentices who are normally employed by the Public Buildings Department will disappear. Carpenters, plumbers and hosts of other tradesmen weekly paid employees in the Public Buildings Department will be out of work soon if Mr. Brown and Mr. Tonkin have their way. In the case of unions, Mr. Tonkin had this to say, "Dispute solving procedures will be encouraged." He goes on further to say that there will be an investigation into the feasibility of giving the Industrial Commission the power to require a bond from unions which have previously used the threat of disruption to achieve wage increases, etc., as a precondition to the granting of additional benefits and wage increases. Mr. Tonkin is saying that, if a union threatens to go on strike in support of wage demands, it will be required to pay a bond to the industrial court. I can see that the industrial courts are going to be very busy if Mr. Tonkin and Mr. Brown have their way, because, as I have said previously, the workers, with the support of their trade union, will fight back for jobs and working conditions. They have my full support.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In supporting the motion, one thing that I want to say is that Parliament should be regarded as a public forum, but that is not permitted, because of the way politicians are returned and because of the systems in all political Parties. The public are denied a voice, and the only way that they can get anything is by signing a meaningless and hopeless petition which is put in the archives and on which no action is taken.

Any political Party should be honest, but a Party that has been in Government and then has lost office should be more than honest. There has been conjecture about why the previous Government lost the election. Members opposite have spoken in terms of back slapping on how the Liberal Party came into office. However, some Liberal members are astonished. One told me recently that he doubted that it was true that they were in office. There have been statements by members of my Party and press statements that we can blame the press for the loss.

In some respects we could blame the press. Some of the advertisements that we used to try to ensure our return to office should have been banned by the Murdoch press. They did nothing for us, but I say that in a subjective and critical sense. However, there is a warning to all political

Parties and all Governments that Executive control is just not good enough for any political Party. It is a disaster for the Australian Labor Party, which has prided itself (as it ought to) on being a Party that attracts the masses.

I will always regret that my role as a politician is not more effective in this Chamber. Taking an analytical view of a politician's life, I believe that other than in the case of Cabinet members, less resolves itself in such a Chamber, than in the other areas where politicians work, say, in carrying out duties for those people they represent.

It is no good for the A.L.P., at the machine level or any other level, saying that we lost the election because the press was against us. The press was against us and it has always been against us. On one occasion during the 1970's the Murdoch press was not critical of the Whitlam Government; indeed, it sought to have the Whitlam Opposition elected to form the Federal Government. Murdoch was looking for a few plums then, and he went cap in hand seeking from the Prime Minister some favoured treatment for a company, Allwest, but he was knocked back, and he knocked Gough back.

In N.S.W. the Murdoch press supported the election of the present Government. There was something in it for Murdoch, although I will not say what it was, and so Neville may be shrewd in that regard. We have never had the press on side. The history of the Labor Party in Australia has been unfortunate inasmuch as it has been elected to office to pull Australia out of turmoil at the end of two world wars. We found ourselves in power just before the great crash of 1929 and again in 1972 just prior to the great international crash of the 1970's. Obviously, that is our unfortunate lot.

I have been associated directly with the Labor Party in South Australia since 1946, and all my adult life I have seen few years when the Federal Labor Party has been on the Treasury benches in Australia. I went through the long hard period from the late 1940's, through the 1950's and into the 1960's, when 1965 saw the A.L.P. Government elected in South Australia after 30 years in the political wilderness and then narrowly losing again in a gerrymandered electorate in 1968. Indeed, I can still hear the feet of 15 000 people marching in King William Street in 1968 demanding electoral justice. I thought that the South Australian people would then have a fair chance of voting for a Government of their choice and that happened in 1970 and has continued since.

The Labor Party started to lose the recent election in 1977, because it lost touch with the people. It lost touch with Parliamentarians and made too many decisions at Executive level. Two people decided what would happen and when it would happen. Statements were made without any consultation with the Party proper and decisions were taken paying only scant regard to the policies of this great Party which has had at heart the interests of the common people, and the people for whom I plead today and the people over whom I feel sure the present Government will ride roughshod. That is borne out by this Budget statement.

Has there been any guarantee by this Government that it will honour the promises of the last Government to the black inhabitants of South Australia? They are the people for whom I feel most sorry because of the return of a Liberal Government. Certainly, the return of a Liberal Government is the result of our neglect and not the result of our opponents' astuteness. It is not because the Liberals had superior policies: it was handed to them on a plate by two or three people who did not know any better and who should have known better. I make no apologies for saying that, because outside this Chamber is a multitude of people who may not necessarily be members of this Party

but who have been traditional Labor supporters. They have not been treated in the manner to which they are entitled by an Executive bound up in such a small world.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Why did you not call your blokes back to order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I will come to that, but why do you not shut up for a moment! I recall when two or three of us were publicly called to account because we might wreck the Government after attending a meeting in Gilbert Street. I say again that it was not the rank and file of this Party, the trade union movement, the so-called left wing, or the so-called forces of the press that lost us the sense the needs, forgetting their obligation to the tens of thousands of people in this State who at least always had an allegiance and who have lost.

It grieves me greatly (and I make no apologies for saying this; it would be a dereliction on my part if I did not do so) that after waiting for many years and working hard, although perhaps not as hard as people outside worked, to ensure that we had a continuous Labor Government in this State, our position was frittered away overnight, divebombed and destroyed. Arguments were not even put up against false propaganda. Advertisements appeared in an Adelaide paper bearing Tom Playford's name and referring to power stations in South Australia. Tom Playford came into office in 1932, when South Australia had one power station. There was not a farm property on the circuit, and Tom Playford went out of office about 30 years later when we had 1½ power stations. Where was our Executive during the campaign? Why did they not say that we had built over 200 per cent more power stations in our period in office? It was not said.

I was conducting factory-gate meetings, and men on the shop floor were saying, "Why don't you say this or that?" Then a big advertisement came out saying that we were not concerned about business. It amazes me that members on the other side so falsely say that South Terrace, be it the union or the Party office, dictated the last election campaign. The fact is that Government members are always critical of trade unions. This Party was born of trade unions. Members of Parliament should not believe that they have been given some God-given right to be here, because we have never done anything special in our lives.

We belong to a Party and a machine. We expect loyalty to it and we expect loyalty from it. We expect some openness from it and not super secrecy. During and after the election campaign, members opposite made false attacks on the trade union movement, and that was a cause of the Labor Party's defeat. Did the tramways strike also have some effect on the election? Of course it did and blind Freddy could have seen that a fortnight before polling day. It is no good our trying to talk to workers as one would talk to a platoon of soldiers; that is not on. I have no criticism of the tramway employees' union, which was striving for a rightful goal and became frustrated. A proposal was put to two different Ministers 12 to 18 months ago, following vast changes that had occurred in this industry when a large private employer was absorbed into it and the traditional area became almost a minority.

When that union appeared before the Industrial Court a proposal should have been put forward to give it an opportunity to hold an authorised paid stopwork meeting each quarter. Buses should have been made available at Warradale, in the southern areas, at Port Adelaide and Tea Tree Gully, etc., with members meeting on their own property at Hackney. A further proposal could have been made on the basis that, if the union was to take industrial action as a result of one of those quarterly authorised paid

stop-work meetings, any industrial action should be deferred for 24 hours in the public interest. That authorised stopwork meeting could have been held between the hours of, say, 11.30 a.m. and 1.45 p.m., at the quietest time of the day, and people could have been told publicly that there would be no buses or trams running at that time. This matter could have been settled to everyone's satisfaction, and we should have talked to people instead of ignoring them and getting ourselves into a state of political upheaval.

Is it any wonder that when one went into, say, the Morphet Arms Hotel at Warradale one heard that people were out to get Virgo. It was no good saying that, Virgo had retired; the Labor Party had simply lost touch with the workers. Some thought holding the A.C.T.U. Congress at about the time of the election had an adverse effect for the Labor Party. That congress was controversial, as it always will be, and as could also be said of the Young Liberals' meetings, which the Liberal Party considers a liability when they take place each year. I am not saying that the A.C.T.U. Congress was a liability, but it did deal with measures involving the policy of this Party in South Australia. Accordingly, those policies would come under close scrutiny and of course they would be divisive and would receive a great deal of publicity.

The fact that the Labor Party did not consult with the unions is an example of the price the people of this State, indeed possibly the people of the world, will pay. The stupidity and arrogance of two or three people have perhaps committed the people of this State, of this nation, and perhaps the world, to a short-term lifespan for all mankind.

Inherent in the Labor Party's policy on uranium mining was the fact that many people overseas—those that do know we exist—saw us as being one place where common sense might prevail. I will deal later, if time permits, with the rubbish that was spoken here yesterday by Dr. Ritson.

Is it any wonder that a quarter of a million people marched in America against uranium power houses? Is it any wonder that in Austria a multi-million dollar project is not allowed to operate? I ask members opposite why that is so: because a referendum of the people said "No".

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Half of 1 per cent.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Next week you get yourself down to the library and read in the *New York Times* what I hope will be the full report of the disaster in America. Tonkin came back from America and said everything was lovely. He probably did not go near the place and never consulted any of the workers. The engineers, architects, designers and the construction authority have all been soundly condemned for the disaster that occurred at Three Mile Island. Carter, who is a nuclear engineer and almost a nuclear scientist in his own right—not a peanut farmer like Bjelke-Petersen—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is it any wonder that my anger will not subside when I realise that members opposite might tear the world asunder in their mad dash for false goals? Do they think that the youth of this country, who today are being denied the distribution of wealth, will put up with the conditions being forced on them? In 10 years time when those youths are in their 30's or 40's, they will react against the system that continues to keep them in poverty, never having had a worthwhile job. Members opposite know darned well that mechanisation followed by technology and then super technology is never going to permit anything like so-called full employment. Does that not then lead them to think that there should be something new? God forbid that members opposite should think about any socialist measures and I would not suggest

that they do, because they would probably die of a heart attack. But there must be a reappraisal of wealth for the benefit of all people in this country.

It is a crying shame that the North-West Shelf is today being plundered by the likes of Anthony, who flew to Japan the other week and sold us out. It is being plundered more efficiently today than if it were to be invaded by the Japanese. Although a move is being made in Western Australia to do something about this, I do not know where it will get us.

South Australia has basically been a rural economy, favoured recently by a good season and perhaps another one coming up, hopefully improving our economic situation for the time being. The other aspect that has saved this State in the past has been the spasmodic discovery of minerals. Few discoveries have been made in South Australia until the last 10 years. Today I asked a question about the most accessible mining operations from the point of view of the present Government; uranium and uranium mining. We found that those mining sites are owned by an overseas company and, in turn, by one of the greatest Australian political scoundrels ever to draw breath—Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

Mr. Tonkin will be able to sign contracts with any overseas company that wants to be involved, just for a pittance in royalties. Where are the hundreds of thousands of jobs? That is a load of rubbish, and members opposite know it. If one looks at the gigantic export projections for Australia for the next 10 years, one sees how staggering they are, and this State Government should be doing something about it.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris asked a question today about our coal deposits. He knew, when he asked that question, that this was the lucky country. However, we do not even have the facilities to test our brown coal deposits. Samples thereof must be sent to West Germany, which merely states that it can supply us with the necessary technology and hardware. It is about time that members opposite raised this matter in their Party room and anywhere else that is necessary. It has already been raised in Labor's Party room.

There must be a redistribution of wealth, because the dole is not good enough. The youth of this country has been subjected to unemployment and under-employment for five or six years, and at some stages it has run as high as 50 per cent. Members opposite say, "Let us get a few royalties." The Hon. Mr. Burdett can afford to laugh. He has probably never had to do a day's work in his life.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You've been in Government for 10 years. What have you done about it?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I was waiting for that. The Hon. Mr. Hill comes in every time.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We've been in office for only six weeks.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: That is so, and the first person who came to visit you was that boundary rider, Fraser, who came galloping up the front steps. However, before he came here he was ensconced in the Festival Theatre with Mr. Tonkin. Conservative Governments have been in power in Australia for almost three-quarters of a century, yet the Hon. Mr. Hill talks about his Government's having been in office for only six weeks.

Mr. Goldsworthy, in another place, has said enough to set sales for the next three years. Did members opposite give any thought to their grandchildren when they made this decision? For the few thousand dollars involved in royalties what will the companies concerned be given back from taxpayers' money for roads, railways, wharves, and so on? Most of the money that has gone into the Northern Territory has come from the taxpayers' pockets, and Mr.

Anthony has flogged things off at bargain basement prices.

I make the point that we have the wealth, including natural gas. Indeed, we have probably got more oil than we realise today. We also have more iron ore deposits than almost the rest of the world combined. Yet we flog off our raw materials for a song. If people want to develop Roxby Downs, let them do it. They can put in their money and all the structures they like. However, they should be returned nothing more than the product they want, be it coal, oil, gas or some other form of mineral.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: Or uranium.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No, that can be kept in the ground. Then, the wealth of this country can be distributed amongst the people, as is their right. One can imagine what countries like Greece would do if they had mineral deposits. Would they allow other countries to come in? Certainly, they would not. Australia is supposed to be grown up and developed, yet we allow ourselves to be conned, robbed and plundered 24 hours a day for God knows how many years.

Some Liberals say that unemployment is the fault of the trade unions, because they have exported jobs. However, that has happened ever since Macarthur sent the first fleece to England. If we have this untold wealth, we must wrest it from the hands of those who believe in themselves only and no-one else. That is the only way in which we can stave off a catastrophe in this country, because people will have no respect for government, and, if they think they can get justice from the end of a gun, they will no doubt try to do so.

The Hon. Mr. Ritson, who has just left the Chamber, referred to terrorists, but we could be creating terrorists. The honourable member said that such people would do all sorts of things if they got their hands on uranium. Of course, the answer is to leave it in the ground. It is as simple as that.

I now refer to the more immediate problem relating to liquid fuel energy. I intend later to say much more about the multi-national area.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Members opposite have been most unfair to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who carried the can for them for years. They deserted him in his hour of need. That was indeed shabby treatment. The honourable member, who has served his Party so well, should have been treated much more fairly than he was treated.

The Liberal Party despatched the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, after the risks he had taken for the Party and the work he had put in prior to the last election, and it does not give me much encouragement to say that to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, but I say it in all sincerity and with respect.

A great deal has been said about the liquid energy crisis. One of the great tragedies here is that the present Federal Government has seen fit to regard the crisis, which is not of the Australian people's making, as one from which it will derive profit, imposing on the average person in Australia a heavy taxation burden. It is astounding to hear people in the community saying that the oil companies are responsible for the increase in oil prices. In the United States that is true, but it does not apply in Australia, because those companies must hand it back to the Federal Government. Some six months ago members opposite laughed at me when I said that the Federal Government would grab so many millions of dollars in a few short months. It is a much higher figure now.

The tragedy of that is two-fold: first, it increases the cost of living generally; and, secondly, it has an adverse inflationary effect on the cost structure in the transport field generally in Australia, while it has no other purpose than to allow the Government to decrease its deficit. That

is what the Federal Government is doing in the hope that at the next election it can claim to have expertly managed the country and returned economic planning to sanity, when that Government has merely over-reduced its deficit. It is criminal for that reason and it is also criminal because it is forcing up the cost of living. The Premier said that he was going to do something about price control.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: He said he would review it.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: When the Liberals say that, it means nothing. They are not saving any energy; there is only one way of doing that, and that is to set a quota system for the private motorist. People could be placed in different categories, for example, distinguishing between those who have access to public transport and those who do not. If one is going to use the charge as a conservation measure on liquid fuel, then that charge can be increased beyond the quota and not taken below it. If a person is entitled to 100 litres per week, he pays a reasonable price for it. However, the cost of production and transporting goods will be increased 100-fold in 12 months. This can be applied to the farming community, as it can be to industrial workers, etc. The price can be such that there is a deterrent not to go beyond the quota.

As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris knows, there is a great need for a liquid energy audit throughout the country. It can be done by the State but it is much more desirable and efficient that it be conducted and investigated by the Federal Government. If this occurs, there is a problem involving where the powers lie, and it is up to the State to grant power to the Commonwealth to act in a wide field.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is being done now by the National Energy Committee.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is not being done, it is only being talked about. Mr. Fraser is intent on grabbing millions for his deficit.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I am talking about audits.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is not; it is being talked about. There may be something in conducting an audit, and it should be done, but, while Fraser is grabbing millions for his deficit, nothing will be done. One realises that there has to be a stand-by capacity equivalent to about 25 per cent of the total electrical generating power to carry through the peak loads. However, we are bent on a course that spells doom for us measured in terms of liquid energy, because we waste it, and we will not cease wasting it because of the cost factor. We should be telling the Federal Government that we are not too poor to be carrying out a number of gigantic projects that will have a two-fold effect: save energy in the long run, and create work in the immediate future (much more work than is involved in the Redcliff project).

Travelling on the South-East Freeway, one finds row after row of the most uneconomical system of transport units in the world. They may be a great free enterprise dream, but they are wasteful, costing billions of dollars in requiring the construction and maintenance of roads. I am not suggesting that semi-trailers should be hauled off the road next week. However, there should be a five-year or 10-year plan of duplicating, for example, the railway lines from Melbourne to at least the border of this State, and of duplicating other lines, thereby increasing the volume of railway traffic, and resulting in greater use of coal than of diesel. Technology has led to the use of coal as a vastly more efficient fuel source, and we have adequate supplies in this country for some hundreds, if not thousands, of years.

We cannot afford the luxury of half-laden transport or of containerisation, and the stupidity of the Department of Trade in 1963, when Black Jack McEwen's department and Sir Alan Westerman fell for the British trick of

complete and absolute containerisation. It costs about \$40 to move a container from one side of the container terminal to the other. The cost is exorbitant.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You're quite right on an energy basis, but you're not right when you value it on a cost basis. The cheapest form of transport is around the coast.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I was coming to that. I said that to the committee.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why did you say that?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Because people in London, Rotterdam, New York, and Bremerhaven decide what to do with shipping in Australia. With the Department of Trade, Alan Westerman and others made the decision. I always accused Black Jack McEwen, when I was in the Federal House, of trotting off overseas with \$40 000 000 to buy the Australian shipping lines into the Conference Line system. God knows what he did with it, and whether he put it back into his farm. The Conference Line is a gathering of shipowners—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It's a cartel.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: That is right. The Australian National Line was set up during the war and was altered by the Liberal Party in about 1952, when it set up the Australian Shipping Commission and stripped the line of its competitive rights, so that it was not able to set up its own agency and had to use the agency of the existing overseas shipowners, the pirates who came here in the 1800's. They are still pirates. The Australian line was forced to use their facilities and their agency.

After it got into the Conference Line (the Australian National Line was able to get into the Conference Line through the Department of Trade), it first entered the Japanese trade. It was given a percentage of the north-bound traffic, but that percentage meant that the first vessel could not come back other than half loaded. Only after a great struggle by the maritime unions and others were the Japanese forced to take in the second vessel. In 1970, the Australian National Line exceeded its percentage right and had to pay back the additional percentage to the overseas burglars. For the first time ever (and Nixon was the Minister at the time), the Australian National Line showed a loss of between \$1 000 000 and \$2 000 000.

Shipping here was undertaken by the Australian National Line, but it was strangled because the Adelaide Steamship Company, the interstate and intrastate owner and operator, had priority of allocation. If there were two ships at Port Adelaide, labour would be taken off the Australian National Line ship and put on the other. They operated on the cost plus basis, and where four forklift trucks would be needed on a vessel, they would put 20 on an A.N.L. vessel.

I remember the *River Murray* and other ships built as a wartime measure. One I.C.I. vessel took seven weeks to take a load of soda ash to the Eastern States. We have heard criticism of the maritime unions for starving the shipowners off the coast. There has never been one word about the machinations of the shipowners. Talk of the power of unions is rubbish. If the trade union movement in the transport field decided that there were to be two airlines operating in Australia, that they could operate only on the basis that they went into an airport together, that they would operate in the form of the same passenger configuration, and that they would operate the same kind of aircraft, the union movement would be condemned soundly.

However, if employers do something similar, it is the dream of free enterprise. The restrictions in this country are not necessarily restrictions by the trade union

movement: they are inbuilt in the system. About 15 years ago, one could not travel in Queensland without seeing an agency, wharf, or shipping facility for the Adelaide Steamship Company. That company ripped shipping off and then got out. The company built the *Troubridge* in 1961 or 1962 to go to that haven of right-wingers, Kangaroo Island. The people there hung on to their blunderbuses and cannons. They are the most right-wing group that I have spoken to and they include Mr. Buick, the man the Liberal Party conned into putting its advertisements into the newspaper. I can remember when he would not want to know a member of the Liberal Party, let alone put its advertisements in the newspaper.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Buicks aren't bad vehicles.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Even they have gone insolvent. The terrible socialist Labor Party in South Australia was forced to pick up the tab for the loss by the Adelaide Steamship Company in going to the island. The company did not care about the community being isolated, but it would ask us whether we were going to allow ships to run. We would say that we had a written agreement that we would not break. The present Government will have to make up its mind whether it will make available about \$15 000 000, or let the *Troubridge* be sold.

Honourable members opposite have criticised my Party on the one hand for being socialist and on the other for not keeping a service running to that area. There will have to be a return to the sea lanes along this coast. Anybody who spends a dollar on the Stuart Highway ought to have his neck wrung and his head read because, if we are going to spend money on that road, it will cost billions of dollars. And who will use that road? The tourist industry and road transport will use it. I refer now to the fine body of workmen who have been up in the hinterland building the Tarcoola railway line. The Hon. Mr. Cornwall, the Hon. Mr. Blevins and I have visited those workmen. I do think the Hon. Mr. Hill has been there.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I have not been invited.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: That line should be extended to Darwin. Never mind about spending too much money on the road: form it up and throw a bit of metal on it, but do not spend billions of dollars on it.

The railway ought to run to Darwin, because there is much trade available to this State from that city. If honourable members had any idea of the concepts to which I was referring when speaking of containerisation, they would have realised that there should have been a container port in Darwin, with a rail link. We would have been far better off doing that, because that port would be close to the best markets in the world, markets that we have ignored for years and are continuing to ignore.

I do not know whether the Government is going to grasp the nettle of the conservation problem so far as liquid fuels are concerned. There is much conflict about that matter today. The only saving grace for Fraser with his plundering of the taxpayers' purse in that area is that one can say that the money is being retained in this country, whereas had it gone to the oil companies it might not have stayed here.

One of the great problems that faces the Carter Administration in America today is whether or not it will legislate (in that free enterprise country) to prevent billions and billions of dollars in increased profits that flow to the oil companies from being used to take over other resources and areas of commercial interest in which the oil companies have previously never been interested, thereby strangling everything in those fields. I have a quote from a British newspaper that I wish Dr. Ritson to hear. It is titled "Disposing of nuclear power's unwanted by-products."

Before I continue, I take this opportunity to compliment

my colleague, Barbara Wiese, on her fine contribution in this place in her maiden speech on this important question. I thought it appropriate that the youngest person in this Chamber should concern herself with a problem such as this, because it concerns the young more than it concerns those who have been around for many years. The report states:

Highly concentrated nuclear waste, unwanted by-products of reactors, is created during the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuels.

This waste initially produces a great deal of heat, is highly radioactive and contains such components as the isotopes plutonium and americium—which will remain potentially dangerous for hundreds of millennia.

The main problem of disposal is therefore effective isolation from the environment for periods which, in human terms, are extremely long.

Having dismissed bizarre solutions, such as firing the waste by rocket into the sun or burial under the Arctic ice cap, most nuclear nations have now opted for disposal by vitrification—incorporation into glass blocks—and burial in deep, impermeable rock sites.

The EEC programme, of which the Atomic Energy Authority Institute of Geological Sciences drilling projects are part, is intended to define suitable locations.

Present plans for vitrification would lock the waste in borosilicate glass in cylindrical blocks about 60 centimetres in diameter and 3 metres long.

Waste would have to be stored in a liquid form for months or years before vitrification, to allow short-lived radioactive substances to decay to an acceptable level.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Look at Windscale. It's been there for 30 years.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I have much information to show what is happening. They are coming undone fast. The nuclear freaks have had you by the ears for too long. The report continues:

After vitrification, the blocks would again have to be stored at the surface in specially engineered cooling ponds for a few years.

What is involved in specially engineered cooling ponds I do not know.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I know; I have seen them.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Did Mr. DeGaris see all this when he saw the cooling ponds? Did he think he would have to look at it for a thousand years if he lived that long? The report continues:

Their heat output would be high for about 1 000 years, a factor which would have to be taken into account in disposal if melting and the creation of local "hot spots" and stress are to be avoided. Present plans are to place these hot blocks in shafts running from an engineered disposal site deep underground in hard, unfissured, rock.

Harwell's latest calculations suggest that an underground site roughly half a kilometre square and 150 metres deep, with access shafts at the surface, would be capable of dealing with the whole of Britain's nuclear waste to the end of the century.

How can Mr. DeGaris claim that Windscale is so effective if the United Kingdom is looking at all this? The report states:

This would cost more than £100 million. Because radioactive materials may leak out of the repository, location is critically important. Not only must it be deep enough to avoid the possibility of rock fracturing in the event of another ice age . . .

This is how far ahead the United Kingdom is thinking. They are concerned that such a system can withstand an ice age. The report states:

Not only must it be deep enough to avoid the possibility of

rock fracturing in the event of another ice age, but it must have initial low permeability, and be above any possible future level of the water table.

Progress has not gone that far in Australia. The importance of the water table cannot be overlooked, if honourable members consider the situation at Roxby Downs and the safeguards required. What is unique in the world is the water supply to the vast dry region of Australia, the Great Artesian Basin, where the water table of that basin is on the surface.

The Cooper Creek and the other rivers that flood there occasionally are the waters that supplement the artesian basin, and they come from the surface. Anything near the surface must leak into that artesian basin, which is unique from other land structures in the world where water is supplied by rainfall.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Water is going through there now?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes. The report continues:

It has been found that, in the special circumstances of the so-called "natural reactor" in Gabon, West Africa, waste products are absorbed and held by granitic rock.

The investigations are aimed at evaluating rock structures which, on the basis of initial investigations and laboratory studies of leaching and absorption of nuclear materials, have already been identified as being of possible value.

The crux of the problem lies in predicting accurately how a rock structure will behave over the next few millennia.

What engineer, geologist, egghead or professional person can say what is going to happen to a rock structure over the next millions of years? Ayers Rock would probably not be there by then, because natural weather erosion would have probably powdered it and built up the surrounding plain. The report continues:

Other possibilities being investigated in Europe and Russia are waste disposal in deep salt deposits—which indicate great geological stability—and deep clay formations.

Neither are suitable for the disposal of "hot" wastes, although both can be used for medium-level wastes and, assuming long surface storage and dilution, could be utilised for all wastes.

It is only on the assumption that we can find a ground level area suitable for the long surface storage and dilution that we can think about the other alternatives. Where does the Government think it is travelling in the interests of the future generations that may inhabit this earth? The report continues:

The United States has adopted a policy which, if other energy sources are developed, avoids the disposal problem by not reprocessing used fuels.

Storage of used fuels is less difficult, less intrinsically hazardous and means that materials used for making nuclear bombs cannot be separated.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: The future of mankind depends on nuclear energy.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I will deal with that in a moment. The report continues:

A paradox of the search for nuclear waste disposal sites in deep rock is that the rocks involved are often the most suitable for exploitation of geothermal energy.

I could go on. I could refer to the boilermakers case in England, where the steel containers used to transport waste were totally inadequate and created awful dangers and problems. I could go on and deal with the stupidity of the United States plan for a nuclear dump in a Pacific atoll. I have raised this matter before; it should never have been considered. The United States was going to buy that atoll for \$2 000 000 from the native inhabitants. I could also refer to Hazeldine, who named 15 possible sites in Great Britain for underground radioactive waste dumps,

and there is a great deal of concern about that.

I now turn to the point raised by the honourable member opposite, who said that the future of mankind is dependent upon this source of energy. This source of energy is very short-lived; if this energy is utilised to its utmost, in known technology it would probably all be gone within the next 20 years. I want to impress on members opposite that from time to time they must feel some form of frustration at the strategic arms limitation talks, the politicking and political debates that take place between Russia and America, following yet another round of so-called SALT talks. Professor Oliphant, the previous Governor, has had a dollar each way. He helped create nuclear energy, but when the dangers became known he took an opposite view. He has preached about its frightening qualities and aspects.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: He has supported the mining of uranium at Roxby Downs.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, thank you. He has a dollar each way.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Two to one.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: All things to all people and master of none.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Hugh Hudson spoiled Roxby Downs.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: To be honest, he did to a degree. I notice Burdett looking at the clock, because he has an appointment somewhere tonight. I am telling him that the bloody clock has run out for mankind, if this Government does not alter its headlong race into assisting the world into oblivion. The atomic energy programme will be just as difficult as was the atomic and nuclear arms race. There is no way that there will ever be an international understanding about this matter. If there had been such an understanding, there would never have been a Second World War, because the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles would have taken care of that.

There would never be a border skirmish if treaties were not broken, if there was not a misunderstanding of a treaty, or if there was not some territorial demand by one nation to another. In 1915, Australia invaded Turkey and the poor old diggers have been thinking about it ever since. We invaded Turkey and that was that, because we got drawn into a world conflict. We had no particular treaty but we allowed ourselves to be used by others who considered they had an obligation and a treaty. An obligation sent Australia into World War II; it was not even a treaty. Treaties are not worth the paper they are written on. There is no one nation in the world today in the nuclear field that pays any real regard to an international body.

If one watched *Four Corners* on Channel 2 a few months ago, one would have seen the most primitive method of disposal of waste displayed in Western Germany. This country is one of the most advanced technological countries in the world. Waste was being dumped in 44-gallon drums. People in Adelaide are not even allowed to put garbage out in the streets in 44-gallon drums.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That was low-level waste.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I will not accept that it was. I would be tempted to look at you and apply that term. West Germany has entered into contracts with nuclear power stations in the southern American States and has paid no regard to the safety aspects of those reactors. There is no future in this world for any sort of international agreement. It would be laughable for Australia to trust Marcos with a treaty and say, "We will flog all our uranium to you. You are a good bloke, Marcos. You have shot hundreds of political prisoners. You have subjected the country to martial law for years.

You have never considered the people in any shape or form, but here is all of our uranium for the next 50 years. Do what you like because we know you will be a good boy and build a nuclear power station." That is not on. If anyone thinks it is, he is living in a fool's paradise.

I have raised in this place (and I am pleased to see that the Minister is present) the fact that the Hon. Mr. Arnold has been making statements about salinity and water quality problems in South Australia.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are back on water?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, like Dawkins; he is always having trouble with his water, amongst other things. There is no possibility, for the next 15 years, of any decrease in the irrigation areas of New South Wales and Victoria or in the upper reaches of the Murray River in South Australia unless, of course, the salt kills off all the orchards, trees, and vineyards. There is no way in which a polluted river can be treated in the way it is. That is my strong and firm view.

I was bitterly opposed to the actions of the Federal Government and Gough Whitlam in relation to the so-called development of Albury-Wodonga and my opposition was based on the fact that there was no guarantee that a great deal of pollution would not result in the whole Murray system. The whole of South Australia is on the slush and sludge end of the Murray River. A minute amount of the problem is of our own making, and the rest is imported from up river. What can be done when filtration methods are a technological impossibility to the extent that salts, pesticides and other impurities must be removed from the river? The only other way to do that is by dilution. That cannot be done to combat salinity unless the dilution is by an equal volume of water or a volume of water greater than that already existing.

The only way to do that is to induce a flow into the Murray River system far greater than its natural intake rates. The holding rate at Lake Victoria is not great. The quantity of water there is not increased to such an extent that a significant degree of dilution occurs.

The Murrumbidgee River is probably one of the most polluted streams because of so-called development outside Canberra. If one wants to see land that resembles the surface of the moon, this is the place to which one should go. The best type of storage area that one can get is one in which there can be a reasonably fast flow of water. The Darling River is the one that comes to mind immediately. However, it has certain blemishes associated with it, as cotton seed grown in that area contributes to its pollution. The Darling River contains a tremendous volume of water almost all the year round, except during extreme drought conditions. Wool from the north-east of New South Wales used to be shipped from this area 100 years ago. This indicates the tremendous volume of water that was there. That river has a very low fall level. Indeed, it runs for hundreds of kilometres without much of a fall, and it would probably cost much money to carry out work to ensure that a great volume of water could be pushed through.

Our only salvation is to make this particular area the subject of an intensive study by our universities in Adelaide and perhaps also by the appropriate officers in New South Wales and Queensland, to ensure that the volume of water in the Darling River is increased to twice its normal flow. A study undertaken some years ago reveals that it is possible to ensure some 20 feet of water in the Darling River all year round. That water would flow into the South Australian system a few miles from the border at a point better than that on the other side of the very industrialised and irrigated areas of both New South Wales and Victoria.

In the hinterland to the north of Coffs Harbor in the Moonbi Range (actually in the Apsley Gorge) just a few miles from Peel River, the rainfall averages hundreds of inches. There would be less engineering required to divert one or more of the three rivers that flow eastward to the Tasman Sea than was involved in diverting the Snowy River and, of course, with the much better equipment now available it would be much easier to do, although I am not suggesting that the cost factor would be very low. What has been happening in Australia for 20 years or so is that those Country Party clots in northern New South Wales—people like Doug Anthony and Robinson—have insisted on millions of dollars being spent in their area on what is termed flood mitigation or the restructuring of rivers, etc., to hasten the flow of that precious mineral commodity—water—wasting it into the ocean. These rivers of course could be adequately turned into the Murray River. Many rivers such as the Macintyre, Namoi, Macleay, Macquarie and Castlereagh Rivers, to name a few, are subject to periodic annual flooding over the vast plains of New South Wales, with billions and billions of acre-feet of water every year going to waste, when it should be harnessed. Surely, money for this work should be available.

The Hon. Mr. Burdett is going to sleep and, as a person who lives at Mannum, on the river, he may not be able to continue living there, in 10 years time because, along with the rest of us, he will not be able to drink the water. If honourable members want any further information on anything that I have mentioned, they can see me outside after hours and I will give them details of the rest of the document I have in my possession.

Engineering is not the greatest obstacle in this matter: the problem that besets us is the politicians in Government; quite simply, it is the obstruction existing between the South Australian, Victorian, New South Wales, Federal and, possibly, Queensland Governments. They all bear equal guilt and the fact is that they have never been able to get together on the matter. If one looks at the Constitution one finds a complete set of pages which deal with a tremendous amount of data on the Murray River flow way back at the turn of the century. None of that data has been correctly used to the benefit of the people who inhabit this continent, because in fact it was not envisaged in those days that the population on this country would be as big as it is. I have cut my speech short.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Why don't you borrow Murray's book? It's called *How to Make Long Speeches Shorter*.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I can only think how to make his life shorter. I apologise if I have placed any burden on the very efficient *Hansard* reporters. I will read the pulls in the morning, and correct them, if necessary. Government members should do a lot of straight thinking and get rid of their woolly-headed ideas. Unlike their predecessors, they will not be here for 33 years.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Well, 32 will do.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is not on. Although I would like to seek leave to conclude my remarks, my Leader will not allow it.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

ADJOURNMENT

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

At 6.19 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 6 November at 2.15 p.m.