

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 25 October 1978

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CANNED FISH

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: I have received advice from the Victorian Health Department that "blown" tins of Safcol salmon and fish cutlets had been located in that State. The suspect batches are numbered C.5.F. 6018 and C.5.F. 6138 (both salmon), and C.5.G. 5258 (fish cutlets). The Health Commission has warned against eating Safcol salmon and fish cutlets bearing those numbers until the cause of the contamination has been positively identified. These tins of salmon and fish cutlets are marketed under the "Safcol" brand. Safcol in South Australia has claimed that it is most unlikely that the products, which were processed in Tasmania, would have been marketed in South Australia. However, my officers will continue their search for cans bearing these or closely related batch numbers to prevent their sale in South Australia. I think that members of the public should be warned that, if they see any of these batch numbers, they should not eat the contents of the can until they have been cleared by the commission.

QUESTIONS

FIRE PROTECTION

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Lands a question regarding fire protection.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: I received today a telephone call from a person in the Elizabeth area who complained that there was in the Elizabeth council area a considerable growth of uncut grass and who expressed concern regarding the fire hazard that could develop. As this is the time of year when the thoughts of the people in this State turn to fire protection, will the Minister say whether there is any truth in the statement that the grass at Elizabeth is a fire hazard, and whether any action can be taken to help Elizabeth residents reduce the fire hazard in that area?

The **Hon. T. M. CASEY**: I will draw the Leader's question to the attention of the Minister of Local Government and bring down a reply.

CARP

The **Hon. R. A. GEDDES**: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Fisheries a question regarding Murray River carp.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R. A. GEDDES**: In the last issue of the magazine *Riverland* there is a report stating that research has been undertaken in Britain to test the feasibility of using a virus to control European carp in river waters. It seems, as a result of questions and observations by fishermen and concerned people in the Riverland, that European carp is not considered such a problem nowadays

as it was initially, and there is a ready market for the product. Can the Minister say whether a survey has been made as to the need to get rid of European carp by any means?

The **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON**: I do not think it is a practical proposition to say we can ever get rid of European carp from the Murray River system. The approach we have taken is that we have to live with the problem. True, the problem of European carp is not nearly as great as it was some years ago; this is not unexpected, as it is the normal pattern applying to any influx of a new plague or pest. First, there is a sudden growth in the population of the pest as it builds an environmental niche; then, gradually the competition amongst the various types of fish will cause the numbers to decline until the population stabilises. This is happening with European carp now. True, there is a ready market for European carp, but one must realise that the prices for it are very low. It is used as bait by rock lobster fishermen. There is a limited market at low prices, but it is not very profitable.

EMISSION CONTROLS

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport ascertain what is the current opinion of the Australian Transport Advisory Council on the question of emission controls for private and commercial vehicles? Do all States agree with that opinion? Has full consideration been given to the objections to those controls that have been voiced over the past 12 months? Does the Minister foresee any change in the requirements for emission controls in the future? Dealing with the situation locally, have any tests been undertaken in this State to ascertain the benefits, if any, of those controls and, if so, what are the results of such investigations?

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

MINERAL EXPORTS

The **Hon. R. A. GEDDES**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Mines and Energy regarding lead exports from Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R. A. GEDDES**: A press announcement this morning states that the Federal Government has indicated that there will be orderly marketing of minerals for export from Australia. One of the principal mineral exports from South Australia at this stage is the lead from one of the largest lead producing works in the world, at Port Pirie.

My concern arises because I have understood that in the past the marketing of lead has been done through the London Exchange. Will the Minister find out whether the new decision by the Federal Government will involve the marketing of this product by the company to which I have referred?

The **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON**: I will refer the question to my colleague and get a reply.

The **Hon. N. K. FOSTER**: I wish to ask a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Mines and Energy regarding the export of Australian minerals, and I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking such question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: This morning's newspaper contains a brief report that the Federal Minister (Mr. Anthony) has embraced the policy of the late Rex Connor. Mr. Anthony was a principal opponent of that policy, and I compliment him on having come to his senses, after four long and wearisome years. The exportable Australian mineral product should not be devalued by being sold on the world market at much less than is obtained for comparable minerals from other countries. Since the change of Federal Government in 1975, we have been selling some of the best bituminous coal in the world at about half the price of less valuable coal in terms of its capabilities as an energy source. I compliment the Federal Minister for embracing the policy of the previous Labor Government.

Of course, inherent in the policies of the Labor Government between 1972 and 1975 was an understanding that, basically, in regard to coal and other minerals of which our export rate is high, certain other producer countries ought to reach an OPEC type of arrangement, whereby the price of the product would remain buoyant and not be subject to the vast changes or to the decision of the oil-producing countries in the so-called energy crisis. Will the Minister ask his colleague to find out from the Federal Minister whether, in regard to the announcement reported this morning, consideration will be given to the matter of producer countries getting together as I have suggested?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

INDIVIDUAL AXLES

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. M. B. Dawkins:

That the regulations made on 29 June 1978 under the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1976, in relation to the aggregation of the mass on individual axles, and laid on the table of this Council on 13 July 1978, be disallowed.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1499.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I support the motion. First, I want to clear up a matter about which there seems to have been heat in another place. Late one evening recently, while travelling to the South-East, the member for Alexandra and I were passing the weighbridge at Murray Bridge, when that honourable member suggested that we call in and watch the weighing procedure, which he had not observed previously. I also was interested in the matter, and we did call in. We made ourselves known to those in charge of the weighbridge, and they kindly allowed us to see the weighing procedures. At no stage did we "take over" the weighbridge: we merely stood and observed the procedures. We made a point of not interrupting the operations.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I should think so!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The honourable member is jumping ahead a little quickly. I am merely answering allegations. As reported in *Hansard* of 18 October in another place, the Minister of Transport said:

The surprise of the officers was not at the different weighings but at the temerity of the member going in and taking over their weighing station.

The Minister further said:

... when he and another person went there and occupied the crease for a couple of hours.

We were there for only about 20 minutes, not a couple of hours, and I assure the Minister and anyone else in doubt that we certainly did not take over the weighbridge. The Minister of Transport also said:

I can assure the honourable member that, the next time he meets those officers, he will not find a welcome to come inside the door.

Obviously, members of Parliament cannot watch trucks being weighed any more.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Was this like your survey of butcher shops about the price of meat?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not know what the Minister is talking about. He is obviously still in India.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must address his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. This matter is being considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and I understand the question was whether or not a person could go around the committee, rather than to it, seeking information. Also—

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. That is an explanation.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I know—as long as I get it in *Hansard*.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That last statement was absolute nonsense. The honourable member concerned was trying to help the Subordinate Legislation Committee and I think any reasonable member of that committee would acknowledge that the honourable member had been helpful. Of course, I use the word "reasonable" in its true context. Anyway, I subsequently had a short discussion with the Minister of Transport, and he assured me that he accepted what I said as being a correct summation of what occurred on the occasion in question.

At the weighing station, a truck was weighed merely because we had asked whether there were variations, depending in which way a truck, particularly a triaxle semi-trailer, was weighed. Weighing the three sets of wheels in pairs in two different directions, there was a difference of 13.6 tonnes one way and 18.1 tonnes the other way. That raised doubts in my mind about the procedures involved and about what may occur if these regulations are allowed to come into force: we will be legalising that potential error and I do not think that that should be done by this Parliament.

If the visit to the weighing station only achieved another examination of the situation, it was well worth it. I suggest to honourable members that they observe what occurs at these weighbridges. I am not condoning overloading on the roads: that should be brought under control, but, if an error of four or five tonnes can lead to a fine of \$500 or \$600, it is quite wrong to allow regulations to continue in force, legalising that error.

I suggest that any truck driver who is to be fined or booked for overloading should ask for his truck to be weighed in four different directions (forward and backwards in one direction and then in the opposite direction). I am sure that the variations would be sufficient to convince any court that there would be much doubt surrounding a conviction.

The problem is that the courts would have to make a decision, but we should not be forcing the courts to make that decision until we are absolutely certain that the procedures are foolproof. We are not the only people with some doubt. I refer to a letter addressed to Mr. J. Mathwin, member for Glenelg in another place, from Mr. J. A. Crawford, Managing Director, Commercial Motor Vehicles Limited, who is well versed in transport problems. I refer to his letter because it is important to

realise that this error has been recognised by people involved in the industry, and not merely by two members of Parliament who happened to look at the procedure. The letter states:

On the weekend you recall talking to me about the problems of split weighing of commercial vehicles and the problems that arise. Attached is an article from the August edition of the Australian Transport Magazine *Highway Transport* which sets out the problems experienced by Sporns Transport. Personally, I am dead opposed to the highways procedure of split weighing, because I think it is not an accurate method of assessing individual axle weights. Whilst I do not condone overloading, it seems to me that, provided an axle group is not overweight in relation to the Road Traffic Act limits, then that is all the department ought to be concerned about, and I would be grateful for any assistance you are able to provide through your Party to have the Act amended to overcome this split weighing problem.

That letter was received well after this motion for disallowance was moved. I understand that there can be, if there is an inch difference in how the truck stands on the weighing station, an enormous difference in the weight transferred to a particular axle. If a truck pulls up suddenly on the weighbridge, that can affect the weight that is transferred from one axle to another part of the tri-axle. Even if the driver puts new tyres on one axle and not the next, that can make a difference to the weight recorded. The new tyres can lift the axle enough to alter the weight on the axle behind the new tyres, and it can make a difference of two to three tonnes.

I do not know how this problem can be overcome. I do not suggest that I have an answer. Perhaps we should have weighbridges to weigh the whole vehicle or tri-axles as a total unit, and not weigh single axles. Until that situation is resolved we would be unwise to legalise what can be a serious error. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I do not intend to speak long on this matter. The Hon. Mr. Cameron claims that he does not know how to resolve the situation. The first thing he could do is not vote on this motion now, because it is still actively being considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Whilst the Council could act independently of that committee and disallow the regulations, it would be unwise for it to do so, especially as the committee is still receiving evidence on this matter. It has heard from critics of the regulations, and it now intends to hear from the Government.

I hope that the Council will not persist at this stage and vote on the matter until the committee has brought down its report. I do not wish to enter into the merits of the case now, because it is still actively being considered, and I would not want to make any comment that would prejudge the decision of the committee. The matter ought to be adjourned until we have brought down a report, and I ask the mover of the motion to follow that course of action.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Will you be seeking information at the weighing stations yourself?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I do not know.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I support the comments of the Hon. Mr. Sumner. True, the Subordinate Legislation Committee is still considering this matter. As I understand it, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who moved this motion, has no intention of bringing this matter to a vote today. I support what the Hon. Mr. Sumner said: that it would be advisable to enable the Subordinate Legislation Committee to bring down its report, whatever it may be.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I, too, shall be brief. I refer, first, to the criticism made of the Minister by the Hon. Mr. Cameron.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It wasn't a criticism.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The honourable member may not think that he was critical of the Minister, but I do. Indeed, if he was honest, he would agree with me. The objection was not made because a member of Parliament went to the weighbridge. I do not believe that members of Parliament ought to be the privileged persons that they are in relation to these matters. The member for Alexandra in another place, when he appeared before the committee, must have borne in mind that he was a member of Parliament and that he was, therefore, different from members of the public. It is important that members of Parliament realise that they are different in this respect.

Certain matters that come before Select Committees are indeed important, and, before any member of Parliament goes into the public arena and carries on in the manner in which the member for Alexandra did, and then presents himself before a Select Committee, having had four bites at the cherry in another place—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That's a peculiar logic.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: From the honourable member's point of view, it would be. I did not interrupt when the honourable member was asking questions earlier, and I should appreciate it if he did not embarrass the President by interjecting now.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am quite able to look after myself.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Chapman took over the weighbridge.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Nonsense! You weren't there, you galah.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Whether or not I am a galah is beside the point, because Mr. Chapman, in his own words, admitted to that. When he gave evidence, Mr. Chapman was asked specifically whether he acquainted the Minister of the facts, in reply to which he said that he had not done so but that he would do it. However, he did not do so. As two members of this Council have now said, the matter is still before the committee, and Mr. Chapman did not adequately or properly inform the Minister.

I say to the Hon. Mr. Cameron that, if I was a member representing so-called rural interests, as he is, and I wanted to clinch the argument beyond all doubt, I would have said, "Let us have the system of weighing that is used on every bulk bin of grain that a farmer takes to a weighbridge." I see the Hon. Mr. Geddes nodding in assent: he knows that the system on weighbridges is the reverse of that to which the Hon. Mr. Cameron referred.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: You're suffering from delusions.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If I was putting an argument in the way that the Hon. Mr. Cameron wanted to put it, I would not have referred to "4.5 tonnes" or whatever; the proper way to have put the argument would have been to refer to percentages. The Hon. Mr. Cameron did not put his argument capably or well. Indeed, he put it badly. I did not know until today that the Hon. Mr. Cameron was present on the day in question. If I had been Mr. Chapman or the Hon. Mr. Cameron, I would have taken the experimental load three kilometres down the road to Murray Bridge, and weighed the load at Noske's weighbridge, which would have been capable of weighing the complete vehicle.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

FUEL RESOURCES

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon:

1. Action that could be taken (including legislation that could be enacted by the Parliament) to conserve petroleum-based fuels and resources in South Australia.
2. Action that could be taken (including legislation that could be enacted by the Parliament) to encourage the use of fuels which could be substituted for petroleum-based fuels in South Australia.
3. Any other matter related to conservation of petroleum-based fuels and the use and encouragement of substitute fuels or alternate energy sources in South Australia.

(Continued from 27 September. Page 1192.)

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): I oppose the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to appoint a Select Committee, which would have the terms of reference outlined on the Notice Paper and which basically would examine the matter of energy conservation in South Australia. I do so not because there is no need for an examination of this matter (an aspect to which the Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred and which has certainly been accepted by the Government) but because the matter is already being adequately researched and investigated by the South Australian Energy Research Council, which was established by the Government with terms of reference to cover the whole area of investigation and research. The functions of the Energy Research Council are as follows:

To develop policies and advise the Government on the following matters:

- (1) All areas of energy conservation;
- (2) The development and co-ordination of existing energy supplies;
- (3) The development of necessary exploration;
- (4) The rationalisation of final uses of energy; and
- (5) The development and organisation of research into alternative energy sources and, in particular, solar energy.

So, the council's terms of reference are wide. It is easy to see that it can cope with any problems that arise in the whole area of energy policy and research. The council has considerable expertise. Indeed, I suggest that it has more expertise in this area than could be found on a Select Committee of this Council. The members of the council and their respective qualifications are as follows:

Chairman—Mr. S. Huddleston, former General Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

Members—

Mrs. Fitzgerald (member of National Energy Advisory Council)

Professor R. E. Luxton, University of Adelaide

Mr. P. Alpin (General Manager, Port Stanvac Petroleum Refineries)

Mr. E. Scarborough (Chief Design Engineer, ETSA)

Mr. J. Zehnder (Managing Director, Santos Limited)

Mr. J. Burnside (General Manager, S.A. Gas Company)

Mr. B. Webb (Director-General, Mines and Energy Department)

Dr. Susan Richardson, University of Adelaide

Mr. G. Stokes, Flinders University

Dr. P. Davis, University of Adelaide

Mr. G. Meikle, (Secretary of A.A.E.S.D.A.)

Mr. H. DenOuden (Urban Design Adviser, Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department).

One can see from that list that there is a considerable body of expertise on that council that can adequately cover this whole question, and report to the Government on the vital question of energy policy in the future. It is obvious that the Select Committee is not necessary and is a wasteful duplication of effort. It could cause unnecessary delays by requiring the small staff of the energy branch of the Mines Department to be occupied with producing material for the Select Committee. It seems unnecessary to have another group of people who do not have that expertise investigating this matter. For those reasons I oppose the establishment of a Select Committee.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT REGULATIONS

Order of the Day, Private Business, No. 11: the Hon. C. M. Hill to move:

That the regulations made on 8 June 1978 under the Health Act, 1935-1976, in respect of swimming pools, and laid on the table of this Council on 13 July 1978 be disallowed.

The Hon. C. M. HILL moved:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

LEVI PARK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Lands): I move: *That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The objects of this Bill are to reconstitute the Levi Park Trust, to remove certain provisions in the existing Act which have become obsolete, and to recast other provisions in forms more appropriate to the new concept of the trust. The Levi Park Trust was set up in 1948 to administer the newly created public park from which it took its name. This park was established at Vale Park on land which Adelaide Constance Belt, a member of the Levi family, had offered to the Walkerville council for that purpose. In fact, the council did not accept Mrs. Belt's proposal, which is the reason why the trust came into existence. Nonetheless, the Walkerville council has played an active role in the administration of Levi Park since 1948.

Until the present time the trust has consisted of five members; a Chairman and one other, both appointed by the Governor; two appointed by the Walkerville council;

and one by the Enfield council. A representative of the Enfield council was included because until 1975 Levi Park was situated within that council area; however, it is now within the area of the Walkerville council.

At present, Levi Park contains various facilities and several buildings of historic interest. Foremost among the latter is Vale House, the old Levi home. This is currently leased as a kiosk, and the lessee occupies it as a residence. A coach house and stables are also situated within the grounds. In addition, the area contains a public park incorporating an oval and tennis courts, and a caravan park of some 150 sites. The caravan park is well patronised by interstate visitors and constitutes a most valuable source of revenue for Levi Park.

The National Trust of South Australia regards Vale House as a building of considerable historic importance. Consequently, the trust now proposes to initiate restoration work, and to transfer the kiosk to the old coach house and stables. It also proposes to improve the caravan park.

Administrative matters associated with these projects make it desirable to bring the trust more directly under the control of the Minister. A complement of five members will be retained, all of whom will be appointed by the Governor, two on the nomination of the Walkerville council. Enfield council representation will be discontinued, as it is no longer appropriate. The Bill will excise obsolete references to the date on which the original trust came into existence together with certain financial provisions dealing with contributions formerly made to the trust by the councils of Walkerville and Enfield, and related matters. It will recast substantial portions of the existing Act in order to make the Act somewhat more comprehensive and up-to-date. Provisions to be modified in this regard include those relating to procedure at meetings, the appointment of deputies for trust members, the remuneration of trust members, the accounts and other financial affairs of the trust, and exemptions of the trust from certain rates and taxes.

The Bill will also remove the present power of the trust to make by-laws, replacing it with a regulation-making power vested in the Governor. In accordance with prevailing practices in legislation of this kind, new sections will be enacted compelling trust members to disclose personal interests in contracts under consideration by the trust, and also obliging the trust to submit an annual report of its affairs to the Minister. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 removes an obsolete portion of the preamble to the principal Act. Clause 4 strikes out the definition of "Enfield council" in section 2 of the principal Act. Clause 5 enacts a new subsection (3) to section 3 of the principal Act, providing that the trust shall be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister.

Clause 6 repeals sections 4 and 5 of the principal Act and enacts a new section 4. The old sections dealt with membership of the trust and terms of office. The new section combines these, providing that, at the commencement of the proposed Act, all offices of the trust shall become vacant, and that thereafter the trust shall consist of five members appointed by the Governor, two on the

nomination of the Walkerville council. Members shall be appointed for a term of five years, and the clause makes provision for the appointment both of a Chairman and members' deputies.

Clause 7 repeals sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the principal Act, and enacts new sections numbered 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in their place. The old sections were concerned with the date of creation of the trust, quorums and decisions at meetings, the appointment of members' deputies, procedure at meetings and validity of proceedings, remuneration of trust members, and the accounts of the trust. The new sections deal with substantially the same matters. Section 7 provides that trust members shall receive such fees and allowances as are determined by the Governor, and section 8 sets out the procedure to be followed at meetings of the trust. Section 9 provides that acts of the trust shall not be invalid by reason of a vacancy in the membership of the trust or a defect in a member's appointment. Section 10 enacts the new requirements for members to disclose interests which they might have in any contract contemplated by the trust. A member with such an interest is prohibited from taking part in deliberations of the trust relating to the contract in question. Section 11 provides for the form of execution of trust documents.

Clause 8 repeals sections 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 of the principal Act and enacts new sections numbered 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 in their place. The old section 16 dealt with a sum of £5 000 which Mrs. Belt gave to the Walkerville council before the trust was established, and which was later paid over to the trust. This provision has clearly become obsolete. The remaining sections were concerned with contributions to the trust by the Walkerville and Enfield councils, the trust's power to borrow, the application of trust moneys, the exemption of the trust from certain rates and taxes, the refund of stamp duty and costs incurred by the Walkerville council, and the trust's ability to accept gifts. Here again, the provisions relating to the two councils will become unnecessary in the light of the proposed amendments. The new section 16 sets out the trust's power to borrow and provides that repayment may be guaranteed by the Treasurer. Section 17 stipulates that trust moneys shall be applied for the purposes of the Act and may be invested in any manner approved by the Treasurer. Section 18 provides that the trust may accept gifts of property and section 19 sets out in specific terms the rates and taxes from which the trust is exempt. These include land tax, rates and taxes payable under the Local Government Act, 1934-1978, pay-roll tax, water and sewerage rates and any other rates, taxes, charges, levies or imposts as are prescribed. Section 20 deals with the accounts of the trust, and provides for their auditing by the Auditor-General.

Clause 9 removes an obsolete portion of section 23 of the principal Act, which is concerned with the vesting of Levi Park in the trust. Clause 10 repeals section 28 of the principal Act, which deals with by-laws, and enacts new sections in its place numbered 28, 29 and 30. The new section 28 requires the trust to submit an annual report of its affairs to the Minister and the Walkerville council, and section 29 provides that proceedings for offences against the Act shall be disposed of summarily. Section 30 empowers the Governor to make regulations which are necessary or expedient for the purposes of the Act, and provides, in addition, that by-laws in force immediately before the commencement of the proposed amending Act shall be deemed to be regulations.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Lands): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes amendments to the South Australian Museum Act, 1976, which will allow a more efficient method of enforcing regulations relating to parking offences on museum land and which will bring the principal Act into line with the provisions of the Art Gallery Act, 1939-1978.

Section 20 of the principal Act empowers the Governor, on the recommendation of the Museum Board, to make regulations for the control of parking. As the Act stands, however, the only remedy against an offender is prosecution in court. This is both costly and time consuming. The Bill provides for the expiation of an offence by payment of a prescribed expiation fee. This is a procedure commonly used by local councils for parking offences. The offender can pay the expiation fee or accept the risk of prosecution. Usually the offence is expiated and the need to prosecute the offender is avoided.

The State Library, the Museum, and the Art Gallery face similar problems relating to unauthorised parking and driving on their land. One problem is that there are no clearly defined boundaries between the land controlled by each of them. It is therefore desirable that uniform legislative provisions and regulations apply to all three institutions. The Bill will make the principal Act uniform with the Art Gallery Act. A Bill to amend the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1977, bringing that Act into line with the Art Gallery Act, will be introduced with this Bill. I ask leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2: paragraph (a) adds power to regulate, restrict or prohibit the driving of motor vehicles on land controlled by the board. This is in addition to the existing power to regulate the parking of motor vehicles and brings the Act into line with the Art Gallery Act. Paragraph (b) adds to section 20 of the principal Act subsections (3) and (4). Subsection (3) is an evidentiary provision that will facilitate the proof of ownership and control of a vehicle the subject of a prosecution. Subsection (4) provides for expiation of an offence.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is short and it amends the principal Act, the State Lotteries Act, 1966-1975, by reserving the words "Lotto", "Cross Lotto" or "X Lotto" for the exclusive use of the Lotteries Commission as a title or description of a lottery. The amendment has been sought by the Lotteries Commission in order to prevent any confusion by the public of the commission's lottery, known as "Cross

Lotto", with privately conducted lotteries using the same or a similar title.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 19 of the principal Act by making it an offence for any person, without the authority of the commission, to use the words "Lotto", "Cross Lotto" or "X Lotto" in any advertisement or notice as a title or description of a privately conducted lottery.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

**APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)
AND
PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 24 October. Page 1608.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In rising to speak briefly to these Bills, I first compliment the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Hill on their speeches yesterday in which they gave a comprehensive survey of the unfortunate situation in South Australia at present. I also express concern at what I consider to be a lack of proper priorities in Government spending, evidence of which can be seen in several ways in the Auditor-General's Report.

I will give a small example now and refer to other instances later. A short time ago members accommodated on this eastern side of Parliament House were interviewed about the provision of new furniture and fittings. We looked at the examples of what was to be provided, and it seemed to me that perhaps they might not be an improvement on what we already had. However, we were told that they were likely to be supplied. In my opinion, it would be an unnecessary expense, and, if such unnecessary expenses are incurred from time to time, they add up to a lack of proper priorities in Government spending.

We were told that we were to have a belt-tightening Budget this year, that it would be one of restraint and responsibility, and that it would lead to further unemployment. We were told that in respect of a State that has the worst unemployment in Australia. In the 12 months to May last, unemployment in South Australia increased by a staggering 56 per cent, whereas in that period in New South Wales it increased by only 4.3 per cent, and in the month of May there was a reduction of 10 371 in the number of unemployed in Australia. Those figures came from a statement released by the Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Wran).

Despite this, we have been told that this was to be a responsible Budget that would allocate, with proper restraint and assessment of priorities, the \$560 000 000, (an increase of more than 10 per cent on the \$507 000 000 provided last year in untied grant money from Canberra. Also, the latter figure was an increase of more than 17 per cent on the amount provided in 1976-77.

I have mentioned what I consider to be unnecessary spending in one area. Perhaps that is a small matter, having regard to the aggregate spending that will continue at Parliament House. Yesterday the honourable Mr. Hill mentioned other matters that concerned members on this side. He referred to the expenditure at the Grenfell Centre, totalling \$3 120 000, for the provision of office accommodation. He said that this was scandalous and excessive, and I agree with him. He also said that \$963 000 would be spent on fixtures and fittings in the Colonel Light Centre. Those two amounts total more than \$4 000 000.

I will now speak subject to correction, because I am awaiting a reply from the Minister of Agriculture, who has been absent on Government business, and I am not complaining about not having received a reply, because it is not long since I asked him the question. However, accommodation provided for the Rural Assistance Branch in Grenfell Centre has been quite inadequate. I had occasion to go there and I saw files on the floor because the staff did not have sufficient filing space. Doubtless, the Minister will answer my question and, I hope, be able to say that some of this \$3 000 000 will be spent in providing adequate accommodation for that branch, including adequate partitioning. At present we see partitioning that is about 4ft high. That would be quite convenient in regard to moving it but quite inadequate having regard to the confidentiality necessary at the branch.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Did you qualify for any assistance?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I did not qualify for any assistance; the honourable member could do that. I made representations on behalf of a constituent of mine. These items added to others in the Auditor-General's Report, constitute unnecessary spending at a time of restraint. For untied grants there was more than a 10 per cent increase, from \$507 000 000 to \$560 000 000; and the amount of \$507 000 000 represented an increase of 17 per cent on the previous year.

Why is this Government the only Government in Australia (because Tasmania has now got into the act) that is not doing something about death and gift duties? Why does the population of South Australia grow so slowly as to be almost static? Why is Western Australia (which could never boast about being more than four-fifths of South Australia in population and revenue in Sir Thomas Playford's time) advancing on South Australia? It is because of the policies of this Government which, perhaps unintentionally, drive people from South Australia and also prevent people and industries from coming to South Australia. The continuing impositions of gift and death duties, which have been or are being phased out in other States (or significantly reduced in the case of gift duties), are affecting decisions about residing in South Australia. The heavy imposition of workmen's compensation (and no-one objects to reasonable compensation), is preventing people and industry from venturing into this State.

South Australia is the Cinderella State today and is described as such by other States, whereas South Australia was once the most buoyant and fast-developing State in Australia. This state of affairs demonstrates the contrasting policies of the Government and of the Liberal Party, under which South Australia thrived, grew and expanded. However, under this Government, with the escalation of the Public Service, the haphazard use of funds, and the costly public relations exercise of the Government (which has helped to keep it in power), South Australia has languished and stagnated.

Enthusiasm has been lost, and South Australia is called the Cinderella State. This situation had not been caused by lack of money. The Government had been active in raising money, which is sometimes called the rip-off, by increasing charges. One has only to examine the increase in charges in State revenue in recent years to see this. Considerable increases have occurred in the amount of untied grant moneys and the like. However, there has been profligate distribution and misuse of money.

The irresponsible lack of proper priorities has been the principle reason why the Government is the only one in Australia which has not been able (so it says) to do anything positive about removing death duties. To quote one instance, a niece, who had looked after her elderly

aunt for some years before the aunt passed away, had to pay duty, because she was not a direct descendant, on an estate of only \$700! The duty payable was at the rate of 5 per cent. I am also informed of another similar instance where a nephew had looked after an elderly person for some years; duty on that estate was at the rate of 10 per cent, and it was charged on another very small estate of about \$1 500. This Government is taxing people who inherit very small estates. It is reprehensible that small estates should be taxed in this way and that people who have done their best for their relatives for a considerable period are so penalised.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the constant whingeing about the Federal Government, the down-turn in the economy of South Australia, and the escalation of unemployment to the highest proportionate figure in Australia. I share his concern about the down-turn in the economy and about the refusal of this Government to grow up and accept blame for its own mistakes, instead of whingeing about the Federal Government, whether it be the Whitlam Labor Government or the Fraser Liberal Government. The South Australian Government has had an increase of 17 per cent and 10 per cent in the last two years, respectively, and I am concerned that the Government has not grown up and been prepared to admit its own mistakes and has not seen the error of its ways. With much misgiving, I support the second reading.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I support the second reading with much pleasure, unlike the previous speaker, who complained about this Government's spending. I understood he was complaining only about furniture in Parliament House and the Grenfell Centre. If that is all he can find to criticise in the Budget, it is obviously a good one. Much has been said about the State Budget in the House of Assembly and in the press. Because the Opposition can find nothing at all wrong with the Budget, and we on this side of the Council fully approve of it, I do not intend to spend much time referring to it.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins produced not one shred of evidence to convince the Council that there was any over-spending or misspending at the Grenfell Centre; he merely picked up gossip around the corridors and repeated it in the Council. The State Government has set its priorities on its allocation from Canberra. In spite of what members opposite say, the Federal Government in this country controls the purse strings and, by and large, directs expenditure. State Governments have to manage as best they can within the guide-lines and finance allocated to them by the Federal Government.

What was significant about the recent Federal Budget was not that it was full of broken promises (it would be remarkable if it were not full of broken promises—that would be something to comment on), but that it was utterly irrelevant to the problems facing Australia. I hope that later speakers from the Opposition will give me some idea of what relevance the following actions that I list have to the problems facing Australia today.

First, the Federal Government in its Budget removed the maternity allowance. I think the allowance was \$30 but, never having been a recipient of it, I cannot be sure of the exact amount. What has the removal of that \$30 allowance to do with solving the problems facing Australia today? Secondly, I refer to the proposed tax on newsboys. I say "proposed" because the outcry was so strong that the measure had to be withdrawn. That measure provided that, if a child had a paper round and earned more than \$300 a year, child endowment payments were affected. What a ridiculous action, and I was most pleased to see it withdrawn.

Does the Federal Government really spend its time devising means to tax paper boys' incomes? I suppose that is a good indication of the mentality of that Government. While Australia faces such enormous problems, this kind of situation is exercising the mind of the Federal Government. That is incredible. Thirdly, the Federal Government has stopped indexing unemployment benefits paid to people without dependants—a mean, petty, and spiteful action. Many similar measures were contained in the Federal Budget. Pensioners now have to wait a whole year before they get indexation increases. Indexation will no longer apply every six months, as was pledged by Mr. Fraser before the election. Again, a mean, petty and spiteful thing to inflict on a section of the community which is the most vulnerable and which can least afford it.

Such measures do nothing whatever to solve the problems confronting Australia. Much has been said and written about the Federal Budget. Certainly it has been universally condemned by every newspaper and every responsible commentator in the country. However, the biggest condemnation of the Federal Budget was given by New South Wales electors in the Wirrewa by-election (where there was an enormous swing to the A.L.P.) and in the recent New South Wales State election, where there was an even larger swing to the A.L.P. The electors of New South Wales have spoken for the whole of Australia.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Aren't you going to give any credit to Mr. Wran?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Of course I will. Mr. Wran and the Labor Party in New South Wales have shown by contrast what a capable Government can do in what are difficult circumstances. Mr. Wran and his A.L.P. Government, like Mr. Dunstan and his A.L.P. Government, have given a clear contrast to the people of Australia and, when given the opportunity to vote in South Australia, I am sure that electors, just as they did in New South Wales, will vote to condemn Mr. Fraser, his Government, and its Budget.

However, I want to spend my time today on something a little more constructive than attacking the Federal Government. I want to speak today on the problems and benefits of automation to the work force and to community. Automation and computerisation is being introduced into all branches of industry at a rate that will create unemployment and the potential for abundance such as we have never seen before. Perhaps the main reason for the growth in introduction of the new technology is simply that for the past few years there has been a staggering reduction in its cost.

Where previously firms could not afford sophisticated machinery, now even the smallest of firms are able to afford to buy mini-computers to process their paper work, and machines that can replace even their most highly skilled workers. Some uninformed commentators, and I include the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's speech from yesterday in this category, parrot the cries "Australian workers' wages are too high," and "Australian workers have priced themselves out of the market". Statements of this nature ignore (and I am sure mainly for political reasons) that, irrespective of the level of workers' wages, automated techniques are being introduced all over the world regardless of the local cost of labour.

I give the House one example. In South Korea the average wage of a shipyard worker is about US\$50 a week, far less than any other major shipbuilding nation. Despite these very low wages the degree of automation in Korean shipyards is equal to any shipyard in the world and surpasses most. We can see that the use of new technology has little if anything to do with high wage rates. As I said, the reason why new technology is being introduced in

industry is simply because it is available and it is cheap.

I give a few examples of the way in which the new technology can perform tasks that drastically reduce the labour required to produce commodities and service industry. At a car plant in Sweden they are already using robots to do a variety of tasks. A report in the magazine *Sweden Now* No. 3, 1978, should be read by all members of the Council. I quote from that report entitled "Anything you can do a robot can do better", which states:

Talk about industrial robots and you could probably come up with at least a dozen synonyms for them that you've heard over the years, including such literary dazzlers as "monotony killer" and "miracle worker". But no matter what they're called, industrial robots are no longer a novelty. They're fast, efficient—pay for themselves many times over within a short period after installation—and they're around to stay in the factory environment.

It's ironic that a small country like Sweden would have one-tenth of all the robot installations in the world (600 of 6 000) but that's a fact, and serves, perhaps, as yet another example of the country's technical "know-how". The first industrial robot installed in Sweden in 1967 actually came from the United States. But within one year, the first Swedish model from R. Kaufeldt AB, had been installed.

In fact, Sweden is one of the world's leading exporters of robots. There are at least five companies in Sweden which manufacture and sell robots on a world-wide basis: ASEA (Electronics Division); Ekströms AB; Electrolux (Industrial Systems Division); R. Kaufeldt AB, and RETAB AB. You can choose from a variety ranging from the simple pick-and-place to the sophisticated numerical-control types, carrying price tags between about \$5 000 to over \$100 000, depending on what you want your robot to do.

An industrial robot, by the way, is a piece of machinery that is programmed and can work with pieces in three-dimensional volume. It can be powered either electrically, hydraulically or by air, and is instructed, or "programmed", to carry out tasks by adjusting relays, or moving mechanical "stops", or by leading its "hand" manually through the motions required.

Yes, robots have "arms", "wrists" and "hands", duplicating human movements with an uncanny degree of accuracy. The "hands"—called grippers—also come in a wide variety, depending on what you want the robot to do. All the movements are controlled by mechanisms, ranging from simple electrical relays to sophisticated—and expensive—computers.

The report then gives this example of what robots do in the Saab-Scandia plant:

When the Electrolux robot is in operation, engineer Holmgren explains, it orients the work pieces of the sleeve, drills holes into it, broaches the holes and puts the pieces on a conveyor belt—all in less than an unbelievable one minute. Next, we walked over a few rows to where the ASEA robot was located, a 400 000 kronor baby with one arm and two grippers, which was just put into full operation after being installed last year.

Several workers were giving the robot the once-over, fascinated by its power and efficiency. In about six minutes, this quiet giant takes the working pieces, speed gears, cuts, grinds, washes, shaves and punches them—then puts the materials neatly on waiting racks.

The Electrolux robot just described replaces two employees and pays for itself in 15 months, and the ASEA robot replaces three employees and pays for itself in 18 months. There seems to be no limit to what these robots can do. The report mentions spray painting, spot welding, coating surfaces, pressing, handling hot metal, punching holes, cutting, packing, assembling, and moulding. Robots

can be programmed to carry out any of these tasks. In the tertiary sector, jobs are starting to be eliminated by the introduction of, for example, word-processing machines. A recent article in the *Bulletin* described them in this way:

Word-processing machines consist of a typewriter keyboard, video screen and memory bank, and a printer which turns out finished documents. A unit costs between \$5 000 and \$25 000. Currently, there are about 30 suppliers of these units, and they sell about 2 000 a year in Australia. Life assurance, legal and Public Service offices are the main customers. It has been estimated that word processors are eliminating 8 000 jobs in a year.

In the June issue of *Ridges* magazine, it was reported that one word-processing unit and operator could be expected to replace two and a half to five typistes. In certain circumstances, an even greater number has been replaced. The same report goes on to detail the effects of similar technological advances in other tertiary service sectors. In administration, the Federal Social Security Department is the latest Government department that plans to introduce word processors. It plans to have 15, each of which would replace five or six typistes. In banking, local branches are to be linked to terminal centres. Word-processing machines and automatic tellers are forecast for the 1980's. Employment in banking, which has already reached a plateau, seems set to decline as a result of these developments and the closing of many local branches. In the retail industry point of sale computer terminals, combined with a supermarket-type of operation, would replace much of the work done by shop assistants, storemen and clerks.

Those examples are sufficient to illustrate what is happening in secondary industry and the tertiary sector regarding the effects of new technology in employment. There is, of course, another side of the use of technology. No-one can deny that some of these jobs that are being eliminated by technological advances are better left to machines. Also, products can be made more cheaply and should therefore be available to more people. Leisure time should increase as work becomes more and more automated. These are just some of the benefits that should become available through technological change and automation.

I deliberately said "should (and not "will") become available", because it depends very much on the way society uses these technological changes as to whether any benefit will accrue to the people as a whole or just to the minority who own the new technology. That really is the question. The question is not "should we resist technological change because of the cost in jobs?" The answer to that question is that we cannot stop it, anyway, and, even if we could, we should not do so. The question we should ask ourselves is, "How can we best make technological change work for us all?" Because technological change has the potential of liberating people from the drudgery of working eight hours a day at mostly uninteresting jobs, at the same time producing an abundance of goods desperately needed by the majority of the world's people whose standard of living is below anything we can imagine. Some recent actions in areas so far affected by new technology are, I think, worthy of investigation. Even though I have to be brief because of the pressure on the Council's time, I want first to outline the way in which Telecom workers dealt with the issue in their industry.

The line they adopted was that they would not resist the technological changes being made, but those changes would be made on their terms only. Their terms were that their jobs would be guaranteed and that the skills of the present work force would still be fully utilised and, where

possible, upgraded. As members would know, they had a complete victory. In spite of the short-sighted opposition of Telecom management, aided quite vocally, I might add, by Mr. Fraser, the workers in that industry can now have a real say in the way new technology is introduced into their industry.

A very significant part of the Telecom dispute and one that should be carefully noted by all employers thinking of operating in the same manner as did Telecom was that the industrial action taken by Telecom technicians had the almost total support of their fellow workers, workers in other industries, and a significant percentage of the community as a whole. I will return later to the significance of that last statement.

Apart from Telecom technicians, workers in at least two other industries have in the past couple of weeks made clear their position on the introduction of new technology into their industries. Both the bank officers union and the metal trades federation of unions have supported technological change as a means of reducing working hours in their industries. Judging by the initial negative responses by the employers of both groups of workers, it appears that at this stage, anyway, employers have not learned a thing from the Telecom dispute. In the maritime industry (one of the first industries to be hit by technological change), the degree of co-operation between employers and employees has been remarkable. No new technique or machine has been resisted provided that there has been full consultation and, where jobs could not be guaranteed, suitable arrangements have been made for those workers volunteering to leave the industry.

In other words, the maritime workers insisted on getting their share of the benefits of increased production caused by new technology as opposed to the employers having all the benefits. Having worked for 20 years in the maritime industry myself, I suspect that the known militancy of the maritime unions was the prime reason for the responsible attitude of the employers. I have yet to hear of any ship owner who had anything even resembling a social conscience. However, one thing they do have is a realistic knowledge of the strength of the maritime workers from whom they extract their profits.

I should like to give the Council one further example of how a group of workers are dealing with the threats for their jobs caused not only by technological change but also by the so-called rationalisation within a company's structure. The workers about whose actions I want to tell the Council are employed by Lucas Aerospace in the United Kingdom. Their example has, I believe, many lessons for workers all over the world who are being told they are no longer wanted.

The significance of the actions taken by the Lucas Aerospace workers is that they are not only actively seeking out new technology and new products as a way to ensure that they keep their jobs but they are also claiming the right to work on products that are socially useful and not necessarily what the employer wants them to make. In other words, they want to be part of the system that produces for use rather than profit. They are demanding the right to produce goods that fulfil human needs, rather than products which do nothing to enhance the quality of life of the people of the world and, indeed, which are in some cases definitely detrimental to people, as in the case of weapons of destruction.

What the workers at Lucas Aerospace are in fact doing is challenging the decision-making prerogative of those who see decision-making as their inalienable right. The Lucas experience started about four years ago when many industries and firms were undergoing large-scale reorganisation and modernisation which was designed to put

hundreds of thousands of workers on the dole. Workers at Lucas Aerospace have seen their work force cut by 5 000 to 14 000, and further retrenchments were promised.

Although the workers obviously wanted to keep their jobs, they did not believe that the jobs they were doing were socially useful anyway. Their actions were one of the first attempts by workers to work out an alternative to simply defending those jobs when there appeared to be no economic justification for their jobs to continue. The workers elected a combined committee comprising shop stewards in Lucas Aerospace's 14 plants. In conjunction with the entire work force, both blue collar and white collar in the plants, and also sympathetic people outside, they came up with a corporate plan. The plan was an attempt to show what other products could be made by Lucas workers using existing skill and machinery.

To give the Council some idea of what they came up with, I will give just a couple of examples. As the workers were already making sophisticated medical equipment, such as heart pacemakers and kidney machines, they turned their designing talents to improving the kidney machines they were already making. It seemed absurd to these workers that they were being retrenched when a reported 3 000 people were dying of kidney disease in the United Kingdom every year because there were not enough facilities in hospitals to treat them. The Lucas workers designed a portable kidney machine that could be used by the patient in his or her home without the need for major plumbing alterations to the house.

Also, in the field of home heating, the workers thought it a ridiculous contradiction that they were working on a plane such as *Concorde* when old people were dying every winter of hypothermia because of the lack of a simple economic heating system. They designed a heat pump that would supply the heating needs of a home much more efficiently and cheaply than anything else on the market.

These are only two of 150 concrete proposals that the workers came up with that they wanted to manufacture because people needed such products. Unfortunately, the Lucas Aerospace management has not seen fit to take up any of the suggestions contained in the corporate plan.

The reasons the management gave are that the products are not compatible with the present product range, and also that such products would require large Government orders. There is certainly some validity in the last reason. Governments always appear to have money to waste on useless armaments but, when it comes to people's health and welfare, they start pleading poverty.

Regardless of Government orders, it seems to me that the real reason for the distinct lack of enthusiasm by Lucas management for the corporate plan is that, once it concedes to workers the right to decide what products they will manufacture, then the game is up for management. As Mike Cooley, the Chairman of the Lucas shop stewards combined committee, said on a recent A.B.C. broadcast:

Lucas management recognise the kind of power struggle that is going on, and if they were once to concede that their workers had the right to say what should be produced and how it should be produced they recognise that this would be the beginning of the end of their managerial control.

Another Lucas worker said:

We have found out that management is not a skill or craft or profession but a command relationship—a bad habit inherited from the Army and the church.

Lucas Aerospace can be described as the first cab off the rank in what is going to be a "no holds barred" challenge to the owners of production by workers in an endeavour to make companies more responsive toward the needs of their own workers and the community at large. It is this challenge to the traditional role of the owners of the means

of production that is particularly significant. Once workers everywhere realise that they do not have to work on products that they can see are socially undesirable, such as *Concorde* or armaments, once they realise that the skills they have can be put to better use, then we have the basis for a fundamental change in the way that society is structured; that, to me, is something well worth supporting and working for. I do not believe that we can go on indefinitely allowing technological change to be introduced for the benefit of the owners of the means of production alone, and to the detriment of the people as a whole.

What to me is significantly different in the demands of the Lucas Aerospace workers, compared to the demands of bank workers and metal workers, is that they tackle the question of the right of workers to have a real say in what they produce, rather than just call for shorter working hours. While I support fully the call for a shorter working week, I hope that workers everywhere will take a lead from the Lucas workers and include in their demands on employers that they should work only on socially useful products.

Governments also have some thinking to do, and I suggest that the time scale to this thinking is not very long. If we go on as we are now, anyone can see that the social problems we are creating in our society as regards unemployment are going to be horrendous. It has been estimated that in the 1980's up to 50 per cent of school leavers are going to be unable to get jobs.

I do not need to detail to the Council just what effect unemployment of this magnitude will have on young people's attitudes to such things as education and to their elders, who have so mismanaged the world that an age that can so obviously produce abundance instead produces unemployment and a miserably low standard of living for the world's population.

Some employers are already showing concern about the way in which society is heading. In a recent issue of the *Australian*, Mr. Peter Dunstan, an Executive of Unilever of Australia, said that it was in the private sector's own interest to take some responsibility in overcoming the current unemployment problem. The article states:

Mr. Dunstan said the principal objective for any company or corporation was to make an adequate profit. "There is truth in Dr. Parkinson's assertions that companies cannot be expected to carry the burden of unemployment. But the community demands that as a social as well as an economic institution, business should be seen to have a concern for the broader public interest. There is a danger that large numbers of unemployed, particularly the young, are becoming unemployable—the quality of education has not been in time with the new technology."

Mr. Dunstan said this for enterprise and one it could not simply ignore as being beyond its responsibility. "The market economy, as we have known it, is at the crossroads: it must adapt and change to meet the needs of a changing society. But this is not just a response to change—business must manage change. The management of change calls for a positive role in the shaping of public policies and programmes and the development of activities to implement change constructively." Mr. Dunstan noted that business and its achievements were no longer seen to be in harmony with the public interest.

I can only say "Hear, hear" to that, and I regret that that particular executive is virtually a lone voice because at the moment in Australia the only criterion that seems to apply to business decisions is whether they will make a profit, irrespective of the social consequence.

I suspect that employers as a whole will not be responsible enough in the introduction of technological

change, even though it is in their long-term interest to be so. I am quite sure that, in the interest of the nation as a whole, Governments will have to adopt more control over the actions of particularly major companies such as B.H.P., C.S.R., and Utah. Can anyone imagine companies such as these putting the interests of people before profits? If Governments do not intervene more in large companies to force an element of social responsibility, the whole of industry and commerce will become a battlefield. The battle will be between management on one side and workers and the unemployed on the other.

I have no doubt that in such a confrontation the ordinary people will win. Just think how vulnerable industry and commerce are now to industrial action! New technology and computerisation have given enormous power to the organised working class. They have shown that they are prepared to use that power in defence of their jobs and in some cases, as evidenced by the Lucas workers, challenge the very basis on which society is structured. This challenge will get stronger because the technology that the system has had to find to develop its productive forces could turn out to be its Achilles heel.

The new technology has been produced by workers and is applied by workers. Workers today are better informed, logical, and more widely conscious than ever before: able, indeed, to understand the new technology and see that it offers far more than it presently gives.

Apart from these reasons, perhaps the main reason why the workers will win any confrontation with employers about technological change is that fellow workers and a significant percentage of the general public are on their side. The evidence of this was the Telecom dispute. I have never seen such public support for an industrial dispute, and the reasons are obvious. Every worker can see that it could be his or her (or their children's) job next. This support will be decisive in any confrontation, and certainly on this type of issue the workers have this support.

Mr. President, what I have tried to do today, and to do it very briefly, is outline some of the problems presently being faced by society and also show how the workers are starting to react in their own interests. I hope all the Australian people will think about this issue, because I know that technology wisely used can be a blessing to mankind, not a curse as some people consider it today. With some fundamental changes in people's attitudes, Orwell will be proved to have been wrong when he said, "Progress is a swindle."

Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to some matters and I consider that they need to be replied to. He spoke about the Seamen's Union and its members who demonstrated outside the A.M.P. building. Obviously, he knows nothing about the issues involved. He could not have spoken to the demonstrating workers: if he had done, he would have been educated. All he did was take a kick at these workers, which is the general attitude of bosses' lackeys such as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. When they cannot be bothered about getting the facts, or are too lazy to do so, they kick a head and engage in union bashing. They think that that contributes to society, but I do not think that going on like the Hon. Mr. DeGaris contributes anything.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I don't suppose you apply that to yourself, do you?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I do. I always try to be constructive. I do not savagely kick everyone in sight. If I have criticism of people, I try to criticise constructively. However, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has spent a long time here doing nothing but being destructive, and the one saving grace is that he has been more destructive of the Liberal Party than of anything else.

I cannot give all the facts of the Utah dispute, because I have not sufficient time. However, I will briefly outline what the men were demonstrating about outside the A.M.P. building. Everyone in Australia would have heard of the Utah Development Company. That company has purchased eight ships to transport part of its coal output overseas, and the Seamen's Union, along with other maritime unions, has claimed the right to have four of the ships manned by Australian workers. Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that Utah could not afford the cost: it was not profitable to employ these seamen. The figures I will give now are not my figures: they have been computed by reliable sources in financial affairs and in the maritime industry.

The cost of employing Australian crews on those ships, over and above what Utah has been paying, would be about \$2 000 000 a year, which is a tiny fraction of the amount that Utah makes and exports from this country. The company exports millions of dollars as well as coal. Last year the company's profit was \$160 000 000 and the profit for the first half of this year was \$90 000 000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What is their investment in Australia?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I will quote that from the *Financial Review*. The entire profit of Utah, a company that says it cannot employ Australian seamen because that would cost \$2 000 000 year, goes overseas. Lest the Hon. Mr. DeGaris thinks that I am putting trade union propaganda to the Council, I will read a report from the *Financial Review*, as follows:

Utah Development Company is incorporated in Nevada and has a branch office in Australia. Therefore, unlike companies that have their local operations controlled by a company incorporated in Australia, Utah is not subjected to 15 per cent withholding tax levy. This, together with the rate at which the company is paying dividends, indicates that the U.S. group has adopted a policy of taking out of Australia as much money as possible while the going is good.

The report also refers to the fact that, in the latest quarterly returns, Utah declared a dividend of \$60 000 000 out of earnings of \$32 000 000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Say that again.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: In the latest quarterly returns, those for the quarter ended September 1977, Utah declared a dividend at the rate of \$60 000 000 out of earnings of \$32 000 000, or a dividend at the rate of 187 per cent. The report continues:

If Utah was to maintain this payment in the final quarter its dividends for the year will total close to \$190 000 000, which would be a good 25 per cent ahead of the highest net profit ever reported by an Australian company. When it is considered that U.D.C. would have injected less than \$25 000 000 of its own funds as equity capital in establishing its Australian operation its returns are running at enormous levels.

That is the company that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is defending. Not only did Utah make this enormous profit but the manner in which it was made concerns me, and it would concern all Australians. Utah is mining coal in Queensland, using the cheapest and crudest methods possible which many authorities claim are damaging our coal reserves. They say that it will be uneconomic to mine millions of tonnes of coal, because of the way in which the surface is being ripped up.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said it was unprofitable for Utah to employ Australian seamen on its ships. The figure was that it would cost \$2 000 000 each year, but let us examine the figures in simple terms. Enormous amounts may look grand but do not relate to the average worker's production. The before-tax profit of Utah in 1977 was

\$365 200 000. The company, which employs 2 851 Australians, therefore makes a pre-tax profit of \$128 146 per annum per employee. That is a profit of \$2 464 a week, or \$62 an hour, from each employee. This is the company that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has the temerity to say cannot afford to pay \$2 000 000 a year to employ Australian seafarers on its ships. To contrast Utah's profit, I refer to C.R.A., which employs 16 600 Australians, making a gross profit of \$5.12 per hour per employee.

The A.N.Z. Bank employs 21 179 Australians (compared to Utah's 2 851) and extracts \$1.75 profit for each employee. Myer's, one of the largest employers of Australians, has a staff of 28 498 and makes a profit from each employee of \$1.21 an hour (compared to Utah's \$62 an hour). For the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to say that Utah cannot afford to pay Australian seafarers is absolute nonsense, as the figures show, and I was disappointed, although not surprised, that he had not done his homework properly. He quoted figures of Australian seamen's wages, saying that they received \$530 a week, with 20 weeks annual leave.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: If they are on Utah's ships.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Leader's statement is absolute nonsense. A telephone call to the Seamen's Union, B.H.P. or Adelaide Steamship would have told him that the wage for an Australian able seaman on a bulk carrier the size and nature of Utah's which the Seamen's Union and the other maritime unions want to man is less than \$14 500 a year, including overtime and annual leave payments.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That's the annual rate.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Yes, that is the annual rate. Seamen work on a salary, which for that type of ship that we are claiming the right to man is \$14 500 a year.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: But for every week at sea it would be \$520. I know what I'm talking about. They don't get paid when they are on leave.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The rate for an able-bodied Australian seaman includes all his leave and overtime payments. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said it was \$530 a week; these figures were taken from a scale, which I saw, but I did not see who drew it up. It quoted a monthly rate of about \$2 000, but whoever compiled those figures should go back to school or at least make a telephone call to ascertain the true figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It was the International Shipping Federation.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That is a group of international ship owners. Who am I to argue with them? No matter what figures they put on paper, the Arbitration Commission sets the wage rates and says, "All you are getting is \$14 500 a year; that is the salary level." All the talk about \$24 000 is very nice, and I wish it was true: seamen deserve this salary, but the Arbitration Commission cannot see its way clear to award it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You know the point is that in one case \$520 is the salary whilst at sea, on the basis of no pay for the 20 or 23 weeks a year leave, and you are talking about an overall annual rate.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr. Hill knows nothing about the industry, either. Seamen are paid monthly, irrespective of whether they are at work or on leave. It is not divided into \$530 a week while they are on board and nothing while they are off. The salary is paid monthly, and the total of 12 monthly payments is \$14 500, which is a far cry from the figures the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was using.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You've heard of W. D. Scott and Company? They estimate that employment of Australian seamen on Utah ships would cost \$23 000 a

year for every Australian seamen employed. Work that out!

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I have no doubt that that is what they say. Utah is already employing people on its ships, and you have to take away from the total what it is already paying. Australian seamen (in the case of the Seamen's Union) are the lowest-paid workers on the ship and are a minority of the ship's crew. If the Leader wants to start kicking heads in the maritime industry, he should start higher up than the Seamen's Union.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I am saying why Australian seamen cannot get jobs on Utah ships.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That is nonsense. The Leader asked how one could justify seamen being paid \$530 a week with 20 weeks annual leave. However, all workers get 20 weeks, the only difference being that for seamen, the very nature of their industry involves work over seven days (they cannot tie up their ship at weekends). Seamen are willing to tie up on the weekends, but shipowners do not want to do that; they want to keep on sailing.

Simple arithmetic and a little thinking by the Leader would have stopped his making such a stupid statement. Certainly, if one takes into account public holidays and annual leave, one comes close to the 20 weeks off a year. That fact has never been disputed in the maritime industry. Since the introduction of the 40-hour week, and even during the 44-hour week, shipowners in the Arbitration Commission claimed that that was the way the industry should operate. They sought the right to work the industry 24 hours a day, seven days a week. They wanted us to take our weekends, public holidays and annual leave in large lumps, rather than tying up the ships on every public holiday or weekend, or every time the crew were due for annual leave.

As an ex-mariner of some description, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris should have worked out that the industry operated seven days a week, 52 weeks of the year, and that the only way to organise time off for workers was to implement this system. That should have been simple to deduce. However, it was not simple enough for the Leader.

To claim that Australian ships are not sufficiently competitive is nonsense. The Australian National Line has a fleet of ships trading overseas with Australian crews, and they are competitive. The problem in the industry is that shipowners (and this is probably the first time in my life that I have defended shipowners) get no assistance whatever for their operations when they are attempting to compete internationally with shipowners who receive major considerations from their Governments. The Australian Government concedes nothing to its shipowners. It is remarkable that the A.N.L. is able to compete as well as it does with no assistance whatever from the Government.

The fights by the Seamen's Union against Utah and other multi-national companies emphasise how a reactionary Government in Australia is selling this country overseas at bargain basement prices. It emphasises the absolute necessity of fighting those organisations now. It is essential that we fight them for the economic independence of Australia and its people.

The Seamen's Union, of which I am privileged to be a member, is fighting Utah for the right of its members and the Australian people as a whole to benefit from the vast resources of this country. It is fighting for the right of more Australians to work in an Australian industry and for the returns from our national resources to be retained in Australia for the benefit of all the people of Australia, rather than for overseas investors such as Utah.

If the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had done any homework at all before attacking the union as he did yesterday, he would agree that the union's claim is legitimate. Therefore, I urge the Leader and all honourable members opposite to examine the issues involved in this dispute, and I am sure that he will agree with everyone else who has examined this matter that, rather than backing Australia, as Utah claims, it is screwing this country for every cent it can get.

I am proud to be a member of the union that refuses to be treated in this manner. I congratulate it on its campaign against Utah that has had the effect of exposing Utah for the pirate that it is. Such exposure has made the name of Utah stink throughout Australia, and rightly so.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I support the second reading of these two Bills. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday pointed out the deficiencies of our present method of dealing with the Budget Bills and Budget papers. He pointed out that in other Parliaments (he specified Western Australia) procedures are adopted that make it possible to debate the Budget documents in both Chambers at the same time. I should like to refer to this matter in somewhat more detail than did the Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

I asked the Parliamentary Library Research Service to investigate the procedures that have been adopted in Western Australia. The material made available to me states:

Pursuant to a recommendation of its Standing Orders Committee, the Western Australian Legislative Council on 18 August 1976 agreed to amend its Standing Order 151 by the addition of a new subparagraph (c). Standing Order 151 as amended reads:

On any paper being laid before the Council, it shall be in order to move that it:

- (a) be read, and, if necessary, a day be appointed for its consideration;
- (b) be printed;
- (c) in the case of the annual Estimates of Expenditure for the Consolidated Revenue Fund that it be taken note of by the Council.

As the amended Standing Orders were approved prior to the introduction of the 1976 Estimates, that was the first year in which the new system was tried. The debate is conducted in general terms, Council members being able to address themselves to a wide range of matters. The debate is not, however, as wide as an Address-in-Reply. Particular Estimates may be commented on or questioned, but the debate is not conducted "line" by "line". The relevant Standing Order for the South Australian Legislative Council is No. 451 which reads:

On any paper being laid before the Council, the printing thereof may be moved by a Minister of the Crown, and it shall be in order to move that it be read; and if necessary, a day may be appointed for its consideration.

Prior to its amendment in 1976, Western Australian Legislative Council Standing Order No. 151 had a similar intent expressed in subparagraph (a). The Hon. R. F. Cloughton, in agreeing to the recommendation to add subparagraph (c), commented:

I believe that Standing Orders, as they stand at present, would permit them (the appropriations) to be discussed now and would also allow any tabled paper to be discussed simply on the motion "That consideration of the paper be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the Chamber" . . . However, this automatic process is the sort of thing we are looking for and I support it.

It would seem that present Standing Orders for the South Australian Legislative Council probably allow for the Estimates to be tabled and debated, but a formal amendment

to the Standing Orders may be desirable.

I now refer to the debate on the Appropriation Bill in Western Australia (Western Australian *Hansard* 21 September 1977, volume 16), where the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, Leader of the House, moved without notice:

That, pursuant to Standing Order No. 151, the Council take note of tabled paper No. 245 (Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure and related papers), laid upon the table of the House on 21 September 1977.

He stated:

For a great number of years prior to the last couple of years it was the practice in this Parliament that the Budget was introduced by the Treasurer in the Legislative Assembly, and debate pursued. There was the general debate on both the Consolidated Revenue Budget and the General Loan Fund Budget. Of course, a number of Bills are introduced by the Treasurer at that time dealing with a number of matters which are the subject of the Budget itself.

Ultimately these Bills, which include the Budget papers, are passed by the Legislative Assembly. If they are not passed the Government must resign, as everybody is fully aware. But normally they are passed and they come to this House and debate can then ensue.

During the years that I have been a member of this place a number of members, notably the late Sir Keith Watson, have spoken at length about the unreasonableness of that arrangement in that the Legislative Council frequently finds itself comparatively short of work whilst the Legislative Assembly debates the Budget papers. Towards the end of a session various Bills, papers and motions are passed by the Assembly and come to this House by way of messages. When they arrive here frequently members are concerned with a considerable backlog of legislation, and there is a need to end the session, because members have duties in their electorates and many other matters are pressing. Consequently, matters of importance are not debated in this Chamber as fully as they may be. That was the purport of the comments made year after year by the late Sir Keith Watson.

The arrangements were also discussed at great length by Mr. Frank Wise, who always had a considerable amount to say about Commonwealth-State financial relations. I think most of the comments made by current members of this place were probably made by the Hon. Norman Baxter.

A couple of years ago notice was taken of those comments and the motion which I have just moved is the result. Therefore, the papers are on the table of the House. The opportunity is now given to this Chamber to discuss the various matters with regard to the Budget at greater length than has been the case heretofore. This situation has not happened only this year; it has happened previously. I suppose everyone has different ideas about it. I think it is an important opportunity for debate and I place on it perhaps a little more emphasis than has been the case in the past.

All these considerations apply here. However, the situation is somewhat different because, apparently, in Western Australia the Budget goes through the Legislative Council on only the last night of the session. That does not happen here. However, we have a similar situation in that, in the past few weeks, the Council has had nothing to do while another place has been debating the Budget. Of course, although we are debating the Budget now (earlier in the session, as happens in Western Australia), we will find, as always happens, that towards the end of the session we will have a great heap of important legislation that we will be called upon to deal with without having adequate opportunity to consider it.

There is another disadvantage in the present procedure: when we come to the Budget debate and the Budget papers, everything that can usefully be said on the matter has already been said. I ask the Leader of the Government

in the Council whether he would be willing to take up with the Government the possibility of adopting a similar procedure here. Of course, this can be done only by the Government. It seems from what I have said that it would be desirable to amend Standing Orders to enable this to happen because, if this change is made, it can only be to the advantage of Parliamentary debate.

Most of what I have heard about the Budget from Government members and what I have read of the debates not only in this place but also in another place, as well as in the press, seems to be a matter of blaming the "Feds". The fact that substantial untied grants have been made available to this State for carving up into its various portions has been completely overlooked.

The general comments on the Budget have been made adequately by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Hill, and I do not intend to repeat what they have said. However, I intend to deal with a few minor matters, each of which has its own importance in its own way.

I refer, first, to the Land Commission. I have noticed recently in the "Situations Vacant" columns in the press advertisements calling for persons to offer their services to sell land on behalf of the commission. The Land Commission was offering to employ people who were willing to undertake the positions of salesmen for it. I raise this matter in this debate, as I have no doubt that the salaries for these people are part of the estimated expenditure for the Land Commission for the present financial year.

I understand that in the past the Land Commission has employed the services of land agents. It seems now, however, that the commission intends to do this work itself. I have been told that people who have been employed and taken up duties selling land for the commission as its servants have not all been licensed salesmen or qualified persons.

Having looked at the Land and Business Agents Act, it seems that it is not expressed to bind the Crown. Therefore, the Crown and its agents (including the land commission) are not obliged to observe the terms of the Land and Business Agents Act, whereas agents in the private profession can employ only licensed land agents or salesmen, who must undergo a course of, I believe, two years training and who must be qualified. However, the Land Commission, not being bound by the Act, is able to employ anyone, and apparently it is now doing so.

I ask the Minister when he replies to say whether, as has been reported to me, the Land Commission is employing unqualified persons to act as land salesmen. It seems to be rather unfair competition when the Government is willing to use in its instrumentalities unqualified persons to perform services that in the private sector must be performed by qualified persons.

I now refer to the Premier's Department and the decentralisation incentive scheme. The 1977-78 Estimates provided \$1 900 000 for payments to industry, of which \$430 000 related to the decentralisation incentive scheme. The Premier told the member for Mount Gambier in another place on 24 October that these schemes were available in growth centres only. Of course, he has said previously that these payments pursuant to the scheme are available in recognised and specified growth centres but not elsewhere.

In this respect, I instance the problems that have occurred at Mannum and particularly in relation to one of its industries, Horwood Bagshaw Limited, where heavy retrenchments occurred last year and where people found themselves in serious financial difficulties. I refer to a statement made by the member for Murray in another place and reported in the Thursday 19 October issue of the

Murray Valley Standard, as follows:

It was vitally important that problems associated with unemployment in Mannum should not be forgotten by either State or Federal Governments, just because the drought has broken, member for Murray Mr. David Wotton said this week.

"Mannum as a town virtually relies on the one industry which in turn has relied on seasonal effects on the agricultural industry. This has meant big unemployment problems in the past and will continue to do so in the future. It is imperative that real incentives should be provided on a continuing basis, to attract new industry to Mannum, until this problem is overcome," he said.

Mr. Wotton last week sought clarification in Parliament from the Premier on whether it was the Government's intention that Mannum should receive the same incentives offered to growth centres in the recently announced industry incentive scheme, and if not, why not.

Mr. Wotton reminded the Premier that he had announced both at a public meeting, and in Parliament, at the time of the Horwood Bagshaw retrenchments, that Mannum should receive from the Government the same incentives made available to growth centres. Mannum had not been listed as one of the towns to receive this assistance in the latest industry incentives scheme.

In reply, Mr. Dunstan said that the commitment made at the public meeting that the Government would take urgent action to try to minimise the effect the retrenchments would have on Mannum had been met by the Government during the past year.

The Premier said that he was pleased to say that the employment situation in Mannum had improved in recent months and Horwood Bagshaw Limited had added substantially to its workforce.

"Following the good rains throughout Australia this winter, it is expected that sales of agricultural machinery will improve, and it is likely that this will bring increased demand for labour at Mannum," Mr. Dunstan said. "Special assistance to significant developments in other areas might be negotiated."

Mr. Wotton said that the Government had provided employment for Mannum during the last year through the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. He said that he was sorry that the Government has not been able to place Mannum on the list of towns attracting maximum incentives in the future as it was obvious that encouragement was necessary to attract further industry to Mannum.

The suggestion, from what the Premier said, is that because of the rain everything in the garden is lovely for Horwood Bagshaw and for the town of Mannum, where it is mainly situated. This, of course, is complete rubbish. The present unemployment rate in Mannum is 17 per cent, as against the State rate of 7.8 per cent. So, the unemployment rate in Mannum is more than double the State average and about 10 per cent more than the State average. No headers have been manufactured in Mannum this year, nor are they likely to be. There was a sufficient stock of spare parts on hand. A number of headers have been assembled from existing parts, and a small supply of parts, where some were deficient, has had to be made.

Not giving decentralisation incentive scheme benefits in this case is highly detrimental to the town and to the industry on which the town mainly relies. It is quite ridiculous to provide substantial decentralisation incentives to new industry without being prepared to do anything, even on a temporary basis, to support an existing decentralised industry which has suffered a temporary setback because of seasonal conditions. Representations were made to the Premier and the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry, Mr. Dean

Brown, by letter on 17 July 1978 by Mr. Underwood, an officer employed by Horwood Bagshaw and mainly responsible for outside contracts. The reply from the Premier dated 21 August 1978 is as follows:

Dear Mr. Underwood,

I refer to your letter of 17 July 1978 concerning a scheme of preference to country manufacturers for State Government contracts. The Government has examined your suggestion and is of the opinion that no action is warranted.

The Government already operates a general purchasing preference scheme for all goods made in South Australia.

In addition, as part of the Government's regional development policy, a decentralisation incentive scheme exists to assist firms in overcoming establishment costs (and in certain cases expansion costs) in decentralised locations. Firms establishing or significantly expanding in nominated locations are eligible for a number of incentives, including pay-roll tax rebate and relocation grants. These incentives are designed to ensure that such locations remain attractive as alternatives to the metropolitan area for industrial and commercial development.

Overall, the Government is of the opinion that regional development policy should encourage the establishment of viable industrial and commercial concerns which will not require continual Government subsidy over time. Clearly, operational subsidies do not assist in the establishment of long-term viable industries in country locations.

Your interest in forwarding the suggestion is nevertheless appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

The letter is signed by the Premier. The reply to Mr. Underwood's letter from the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry, dated 31 July 1978, is as follows:

Dear Mr. Underwood,

Thank you for your letter of 17 July 1978 concerning the adoption of a preference in Government contracts for decentralised manufacturing industry.

I am aware of the preference scheme as adopted for Victorian decentralised industry under the State Development Act of 1970 and I believe that such preference would help develop decentralised manufacturing industry in South Australia. I shall certainly consider its adoption as official policy for the Liberal Party. In addition, I will press for the State Government to also adopt it.

Enclosed is a copy of the Liberal Party policy on decentralisation. As you can see much of this policy is similar to the incentives offered by the Victorian Government. You are no doubt aware that in South Australia incentives such as a pay-roll tax rebate are only offered to decentralised manufacturing industries in specific zones. Mannum is not in such a zone.

I hope that in the near future we are able to achieve greater benefit for decentralised industry in South Australia.

I was informed by Mr. Underwood that Horwood Bagshaw has indeed been tendering for contracts that were let in South Australia, sometimes on an Australian basis. Horwood Bagshaw has frequently not been successful in putting in the lowest tender because the company has been beaten by Victorian firms that were able to put in a lower tender because of the decentralisation benefits that they were receiving under the Victorian scheme.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Who won the contracts for where?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Various contracts, mainly in South Australia, not from the South Australian Government. Some contracts have gone to Victorian firms because such firms were able to compete on a more favourable basis. It is ridiculous that a South Australian

firm, which has been in difficulty largely because of seasonal conditions, should suffer because of competition from Victorian firms as a result of the favourable treatment they have received from the Victorian Government. It is ridiculous to restrict the decentralisation benefits to State growth centres on a selective basis and to preclude completely existing decentralised industry from such benefits.

In many country towns elderly people particularly need an internal bus service in order to do their shopping and visiting. They may suffer from immobility; many cannot afford cars; and many are not healthy enough to be able to drive cars. They cannot afford taxis, and often taxis are not available anyway.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What about private enterprise?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The effective subsidy for the 800 000 residents of metropolitan Adelaide for public transport is \$20 000 000 a year.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Is that taking the railway system into account?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, it is. Only \$190 000 is provided in the Estimates for payment of subsidy in country areas, so the people there are getting a raw deal regarding public transport. I am referring mainly to elderly people who could do with periodic inter-town bus services. That is their only way to get around, and to grant this subsidy would be humane and proper.

The final matter I wish to raise refers to Horwood Bagshaw and the difficulties that the town of Mannum was in last year caused by retrenchments. In genuine self help, the citizens, including representatives of the unions, business houses, and community organisations, established the Mannum Economic Development Committee to try to overcome the situation by every means that it could use. On a long-term basis, it has tried to attract industry, and it has attracted some small ventures. It also is hopeful of attracting large ventures, but these projects have not yet come to fruition. The community also set up social welfare organisations that have been funded by Commonwealth and State Governments.

The State Government funded a development officer for the committee to which I have referred. The committee showed much initiative. It had to press hard to achieve that, but it achieved it, and I and the other people in Mannum are grateful to the Government for providing funding for this officer. The officer was funded for six months, and that period expires at the end of this month. Today I have received a letter from the Minister of Community Welfare stating that funding is not to be continued.

This is distressing, because, when people are trying to attract industry to a town and to establish long-term development, they cannot achieve that in six months. The development officer has been most efficient and effective, but industry cannot be attracted to relocate in a period of six months. If the funding is not continued, the \$8 000 that the Government has spent already on his employment and supportive services will have been wasted. Not much can be done in six months on a project of this kind.

There has been argument about which department should fund the officer and about whether he is working in community development or economic development. The name of the committee is the Mannum Economic Development Committee and the officer is the development officer. It seems to me that the name does not matter much, because a community cannot be developed without consideration of economic development and we cannot have economic development without developing the community. The appointment of the officer was funded by the Community Welfare Department, but the funds were

approved in the latter part of last financial year and at that time the Government had to examine whence it could get the money, and it was found in the Community Welfare Department.

The member for Murray in the House of Assembly and I have been on two deputations to the Minister of Community Welfare and he has given us a kindly hearing. In addition, the committee has written letters and the District Council of Mannum is preparing, in its budget for the next financial year, to provide funding for such an officer. However, he could not be funded from that source alone. There has been complete community support, and the Minister of Community Welfare has told the committee that, unfortunately, he cannot continue his funding.

Surely, this should come from the Premier's Department. The matter is, by name, an economic one, and it was taken up initially with the Premier, who decided to grant the funding in the first place. The money came from the Community Welfare Department only because that was the only place that had the money. I ask the Minister of Health to say, when he replies to this debate, whether he will take the matter up with the Premier to find out whether funding is possible from that source. I ask the Minister to investigate the matter urgently, because the present funding stops at the end of this month.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I support the second reading. The speeches by Opposition members in this debate have astounded me, and it would be a good idea if, at their own expense, some Opposition members went overseas and saw what was happening in the Western world. A letter in today's newspaper states that in the United States of America, 10 000 000 people are unemployed. Most of them are receiving benefits, but time is running out, which means that the benefits will be reduced.

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference that I attended was addressed by notable people, representing one-quarter of the world's population in 74 countries, and the best debates were about world peace and unemployment. I did not speak on either matter, but a colleague from the Federal Parliament, Bert James, spoke. I spoke on the growth of unemployment and unrest amongst youth, and I think the contribution was well received by those people who were opposed to the capitalist system. They were opposed to people like the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the Hon. Mr. Hill, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, and the Hon. Mr. Burdett, and to the system that takes from the poor and completely ignores the problems of the aged, the afflicted, and the weary, and puts the money into the coffers of the rich. This position cannot obtain for any longer.

One only has to go overseas to find out how the world is upset about exploitation of people by the Western world. In the four years I have been here, yesterday was the first time I heard the Hon. Mr. DeGaris talk about his concern regarding unemployment. He was brief, and when he gave wages as his reason for unemployment he fell down. He listens to economists, but economists have been hoodwinking the people. They have been advising the Liberal Party, ruining this great nation, and putting us back to the dark days of the 1800's.

I refer now to something that I said last year, when the Hon. Mr. Dawkins wanted me to table a document. Last year, the Opposition said that this was a corrupt Government. At that time, I predicted that 400 000 people unemployed would be Fraser's Christmas gift to the people of Australia. This year, I will increase that and say that his Christmas gift will be 550 000 unemployed.

Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that he did not want to say whether the fault for the unemployment position was with the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. However, the people of Australia want to talk about whose fault it is.

The Young Liberals, as reported in the newspaper last Saturday morning, were concerned about the image of the Liberal Party in both Houses of this Parliament. They want young people who can communicate with the public and do not have vested interests to enter Parliament. They do not want the Hon. Mr. Burdett, with his legal practice the Hon. Mr. Hill with his 35 companies, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who is worrying about his sons on the farm, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, with his stud sheep and all the shovels that go with it, and the Hon. Mr. Geddes, who sold out for about \$500 000.

Young people today want answers and full-time politicians who are aware of what is happening in the country. How can these problems be solved? The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that wages are the problem. I wish the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw were here. The linchpin of wage rates in Australia has always been related to the fitters award, and goes back to the farmers award of 1907. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris will now be able to supply his constituents with the truth.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How many young people do you employ?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am not an employer of labour, but I know employers who do not exploit their labourers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You don't employ anybody?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: No, I do not.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Well, it's time you did.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I support the metal union's attitude to wage claims. It has a claim pending for \$20 a week, which should be increased to \$90. The fitters award wage has fallen behind the average weekly earnings; it is now 62 per cent of the average weekly earnings. The original average weekly earnings in 1947 were \$14.32. In September 1977, they were \$204. In 1947, a fitter received 113.8 per cent of the percentage average award earnings, and in September 1977 he received 63.53 per cent. His award wage in September 1947 was \$16.30, and in September 1977, \$142. His loss in terms of salary in 1947 was nil. In 1972, his loss was \$41.89, and in September 1977 it was \$90.30. That is the history of the metal trades award.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris agreed with me when he said there should be a shorter working week. That is another point in his favour. He also believes that wages should be decreased accordingly. If the hours in a working week are decreased by 10 per cent, wages must decrease by a comparable amount. The last national reduction in working hours was in 1947, when employers and Liberal Party members argued, during a shearers' strike of two years duration in which I participated, that a reduction in working hours from 44 to 40 would wreck Australia's economy. It was said that this reduction was a communist plot and that all the strikers were working for the communists and trying to break the country. However, this did not occur.

Through the union movement, the solidarity of trade unions and militant workers such as I, we beat the graziers and the Liberal politicians. Since then we have always rejected the theory that the worker pays the Bill for technological change.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris's salary is about \$38 000 a year; he is supplied with a driver and a staff, and all his speeches in this place are prepared by the Chamber of Manufactures. During the bottle top dispute, he had Coca-

Cola haunting the passageways of Parliament House. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris attends the Council for five months a year. A seaman works seven days a week, six weeks off and six weeks on, when he is away from his family. In an hour's time, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris will return home in his chauffeur-driven car, pocketing his \$38 000, never having raised a sweat in the 20 years he has been here. He has never been inside the boiler room of a ship, and never been on a rough sea, unless it was as a passenger. However, he (and anyone else in this place, including me) has the gall to sit in this Council and not represent the true facts as they affect the workers and the pensioners, etc.

The Hon. Mr. Burdett talked about a bus service for people in country areas, and that is to his credit, but, if the Labor Government proposed something of this nature, he and his colleague, the Hon. Mr. Hill, would say, "This involves more public servants and more wasted money." They would play politics. The Hon. Mr. Burdett lives in Mannum, and talks about Mannum frequently. However, we are dealing with a world problem. I quoted some figures last year, and I will quote more now. Young people are starting to find out, and that is why they are not contributing to society: they know that Australia is being ripped off. A person from a third world country recently said to me at the C.P.A. conference, "You are lucky, Australia is a wealthy and lucky country. People are earning good wages." I replied, "You don't know what's going on there. We are being ripped off like you people will be by the multi-nationals as you develop. What Britain does not take, America takes. We have Utah and G.M.H."

I was a seaman in 1952 and earned £50 a month, including in-and-out ports. There were four men in each cabin. The Liberals, shipowners and employers then said "These blokes are wrecking the economy of Australia." The same thing is being said today whenever a worker wants a share of profits. Seamen all over the world have had to fight for their conditions. Millionaires like Onassis and others have not given them those conditions. Seamen have had to fight and go on strike, and that is how workers win. The Liberals will see some fighting in the years to come if they keep up their present rotten attitude to the workers and their families.

Half of all manufactured goods in Australia are produced by 200 companies. Foreign control extends to 17 of the top 25 companies. Foreign controlled corporations produce 84 per cent of non-ferrous metals and 78 per cent of industrial and heavy chemicals. One authority estimates that by the year 2000 some 200 firms will control three-quarters of the assets of the non-communist world. The picture of a ruling class of national and international powers emerges. We have seen I.T.T. topple the Chilean Government and a multi-national company used to stabilise the Government in Australia. Foreign investment was 39.7 per cent of all private investment in Australia immediately prior to the election of a Labor Government in 1972. It fell by 8 per cent in 1973-74. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris described the heady years of the 1960's when foreign capital withdrew after the Labor Government came into power.

As I have said, people on the international scene, people concerned about the world's population, know these facts are true. An article under the heading "Guns before butter" states:

World expenditure on arms = \$1 000 000 000 per day.
After my return I saw in the *Advertiser* of 8 March 1978 that the Nobel Peace Prize was won by Mr. Sean McBride, who supported that figure. This same document states:

Australian expenditure on arms = \$7 000 000 per day,
\$2 500 000 000 per year. Australia is one of America's largest

customers for arms. Three-quarters of Australia's capital expenditure on arms is spent overseas. The RAAF is currently intent on buying 70 super-sophisticated American F15 fighters at a cost of \$20 000 000 each. Australia is the eighteenth "big spender" on arms. Australia spends \$100 000 000 for Leopard tanks. But by contrast—

Australia has 400 000 unemployed.

Australia spends only \$39 000 000 on Aboriginal housing per year.

Australia spends only \$25 000 000 on school dental services per year.

Australia spends only \$71 000 000 on community health services per year.

Australia spends only \$5 000 000 on solar research at the A.N.U. over five years.

Australia gave \$25 000 000 in military aid to Indonesia between 1975 and 1977.

So it goes on, yet there is not a war in sight. This document also refers to the neutron bomb, which was a hot topic at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. Honourable members should not think that by my referring to it I believe the association is good. I believe it is crook, and most of the people attending the conference are there only to try to make it better. The conference is a political forum, but it cannot make any political decisions. I told the conference that the matters it was debating, exchanging points of view, did nothing productive in seeking to stop certain things happening in the world. True, some other speakers were concerned and supported my view. How can 74 countries seek to make a call on world politicians, talk about important subjects, but not have any power to make decisions? Turning to nuclear weapons, the following statement is made in this document:

Current nuclear weapon stockpiles have the capacity to kill everyone in the world 24 times over. The military strategists have a name for it. Overkill 24! By 1990 there will be enough plutonium, a by-product of nuclear energy, to produce 300 000 20-kiloton nuclear weapons. The mining and export of Australia's uranium would contribute to the production of these weapons. Nuclear weapon stockpiles = 15 tonnes of TNT for every human being on earth. There exists one Hiroshima-size nuclear bomb for every 1 000 people in the world and more being manufactured every day. One nuclear submarine has the destructive power of all the explosives used in World Wars 1 and 2. You think that's bad enough—now read this:

In recent years research and development of nuclear weapons has been directed to improve their destructive power and accuracy. World-wide 400 000 scientists, technicians and engineers are employed in war and war-related industries. In the arsenals of the major powers there are nuclear intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of being sent over 6 000 miles with almost pin-point accuracy. Nuclear missiles have multiple warheads. That is, each missile has many nuclear "bombs" in the head, each being independently targeted to different locations.

The United States is now constructing Trident submarines at a cost of \$2 billion each. Four are being built by General Dynamics. The programme is for a total of 30. Each submarine will be armed with 24 missiles each containing 17 independent warheads. Thus, one Trident submarine will have the capacity to deliver $24 \times 17 = 408$ atomic bombs . . . each three times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima which caused 78 000 deaths and 84 000 injured in a few minutes.

An example is then given of how many jobs can be created if funds are spent on peaceful and constructive projects. The example, giving figures provided by the United States Government and the United Nations Research Depart-

ment, is as follows:

\$1 billion spent on arms = 76 000 jobs.

\$1 billion spent on civilian needs = 100 000 to 120 000 jobs.

True, if we were to change our way of life to more peaceful purposes, employment would be created. These are matters, I believe, that members of Parliament all over the world, as well as in the Australian States and in Canberra, should be talking about. We should be solving the problems of our youth. We would not have violence, drugs and dissension among young people if they had jobs. We would not have the problem of old people being discouraged and living in misery. They, too, feel the dangers of war and the stress felt by youth, because it is their grandchildren who are unemployed.

As I have stated publicly at meetings throughout South Australia, no Government should be in power that presides over unemployment in such a rich country as Australia. Such a Government has no right to be in office, and I believe that, as soon as the Australian people get the opportunity to sack the Fraser Government, they will. They will sack the DeGaris's, the Hill's, the Burdett's, the Dawkins's and the people who have exploited labour all their life and who believe only in the profit system, with no concern for unemployment.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris's first mention of unemployment in his speech was a suggestion that it was caused by high wages. In supporting the second reading, I believe that the Liberals must be concerned and worried about this wonderful document that has been presented by the Premier.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You don't know what you're talking about.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: What the honourable member really means is that he does not agree with what I am saying, but the facts I have given are true. The honourable member has been loafing in this Council ever since his election. He has not done a day's work, he has read every speech, and he has even called me a thief. He claimed that I obtained a car on Kangaroo Island, but he had to withdraw that. He made a vulgar disclosure—he is a waster; he takes money here under false pretences. He knows it, and the voters know it—

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I object to that, Mr. Acting President. It is contrary to Standing Orders to refer to any member in those circumstances. I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He is not a waster, then. However, anyone who gets this salary and does the amount of work that the Legislative Council does should not attack anyone's wage packet. I withdraw the statement that he is a waster. Anyone who sits in this Chamber and draws the wages that we draw is a waster. This Council has not long to go. The Labor Government has promised the people of South Australia that, immediately we get control of the Upper House, we will hold a referendum to put the Council out of business.

I am looking forward to that day and hope that, when the time comes, members on the other side will realise that the people of South Australia have at last woken up to them. I am merely giving them the message: I have told the people how crook DeGaris and Dawkins are, as well as the gentleman up in the corner, who has a private business.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: I've not been in business for years.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You were working in my area.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: I was there for two weeks.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You had no right being

there. You should give someone else a job. I am completely opposed to the proposition put forward by Opposition members. The people of Australia, and indeed of the world, are waking up to the Fraser Government and the exploitation of human nature by the capitalist system.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I hope I can be mercifully brief. However, there are a few remarks that I must make. I begin by referring to the Hon. Mr. Burdett's comments on the way in which the Budget debate is handled. He could have expanded his remarks to the whole system. We in this country have the misfortune to have a Westminster system combined with a Federal system, and a written Constitution. That gives us the worst of all worlds.

As a result of that, we see in this Parliament at this time of the year, when the Budget Bills are coming before us, weeks of continuous unintelligent nit-picking and knocking by Opposition members in the House of Assembly and regrettably, judging by the line that the debate has taken thus far, in this place, also. It is not untrue to say that today's debate has largely been irrelevant.

I also put it to the Council that Messrs. Tonkin and Dean Brown are doing more to destroy business confidence in South Australia than the Premier, Cabinet or the entire Labor movement in South Australia could ever do. In fact, it was brought to my attention recently that employer organisations here have appealed to the member for Davenport to moderate his approach because the continual blocking and distortion was doing nothing but undermine business confidence at a time that business could do without it. In another place, Mr. Tonkin tried to outline an alternative strategy which, on my examination, contained nothing of substance. He referred to incentives to industry. Of course, these incentives under the system that we have in Australia always result in an unseemly scramble among the States. However, I should like to compliment the State Government on the establishment payments scheme and the officers who helped to develop it.

The Hon. Mr. Burdett referred to the problems being experienced in Mannum, and criticised the Government because the scheme applied to specified growth areas only. It is interesting to note the Federal Government's approach to this matter. I refer to a report headed "Long haul for the economy: Lynch" in the 10 October issue of the *Advertiser*, part of which is as follows:

Mr. Lynch later told the convention technological and structural changes carried problems for industry.

"But if we don't meet the challenges involved, Australia faces the prospect of becoming little less than a primary producer and a quarry for the world," he said.

"It can be argued that, if a manufacturing industry runs into trouble, the Government has an obligation to bail it out and certainly this does occur in some countries. There can be no substitute for good commercial foresight and decision-making. Governments can help in the adjustment process, but the assistance provided must be used to tackle the real problems."

This is the telling part of the report:

The Australian Government has no intention of bailing out particular industries within the manufacturing sector, thereby disregarding the realities of the market system. To do so would be in the long run to weaken the free enterprise system and to undermine our national economic potential.

So, it would seem that the Hon. Mr. Burdett and Mr. Lynch philosophically and practically are not on the same lines at all. I have been an admirer of Horwood Bagshaw, which has produced some remarkable agricultural machinery over many years. However, it is of course

necessary to have specified growth centres. Otherwise, we run into the problems that have been experienced in Victoria. It is instructive for one to take a trip around Victoria and to see how its decentralisation programme has worked.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It's a pity that Mannum couldn't be tied in with Murray Bridge as a growth region.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Certainly, we do not want to finish up with the sort of situation that obtains in Victoria, where they have put in a whole range of schemes that are not soundly based. In many regions of Northern Victoria employment ranges between 10 per cent and 12 per cent. In Ballarat, for example, the unemployment rate is over 9 per cent. That is the sort of thing that will happen if we do not have a reasonable base on which to build decentralised industries.

The other thing about industrial incentives is that it does not matter, given the prevailing economic conditions that exist as a direct result of the Federal Government's policy, whether \$2 000 000 or \$20 000 000 is provided. I refer to a report headed "Budget jolts consumer confidence—survey" in the 30 September issue of the *Advertiser*, part of which is as follows:

The Federal Budget severely jolted consumer confidence, according to the Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research. The Institute, sponsored by Melbourne University, uses a five-question survey to test the sentiments of consumers every six weeks. From the answers it compiles an index of confidence.

After the latest survey taken at the end of August, the index dived a record 12.2 points to 91.2, almost equalling the lowest level recorded in 1974. Since January, the index has fallen 28 points. The 29-point fall of 1973 and 1974 was spread over 18 months.

In other words, the present Federal Government has jolted the confidence as much in eight months as the much maligned Whitlam Government was able to do over a period of 18 months! It seems to me and to any reasonable person that only the most right-wing, blinkered ideologists would fail to acknowledge that we live in a mixed economy, yet we are consistently told that the public sector has no role to play in restoring economic health. Everyone knows that the economy is the responsibility of central government, and it is nonsense for the Opposition to say, as it has done so often, that South Australia somehow exists in isolation and that we are just a colony as we were in the nineteenth century.

Some extravagant, although frequently witless, remarks have been made by Opposition members in the many weeks of Budget debate in another place. Unfortunately, overall, their contributions varied from poor to appalling, and I have no wish to take up time detailing some of the more appalling statements that were made. In this place, some strange claims have already been made by members opposite.

For example, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday gave a remarkable performance. I have no wish to make an attack on that honourable gentleman's personal integrity. I have no doubt that in some strange way the honourable member sees himself as some sort of a right-wing visionary. However, this leads him down some strange paths. Yesterday, the Leader advocated a replay of the mistakes of the great depression, in effect saying, "Sir Otto Niemeyer, where are you now that you are needed?" His central thesis, in a somewhat garbled version of a paper by W. M. Corden of the Australian National University, was to emasculate the trade union movement, strangle the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and let wages fall to a level that employers believe they can pay. In fact, it is interesting to see precisely what the

Leader said yesterday, as follows:

I suggest that the policies adopted in 1930 and based on the principles of lower cost and industrial harmony brought about an era of growth and prosperity in South Australia.

Dare I suggest that those hard-headed, realistic and practical policies are required again now in South Australia?

That is a remarkable statement, because the truth is that the only thing that brought Australia out of that dreadful depression was the Second World War. So, when people make reactionary comments like that, the only inference I can draw is that they believe that the only thing that will bring Australia out of the current recession is the Third World War. It is a frightening inference. In any case, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's suggestion is thoroughly impractical on purely pragmatic grounds, because it can result only in massive industrial confrontation and disputation. I turn now to the Hon. Mr. Hill. I am on record in *Hansard* as interjecting yesterday:

You're a Fraser man, are you?

The Hon. Mr. Hill replied:

Yes, and I am proud of it.

I am very pleased that that will be permanently on record. As the already declining star of Mr. Fraser sinks lower, the Hon. Mr. Hill can rest assured that in the next two years he will be reminded that he said that. Also, he dealt with State taxes. He has a new line now. Each year he goes through a new set of lies, damned lies, and statistics, and he has tried another set on this occasion. The Hon. Mr. Hill referred to the situation of a young man buying a Holden Kingswood. Actually, there is not much chance of a young man who is living on unemployment benefits buying a Holden Kingswood. The Hon. Mr. Hill also talked about the great flight of capital, a ploy recently used by his right-wing colleagues in New South Wales. Actually, it was not a very good ploy, because the New South Wales Liberal Party received only 27 per cent of the vote in the recent elections in that State. So, if the honourable member continues following that line, not only will he destroy confidence in his own State but also he will do no good at all for his own Party.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins talks about the flight of probate refugees to Queensland, while the Hon. Mr. Hill refers to the flight of developers to Victoria. Actually, if I had any friends who were land developers in Victoria, I would keep it very quiet indeed, in view of the smell of Victorian land deals. I am therefore amazed that the honourable member should refer to land developers in Victoria.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Produce the statement that you claim I made.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It is in *Hansard*. I will find the quotation for the honourable member.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Tell us about the Novar Gardens scandal.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The honourable member was recycling something that had been going on for years. Some of his colleagues, including his close personal friend, Mr. Steele Hall, had attended a series of meetings over the years, and they were all for it. The following letter was written by Mr. Heini Becker:

Dear Constituent,

You will shortly be asked to sign a petition objecting to plans for the proposed subdivision of Pilkington's land, Morphett Road, Novar Gardens.

The petition requests council to reject the plan to subdivide this area zoned General Industry and requests your council to instruct the planning committee to rezone the area from General Industry to Residential.

Although this land is now zoned General Industry I consider that, as your council has a rezoning subcommittee, the area can be rezoned Residential, which is more in

keeping with the environment of your district.

The Hon. Mr. Cameron completely misrepresented this matter in this Council recently. The letter is signed by Heini Becker, a member of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: So, the Liberal Party advocated the rezoning.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yes. As recently as 10 days before the Federal election last year Mr. Steele Hall advocated the same thing, yet the Hon. Mr. Cameron had the temerity to stand in this Council and try to make out that there was a great scandal. It was one of the poorest performances I have seen since I have been a member of this Council. When the honourable member was with the Liberal Movement at least he had some pretence to having integrity, but now he has just become another Party hack. He tries to beat up stories like that, but not one word of them is reported in the press or on radio or television.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: How do you think you will go tomorrow morning?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: As the honourable member well knows, the Budget debate in this Chamber is rarely reported. I wonder how many lines the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has got in the press over the years. What sort of contribution has that member made in this Council over the many years he has been here? He parroted clichés today for 14½ minutes. The only two items of note that he came up with were, first, criticism of the allegedly excessive spending on Grenfell Centre and, secondly, in the next sentence a complaint that the fixtures and fittings were inadequate. He cannot have his cake and eat it, too. That is the sort of level on which his mind operates. He is a born nit picker.

As a matter of self-interest, the honourable member also dealt with succession duties, a subject close to his heart, because he is a man of very substantial means. I knew that this matter would be raised, because it always is when the landed gentry opposite speak. The latest figures from the *South Australian Year Book* show that 8 per cent of estates probated in South Australia last year were valued at more than \$200 000 and that 4 per cent were from estates of more than \$100 000. An estate of \$100 000 would be only a freehold house and perhaps a few shares or personal savings, yet only 4 per cent of the people who died in that year had estates of more than that amount.

It is not difficult to find the reason for that, because people in their late 60's and early 70's are the battlers who went through the depression years. They have been honest citizens. Already, special concessions in succession duties have been given for land used for primary production, but we are dealing with only a small percentage. Most people in the State (the figure was 60 per cent of the number of people who died in 1976) have estates with a net value of less than \$20 000. The posers opposite misrepresent and try to say that they help the little people. The Hon. Mr. Hill is always talking about the little people, and I am sure that there are some leprechauns in his ancestry. What he says is only a tack, because the average person with any sort of arrangement regarding his estate has nothing to be concerned about.

Again, it is significant to note that succession duties, as a percentage of the total State taxation, declined from about 10 per cent in 1972-73 to 6 per cent in 1976-77. The Government has continued to give relief in areas of greatest need. As I have said previously, I consider succession duties to be one of the fairest taxes in the State, and I would be sorry if they were abolished.

However, that was not the main thing that I wanted to speak about today. I wanted to speak about unemployment, especially youth unemployment, because this is the tragedy of the 1970's. We are in danger of losing a whole

new generation, today's youth, the nation's greatest asset. The guilty men are in the Liberal Party, including the Hon. Mr. Hill, who, on his own admission, is an avid supporter of Mr. Fraser. All other members of the Liberal Party in this State have consistently supported Mr. Fraser. A report in the *National Times* of 28 October 1978, written by Paul Kelly, states:

It is hardly an exaggeration to say that two men run Australia today, John Malcolm Fraser and John Owen Stone. One of the ironies of our system of government is that because Stone is a member of that under-reported section of Australian life, the Public Service, he has remained a shadowy, almost unknown figure outside Canberra. Yet, the ideas, beliefs and *modus operandi* of John Stone and his relations with the Prime Minister will be the decisive factor in shaping the economic policy of this nation, not just for the next two years but while ever these men hold their present jobs.

The report goes on to look at what manner of man is John Stone, Fraser's right-hand man, and it states:

Unless he takes care and gives thought to the human effects of his policies, the economist is in danger of adopting the Harry Lime overview of the world. That is when, like Graham Greene's Third Man, looking down from the top of the ferris wheel, he sees the human beings below as ants. Stone is no exception. He appears to display a callous disregard for those who suffer through his economic prescriptions.

Likewise, we could describe the Prime Minister in that way and, presumably, also all members opposite, since they support him enthusiastically.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Particularly the Hon. Mr. Hill.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yes, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins would not be far behind him. An editorial in the *Melbourne Herald* (not exactly a right-wing journal) of 26 September this year sets out what that newspaper thinks about the present situation. It states:

Mr. Fraser has conceded for the first time that unemployment in Australia is a major social problem, and that his election prediction last year of a sustained fall in unemployment was over-optimistic. In a speech in Sydney yesterday, he then went on to insist that his Government would not relax its hardline economic policies. The Prime Minister will really have to do better than that.

Mr. Fraser's stunningly belated recognition is welcome, but does he propose to do nothing more than go on listening to reassuring and utterly negative Treasury advice? His admission yesterday merely means that a mass of supplied, narrowly-based information and some ideology of the most depressing kind have turned out to be less accurate than the forebodings of the man in the street and of some enlightened people in State Governments—

and, I may add, this State Government—

economics departments, industries, and unions.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why has South Australia got the highest unemployment figure in Australia?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: That is easy to work out, but you are no economist. We have always had the highest unemployment in times of economic down-turn. About 85 per cent of the market for South Australian products is in the Eastern States. Traditionally and historically, when the Eastern States have caught a cold, we have caught influenza. For the first time historically we were able to shield the State and get unemployment below the national average by using the carefully shepherded money that our prudent Treasurer had put aside. That money is not there now.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You squandered it.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: We used it usefully. We

can see the constructive things that have been done under the unemployment relief scheme.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Like the Frozen Food Factory!

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Mr. Acting President, can I have protection from the inane interjections coming from the Hon. Mr. Cameron?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins): Order! The honourable member is getting on quite well.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Will you not afford me the protection of the Chair? I want to make the point again that Malcolm Fraser, John Stone, and all the Liberal Party members opposite are the savage and callous men in our system. I have disposed of the claim that the State Government is in some way to blame by referring to the report in the Melbourne *Herald*. The position has been compounded by the new technology. We cannot consider cold hard statistics only; we must consider people. The *Advertiser* of 28 September this year contained an emotional, touching, and accurate letter from the Director of the Service to Youth Council Inc., in which he stated:

I am pleased Mr. Fraser has finally admitted that unemployment is not going away as quickly as he predicted.

Now the new jobless each year can face up to the possibility that work of their choice may not be available.

Later he refers to the shattered hopes, aspirations, and dreams of the hundreds of people unemployed, particularly the young. He states:

Who will provide the resources to continue this work? But, I must repeat, who will take responsibility for those who sank and never rose, or for those who have now turned their backs on a society which rejected, denigrated and stigmatised them?

Can we ever measure the costs in money and social and personal resources of this massive social sacrifice?

A report of a statement by a Church of England spokesman, the Assistant Bishop of the Melbourne Diocese, Bishop Grant, is as follows:

Unemployment at present levels "violates the conscience of the nation".

They are fairly strong words, coming from a church man. The Anglican Church is not traditionally one of the radical churches in Australia. The statement continues:

Where society severely discounts the worth of so great a number of its members, including many young people, the disease not only afflicts individuals, it brings our system into disrepute and disorder.

What about the Catholic Church? Bishop Cremin, of the Sydney Catholic Archdiocese, Southern Region, stated:

Unemployed Australians were bearing a disproportionate share of the burden of reducing inflation.

He also said that unemployment was the most widespread violation of fundamental human rights in Australia. They are strong words, to say the least.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It's a pity Clyde Cameron didn't take notice of them when he was in.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: An article in the *News* of 23 October 1978 titled "Kids in Crisis" states:

Dave Turner, CITY co-ordinator, has strong thoughts about the dole. They amount to this:

"Does a Government have the right to cut you off from society, to force you to live in poverty simply because there are no jobs available? A lot of people look at young unemployed people and say: 'They could get a job if they really wanted to.'"

This line is taken by members opposite. The article continues:

"And that's just rubbish. The jobs just aren't available. You only have to look at the statistics to see that."

The "sweet pea" scheme is used by officers of the

Commonwealth Employment Service in a most humane way and the rules are bent in an effort to help unemployed youth. In many cases, however, the "sweet pea" scheme is abused by employers to the disadvantage of the unemployed. In the *National Times*, 30 September 1978, Deborah Snow stated:

Federal funds worth millions of dollars are being poured into training programmes for the young unemployed this year—but strong doubts exist about what they're achieving.

A number of measures aimed at sopping up chronic unemployment among young people have been introduced since the end of 1976. But because of the Government's failure to carry through with an evaluation, no-one knows how well they are working . . . There is a pressing need for the Government to map out the potential quicksand in the labour market—areas where automation and restructuring are going to mean disappearing jobs. But funding for research into the future shape of manpower and training needs appears to have dried to a trickle.

Deborah Snow goes on to say that the only survey that was ever done was late in 1977 and was limited. People who go through the "sweet pea" scheme are not being followed up. I have personal knowledge of a 16-year-old girl who was employed as a junior doctor's receptionist under this scheme. She was put off prematurely before the period had expired, with a glowing reference. This occurred because the doctors were reorganising their manpower within the practice, and for no other reason. She then had to go through a five-week waiting period before she received an unemployment cheque. Many young people cannot obtain jobs and when they do obtain them they are put off at the will of an employer because of financial reasons. Their hearts are being broken. The outlook is depressing and reflects the bloody-minded approach of the Fraser Government in its single-minded pursuit of reducing inflation, which has not been achieved.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It has done a damn sight better than you; 19 per cent down to 7 per cent.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: We would not have been prepared to pay the price in human terms.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You got unemployment up to 250 000.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The honourable member has said the Labor Government increased unemployment. Obviously, he does not travel, except between Adelaide and the South-East. The honourable member does not realise what is happening, and the reasons for inflation throughout the Western world. However, I do not intend to explain the situation to him. Unemployment has doubled since 1973. Who was the person who said in his policy speech in 1975 that there would be jobs for all Australians who wanted to work?

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Who said he would resign when unemployment got to 200 000? Clyde Cameron!

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Malcolm Fraser, Prime Minister of Australia, stated there would be jobs available for all Australians. The solutions are not easily found. First, the inflexibility of the Federal Government must be stopped. Opposition members in this State must stop nit-picking and use their influence, however limited, on their Federal colleagues so that solutions to the unemployment problem can be found. P. P. McGuinness, in a recent *National Times*, referring to the wage indexation case to come before the Arbitration Commission, states:

The onus would then fall on the Government to show that a falling level of real wages could, in fact, deliver what it has promised in employment terms. The difficulty here is that, on current Government policies, it cannot. There is no way, given existing monetary and fiscal policies, that unemployment can do anything except continue to increase, even with

a reduction in real wages. For the valid element in the criticisms of Government policy (both in the crude forms espoused by the Prime Minister, and in the hardly less crude version espoused by senior Treasury officials) is that to reduce unemployment a cut in real wages would have to be accompanied by a substantial fiscal stimulus.

This aspect must be examined. It is obvious that the private and public sectors do not stand in isolation. We are living in a mixed economy and anybody who does not recognise that does not deserve to govern. With the present Federal Government, the situation will not only continue but it will get worse. South Australia does not stand in isolation. Australia, as a trading nation, cannot follow the present trend. It is obvious to most decent-thinking Australians (and I could not include the Hon. Mr. Cameron in that category) that the single obsession with

inflation will not provide Australia with the solution to the problem. The unemployment problem is aggravated by recession and must be overcome. Members opposite must repudiate the Federal Government's line and join with Government members in seeking solutions to South Australian and national problems.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.49 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 26 October at 2.15 p.m.