

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 21, 1970

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Mr. HALL: It has been reported to me that the Premier has spoken in favour of curtailing members' question privileges in this House, that he will recommend to the Standing Orders Committee that this form of limitation follow closely the lines of operation in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom, and that members will be restricted in the type of question they may ask by the form to which they will have to adhere. If this is so, it constitutes the first serious attack on members' freedom in representing their districts that I have known in this house in my 10 years as a member. It will be a bad day if the Leader of Government becomes tiresome of the democratic processes. Will the Premier give an assurance that he will not tamper with the form of questioning, which is such a basic freedom that members enjoy in this House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the Leader of the Opposition that I am not tire-some, if I can help it, and that I am not tired of democratic processes. What I have said today (and this is all that I have said) is that there are certain inefficiencies about operation in the House at present, that the asking of questions that obviously cannot be replied to immediately is not an efficient way to obtain replies but merely takes up time that could be spent better in the representation of members' districts by a concentration on other matters in a way in which members can ensure that they will get adequate replies in due course. I do not for one moment want to stop the right of members effectively to question Ministers or others about matters that concern this House. All I suggest is that it is sensible for us to consider whether the way in which we proceed at Question Time is the most efficient way of serving members and their constituents, because I consider it sensible for us always to consider what we are doing and to decide whether that is the most efficient way to proceed. I assure the Leader that I would not support any system that in any way took away from members their rights to obtain effective information for their constituents.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With the Leader, I was perturbed when I heard of the comments

attributed to the Premier on this matter, and I welcome his explanation of them this afternoon. From what he has said, I take it that he intends that there should be an examination, presumably by the Standing Orders Committee, of our present procedures at Question Time. I point out to him (and he will readily acknowledge this) that Question Time is one of the opportunities for members, particularly Opposition members, to exercise their rights in this House. In the light of that observation, with which, as I say, I am sure he will agree, will the Premier undertake that whatever proposals are made to alter the present system are not proceeded with unless they are agreed to by the Opposition?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think I can give the honourable member the undertaking he wants. I would not want to press something that did not have the general support of members. I point out, however, that our present Question Time procedure is inefficient in a number of ways, one of which is that a subject may be raised by way of a question without notice, and then it is not followed up immediately by supplementary questions on the same subject. This, in itself, is inefficient and does not help the Opposition. The honourable member has observed Question Time in the House of Commons, where Questions on Notice are followed up by a series of supplementary questions, which can effectively subject a Minister to a detailed cross-examination on a matter of importance that has been raised. The honourable member knows that that cannot happen in our form of Question Time because a subject gets lost in the series of questions that are subsequently asked.

Mr. Millhouse: I think we could get over that quite easily.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know. With great respect to the honourable member, it has not happened so far this session. I should be interested to help him ensure that it did happen, if he so desired. In addition, it has been the practice, as the honourable member knows, for members to ask questions on topics on which it would be inconceivable for the Minister to reply immediately. It would be much better if such questions could be placed on notice or at least for notice of some type to be given so that all the relevant information could be before the Minister concerned, rather than time being taken up by the purely formal procedure of asking the question. I am concerned to see that this procedure operates more efficiently. I assure the honourable member that since it is the purpose of this exercise

to ensure that better value is given to all members, including Opposition members, during Question Time, I would not want to do anything that would not be generally accepted.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You want to give better value to the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I always advocate that.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I wish to make a statement concerning the appointment of Dr. Breuning and his associate Mr. Kettaneh, of Social Technology Systems Incorporated, Newton, Massachusetts, to undertake, in conjunction with State authorities, a review of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. The Government and the Labor Party have always held that the M.A.T.S. plan should never have been presented to the public in its present form. It has meant, and still means, great inconveniences to people on projected freeway routes, who are not sure whether their properties are to go or lose value generally. We believe that the plan should have been studied by the previous Government with a view to assessing a more effective role for public transport and a less ruthless cutting up of parks, gardens and suburbs. Furthermore, since the M.A.T.S. plan is based on criteria that do not take into account the newly developing mass transit technologies, it is obvious, necessary, and right that further planning and expert revision are needed to incorporate them into the plan.

The M.A.T.S. plan, it must be remembered, is a 20-year plan designed to have about 35 years' effectiveness, and transport systems will change much in that time: they will change far more radically than they have in the last 35 years. It is no use spending millions of dollars on massive freeway systems now when such systems are already regarded as becoming obsolete in comparable American and European cities.

The Government has, therefore, engaged Dr. Breuning, who is Vice-President of Social Technology Systems and who was formerly Professor-in-Charge of Projected Transport at the world famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as a consultant to work with officers of the State Planning Office, the Highways Department, the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Railways Department, through the agency of the Metropolitan Transportation

Committee, on a preliminary study of the changes that will need to be made to the M.A.T.S. plan so that we do not find ourselves building transport systems that ignore the new technologies. Further, since prototypes are already available and since in the United States of America an enormous research effort is now being made into public transit systems that are an effective alternative to private transport, Dr. Breuning will also be able to investigate the practicability of developing and manufacturing the new systems in South Australia, using the State's present skill industries and industrial base.

None of this means that within two years or so South Australians are going to be able to dial the computerized mini-buses, walk on to the moving footways or travel on the mono-rail capsules that are envisaged by the planners of the United States Government's Department of Housing and Urban Development. Such systems and all their many variations will take many years to develop into city-wide systems. Nevertheless, planning provision for city-wide systems must be made now, just as the possibility of manufacturing and installing small and efficient currently available or technically feasible units must be investigated now.

Dr. Breuning has been engaged by the Government to undertake a month's definition study into these matters. He and his associate have already made a preliminary survey of the necessary work needed for a revision of the M.A.T.S. plan, and on August 2 he and an associate specialist in transport engineering will arrive to continue their work on a far more detailed basis. The costs of these studies amount to \$U.S.12,000, covering transport, accommodation and fees for the year.

The engagement of Dr. Breuning is the first step in the Government's major reorganization of Adelaide's future transport planning. We intend to see that the mistakes made in other Australian cities and in similar cities overseas will not be made here. We can do this in South Australia with the M.A.T.S. plan as it stands with considerable ease, since the basic data in the plan on traffic movements and on urban development and population growth remains fixed. It is now a matter of finding the best scheme of planning to suit that data. More than 75 per cent of the M.A.T.S. plan is data upon which any future system of planning has to be based, whether it be a ruinous and gigantic net of cement and iron freeways such as the Opposition is demanding or the integrated systems planning the Government is undertaking. The Government is doing this

to ensure that Adelaide is not, and will not need to be, cut up and jammed up with a freeway system that is the product of poverty-stricken imagination and tardy administrative know-how. It seems that several freeways will be built in the metropolitan area in the future, but nothing as ultimately damaging to the life and design of this city as that which the previous Government tried to force upon us will be built.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I address my question to you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Roads and Transport just obtained leave of the House to make a Ministerial statement. When leave of the House is sought it is assumed, because naturally members do not know what will be in the statement, that the statement will be one of fact or in some way a reasonable relation of facts concerning the subject on which the Minister intends to address the House. The statement that the Minister just made was liberally sprinkled with contemptuous references to the previous Government's attitude to the M.A.T.S. plan.

Mr. Jennings: That was the best part of it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you debating the matter?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking you a question. Both Governments have been involved in the plan. Will you, Sir, take some action to ensure that when Ministers seek and obtain leave of the House they will observe the courtesies that the House, having granted the Minister the right to make the statement, may expect? I ask you to ensure that those courtesies are observed by Ministers and that Ministerial statements will not be used merely as a launching platform for Government propaganda and, what is worse, for making a contemptuous criticism of the previous Government. That is an abuse of Parliament, and I suggest that you, as Speaker, should protect the House from this sort of attitude. If you do not wish to do so and if the Ministers continue to make the sort of statement that has just been made, leave will not be granted by the wish of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Standing Orders provide:

A Minister of the Crown, by leave of the House and so as not to interrupt any other business, may make a statement relating to matters of Government policy or public affairs: Provided that, without further leave of the House, such statement shall be limited as to time to 15 minutes.

I consider that the Minister made a statement relating to Government policy. I appeal to

members on both sides of the House to try, when asking questions, to keep to the point of those questions and not to digress. If one member, irrespective of his Party, digresses, this leads to further digression. Therefore, with the co-operation of members on both sides, I believe that we can achieve our objective, which is the working of the House on a dignified basis.

Mr. HALL: The Minister has given the House an extremely confusing statement about the future of the M.A.T.S. proposals and any other alleged proposals about transport in Adelaide. Undoubtedly, confusion must be caused by his contemptuous statement that local experts have a poverty-stricken imagination. Undoubtedly, that is a reflection on the fine experts in South Australia who have contributed to the M.A.T.S. plan and the proposals emanating from it. The Minister said that Dr. Breuning and his investigators would charge \$12,000. This is obviously a mini answer to a major problem. The Minister went on to outline a situation that seemed to anticipate the results of the doctor's investigation, having said already that all freeways now proposed would not be built. The Minister has also said that his plan will present an effective alternative to private transport. Therefore, does the Minister already know what the doctor will report? If he does not know, can he say whether the Government or the doctor will decide finally what plan will be accepted, or whether there is some likelihood of calling in these local people with their poverty-stricken imagination? Further, when does the Minister envisage prohibiting private transport on Adelaide roads?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can understand that the confusion of the question results from the confusion of the questioner.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, give us some replies.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I heard the Leader meandering around the question for a long time. His first question was whether we knew what the doctor would recommend. The obvious reply to that is "No", as I think that any intelligent person in Australia realizes that one does not call someone in to advise if one knows beforehand what advice will be given. We would not spend money to do that. I have forgotten the second question.

Mr. Hall: Who will finally decide what plan is accepted?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Again, that displays a sad lack of knowledge by the Leader.

Mr. Coumbe: Why don't you answer the question?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member will shut up, I will answer it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader should know (and I believe most of his members know) that the whole of this question is associated with the Metropolitan Development Plan and the Premier in his policy speech stated that, when the investigations were complete, in accordance with the terms of the Planning and Development Act we would submit this matter to the public, as provided for in the Act. I hope that that satisfies the first two of the Leader's questions. If he is good enough to remind me on the third and fourth questions, I will reply to them.

Mr. Hall: When do you expect to prohibit private motor car transport in metropolitan Adelaide?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think that question merits a reply. Obviously, we will not prohibit anything.

The SPEAKER: I appeal to honourable members to try to observe Standing Orders as much as is practicable. We have many new members in this Chamber and traditionally only one question may be asked at a time. I do not intend to embarrass those new members and I appeal to members who have had longer experience in this House to try to restrict themselves to asking one question at a time. If the members who have been here longer do this, the new members will be encouraged and, also, the position will not get out of control. I appeal to members on both sides to try to observe my request as rigidly as possible, and so set an example for the new members.

Mr. HALL: I thank you for your advice about questions, Mr. Speaker. I interjected to try to elicit from the Minister information that had been extremely difficult to get. I do not believe that my question was frivolous and I will develop it a step further. Will the Minister say how, if he does not already know what the investigating team will recommend, he could say in his statement this afternoon that freeways to the extent recommended in the M.A.T.S. plan would not be built? The Minister has said that the final arbiter will be the State Planning Authority. He knows that existing legislation provides for more and longer freeways than are recommended in the M.A.T.S. plan, and the legislation to which he refers could produce free-

ways additional to those recommended, but he has said that he does not know what the experts will recommend. Therefore, how can the Minister say that we will not get freeways to the extent recommended in the M.A.T.S. plan?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suggest that, if the Leader wishes to pursue that line of questioning about my statement, he defer it until tomorrow, when he would have had the chance to read the *Hansard* pull of the Ministerial statement.

Mr. Millhouse: You are obviously prejudging the results.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Deputy Leader can ask a question, too, but I offer him the same advice. I repeat part of my statement, as follows:

Dr. Breuning has been engaged by the Government to undertake a month's definition study of these matters.

Let me make the position plain. Dr. Breuning is not coming here on August 3 to review the M.A.T.S. plan and, at the conclusion of the month, to say that that is the plan he recommends. If the Leader and other members would read the Ministerial statement they would realize that he was not going to do that. Secondly, my Premier stated in his policy speech, made on behalf of Government members, that the Government would not build a network of freeways and expressways that would be concrete structures defacing the beauty of the metropolitan area. Those views will be conveyed to Dr. Breuning, as will the view that whatever he decides must be financially feasible. That was never done in the previous case. The Leader can be assured that Dr. Breuning will be informed of the Government's attitude and will be asked to conduct his investigation in accordance with the policy of this Government. If the Leader wants to infer anything other than that, then far be it from me to stop him. If he will not face the facts of life and tell the truth in his report of this, he must accept the responsibility. I am merely giving him the facts as he has asked for them, and the situation is as I have said it is.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. JENNINGS: I now rise to ask an intelligent question of the Minister of Roads and Transport. Some time ago I asked the Minister to investigate the matter of surplus railway houses in the metropolitan area and, as I understand he now has this information, I ask him to give it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has also written to me about this matter and, as I promised, I have the information he asked for. After the Second World War it became increasingly difficult for new railway employees to secure accommodation in the metropolitan area, and the influx of migrant tradesmen that became vital to the maintenance of railway operations made necessary the acquisition of additional house accommodation for the purpose of providing such employees with lodgings until such time as they were able to secure their own houses. Houses were erected by the department, but because of restricted departmental resources at that time it became necessary to purchase others from the South Australian Housing Trust.

With the subsequent passage of time, most of the post-war entrants have, in fact, secured their own houses, and the need of the department to provide temporary accommodation has abated. Accordingly, groups of vacant houses purchased from the trust were sold back to that authority for disposal in accordance with its requirements. Most of these houses have now been transferred, and the number of departmental houses in the metropolitan area is now in balance with current needs. In February, 1970, the trust repurchased 18 vacant houses from the Railways Department, leaving only 19 unallotted cottages in the metropolitan area. Clearly this is only just enough to provide for exigencies.

Railways Department policy since 1951 has been to provide departmental accommodation in the metropolitan area for employees as follows:

- (a) Individuals whose duties require that they reside close to their place of work.
- (b) Individuals who, in the course of their progression in the service, are appointed to positions that require that they reside for a time in the metropolitan area.
- (c) Individuals who seek accommodation for a limited period on substantiated compassionate grounds.

As I have stated, the number of Railways Department houses in the metropolitan area is now in balance with current needs, and a policy of this type requires that there be a pool of houses at any one time.

ANNUAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMMONS: In his Speech, the Governor's Deputy stated that the Government intended to introduce four weeks' annual leave

for salaried officers of the Public Service. Section 19 of the State Bank Act provides:

(1) The Governor may on the recommendation of the board appoint such officers and servants of the bank as the board thinks necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act, and may on a like recommendation dismiss such officers and servants.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (1) of this section all persons appointed as aforesaid shall be and be deemed to be officers of the Public Service as defined by the Public Service Act.

Section 21 of the Savings Bank of South Australia Act provides:

The trustees may, at such times as they may deem convenient, grant to any officer, clerk, or servant, whether declared on the fixed establishment or not, leave of absence for recreation not exceeding in the whole three weeks in each year.

Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the provisions of the Government policy are expected to be applied to officers of the State Bank? Will it be necessary to amend the Savings Bank of South Australia Act to provide that officers of that bank may also receive the benefit of the extra leave or will the fact that they work under a Commonwealth award render that unnecessary?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In the past, officers of the State Bank have always had applied to them the provisions and conditions applying to public servants. It would seem to me that, once the Public Service Act has been amended to provide for an extra week's leave for public servants, the State Bank will follow suit, its employees being granted four weeks' annual leave. As the honourable member has pointed out, officers of the Savings Bank come under a Commonwealth award. As I understand the position, although the fact that public servants had an extra week's leave would influence the Commonwealth court regarding the granting of an extra week's leave to employees of the Savings Bank, it would not necessarily mean that the extra week's leave would automatically apply to those officers. After having a close look at the matter, if I find I can give further information to the honourable member I shall be pleased to do so.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr. CRIMES: I noticed in this morning's *Advertiser* that Dr. Graton Brown, Chairman of the Road Trauma Committee of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, when visiting Adelaide yesterday made some disturbing comments about road safety bodies in Australia. He said that they were "outdated, amateurish, indifferent, ignorant of road safety research and suspiciously silent in their attitude to fatal accidents". Did the Minister of Roads and

Transport see this article, and has he any comment to make on Dr. Brown's statement?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I saw the article to which the honourable member refers, and I thank him for drawing my attention to it this morning, as it gave me an opportunity to prepare a reply for him. I was surprised at the statement attributed to Dr Brown. I cannot, of course, speak for the rest of Australia but so far as South Australia is concerned, the Government and I have every confidence in the South Australian Road Safety Council. It is comprised of a good representation of bodies and has an independent chairman, and I know that its work is both appreciated and effective in the general context of road safety.

I agree that safety belts are an important factor in reducing death and serious injury in road accidents and the Government supports any move and encourages the use of such belts. Dr. Brown said that deaths on Australian roads are treated as a fact of life. So far as the Government and the Road Safety Committee are concerned, this is certainly not so. The increase in the motor car population makes it obvious that the incidence of accidents will rise, but to say that this is treated as a fact of life is far from the truth. I note also that Dr. Brown said he was attacking the legislators, and I presume that he would encompass both sides of this House in that statement.

Mr. Rodda interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: And he obviously did not exclude the member for Victoria. South Australia, if not leading the field, is at least very much to the fore in the promotion of road safety. I deprecate statements of prominent people, such as that attributed to Doctor Brown. Much more consideration should be given to the efforts that are made by Governments and interested organizations in promoting road safety.

I am impelled to make a further comment. I understand that Dr. Brown was brought to Adelaide by a leading oil company, in conjunction with an alleged safety campaign at the Marion shopping centre. I have been told reliably that this oil company provided a fleet of four motor cars, three of which were so mud-spattered that their number plates were indecipherable and that the windscreen on the other was so filthy that the driver could not have had good vision. I scarcely consider that to be a good example in an exercise allegedly designed to promote safety.

SOUTHERN MATERNITY HOSPITAL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to conduct a survey to determine whether a maternity hospital is needed in the Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga area?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will convey the question to my colleague and get a report.

WATER STORAGEES

Mr. COUNBE: Before asking my question, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the kindly advice you gave to members a few minutes ago, because since I have been a member of this House I have never before been subjected, by a Minister of the Crown, to the discourtesy of being told to shut up. I hope that your advice will be heeded in future.

Mr. Jennings: You were just as offensive to me.

Mr. COUNBE: I never was as a Minister, although I was sorely tempted many times. I seek an explanation of the Government's policy on granting water licences for irrigation on the Murray River. These licences are granted by the Minister of Works on an annual basis, and the Hon. C. D. Hutchens, my predecessor as Minister of Works, was forced to ban the issue of these licences. I continued this ban, with some slight alleviation, I think in December, 1968. It was a most difficult position as hardship was caused to many people on the river, and it was hoped that further alleviation could be given when legislation ratifying the Dartmouth dam project was passed by this House last April. Can the Minister of Works say whether the same procedure is being adopted by him, his department and its officers on the issue of water licences, or whether a change is contemplated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No change has been made in the policy that was pursued by the previous Government on the issuing of water licences on the Murray River. Had the Dartmouth project legislation been passed, this Government would not have been able, for a long time, to alter that policy because, as the honourable member knows, if the Dartmouth project had been proceeded with (and if it is proceeded with now and is constructed) it would be many years before there would be tangible benefits for South Australia in the supply of water. The honourable member would be aware that the quantity of water being diverted from the river at present is the maximum quantity that can be permitted, taking into account the worst possible year.

Mr. Coumbe: It is more.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, it is more than the river could stand in the worst possible circumstances, and I think that we should consider 1967 as an indication of that. However, there has been no change in policy. The honourable member is correct when he says that the present system causes hardship and much inconvenience to many people, but I am sure that he realizes that, if any precedent be created in this policy, the policy itself would be destroyed.

WHEAT SALES

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 15 about the effect on farmers of the loss of sales of wheat that had been affected by mice pollution?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that two storage cells of wheat, approximating 4,300 tons, were rejected for export at Wallaroo recently because it had been contaminated by rodents' droppings. This is a matter causing considerable concern because of serious repercussions which instances of this nature could have on our export trade. A strong appeal is made to all parties engaged in the export grain trade to use every endeavour to solve this problem and to exercise the greatest care to prevent a repetition of the circumstances which occurred at Wallaroo. The Minister of Agriculture has received a comprehensive report on the difficulties involved, and he has as a matter of urgency taken up the problem with the bulk handling authority.

FLEXIBLE UNITS

Mrs. STEELE: During my term as Minister of Education I was pleased to approve the implementation of a building programme to provide new teaching units known as open-space experimental units, the prototype of these (of which there are eight) having been built at Burnside and having been called the "Burnside unit" by the architect from the United Kingdom who worked in connection with a consultancy on plans with officers of the Education and Public Buildings Departments. I had the pleasure of opening the first of these eight units at about this time last year, and the other seven were to follow; in fact, at the time when we went out of Government I understood that the Cowandilla unit was nearly ready for occupation. The rest were sited so as to provide information concerning their efficacy in various types of district and under various climatic conditions. Can the Minister of Educa-

tion say whether this programme has been adhered to and, if it has, can he say how far work on the other six units has progressed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Under construction at present are flexible units at Loxton, Millicent South, Kirton Point (Port Lincoln), and Airdale (Port Pirie) and at the Nicholson Avenue Primary School in Whyalla. A further flexible unit for One Tree Hill is in the design stage, and plans are at present being considered for many more of these flexible units to be introduced into primary schools, but the rate at which we can do this depends on available finance. If the honourable member would like details relating to the current construction programme, I can give those to her, remembering that any dates given are subject to variation should there be building problems. The Loxton unit is expected to be completed in October of this year, as are also the units at Millicent South, Port Lincoln and Whyalla; and the Port Pirie unit is expected to be completed in September. That is allowing a month or so for any difficulties that might be experienced; the date of completion could well be earlier than those dates. The design of the One Tree Hill flexible unit is proceeding, and we hope that the relevant documents will be ready within a month or two of the end of this year. I hope that later I shall be able to provide the honourable member with further information regarding future planning in this matter.

PAROLE

Mr. WELLS: I recently visited the Yatala Labour Prison, which is in my district, at the request of a prisoner being held there, as a result of which visit I obtained information from what I consider to be authoritative sources in respect of the parole provisions applying to certain people being held there as prisoners. I am informed that any person who, having been tried and convicted of a crime in the Northern Territory, and is required to serve his term of imprisonment in the Yatala prison, because he is classified as a Commonwealth prisoner is not permitted to avail himself of the parole system operating in this State at present. However, I am informed that in New South Wales prisoners who have been convicted and sentenced in the Northern Territory and who are incarcerated in gaols in that State are permitted to avail themselves of parole facilities because of an agreement that exists between the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments. Will the Attorney-General investigate this situation and, if what I have suggested is correct, will he take the

necessary steps to have those parole facilities made available to people from the Northern Territory who are at present in the Yatala prison?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the parole arrangements relating to Commonwealth prisoners, discuss the matter with my colleague the Chief Secretary, and indicate the Government's attitude to the honourable member in due course.

BLACKWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about additional accommodation to be provided at the Blackwood High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Education Department is well aware of the accommodation problems at this school that will be accentuated by expected increases in enrolments in 1971. To meet the immediate needs, approval has been given for the erection of five transportable classrooms (including a commercial room), and a wooden art/craft room. It has been requested that these rooms be erected before the beginning of the 1971 school year. In view of the expected future growth of the school population at Blackwood High School, it is intended that a third solid-structure wing should be provided as soon as possible. The transportable classrooms being ordered at the present time are therefore to be regarded as providing temporary accommodation until the new building is available. In this connection, I point out that the erection of a permanent structure of a type that would require full investigation of design, a report to the Public Works Committee, and so on, normally takes about three years from the beginning of the design stage until the availability of the permanent accommodation. Regarding the problem of accommodating increased numbers of students next year at Blackwood, there is no possibility of providing a permanent structure in time; consequently, there is no alternative to providing transportable rooms.

Mr. EVANS: To give people some guideline for the future, can the Minister say whether the design work on the construction at the Blackwood High School has started yet or, if it has not, whether it is likely to start soon?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The design work has not commenced. Perhaps I should explain to members that each division of the Education Department has a list of possible projects that are referred to as the design list of that division. These projects are ranked

in order of priority as the next projects to be brought forward and placed on the departmental design list which, of course, is handled within the Architect-in-Chief's office in the Public Buildings Department. When I say that the project is not on the design list, I mean that it is not on the latter list that currently consists of projects at a design stage within the Public Buildings Department. When the next revisions take place, the new wing of the Blackwood High School will be one of the projects considered. The point of time at which it can be brought on to the overall departmental design list depends on what other projects it is competing with and on the overall position of current and anticipated plans for school buildings.

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Mr. HARRISON: Many people are interested in the West Lakes project. On June 23, 1969, an indenture, to which was attached a broad plan of the scheme, was signed, a Bill later ratifying that indenture. Clause 7 of the indenture provides, in part, that "within one year of the passing of the special Act the corporation shall produce to the Minister general arrangements, design and drawings for the scheme". Can the Minister of Works say whether he has yet received from Development Finance Corporation Limited the general arrangements, design and drawings?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether I would be accurate in saying that I have received the detailed plans to which the honourable member has referred. Certainly I have had discussions with the people associated with the development and have seen detailed plans, but I am not sure whether these have been produced to me formally in accordance with the Act. Currently discussions are taking place between the people involved in the development and me. Some alterations may be necessary to the legislation referred to by the honourable member. Already plans have been drawn up for work with which the Engineering and Water Supply Department is connected to commence shortly. I will obtain for the honourable member a considered reply on the matter and give him what information I can get.

MARGARINE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about margarine quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that at this stage he is unable to indicate whether or not the present table margarine quota is likely to be increased. All the Minister has said is that the quota, which was fixed at 528 tons a year in 1956, and has not since been increased, might well be examined in the light of changes in conditions which have taken place since that time. He refers particularly to the increasing demand by the consumer for margarine and the rise of about 30 per cent in the State's population during that period. The Minister points out that an estimated 600 tons of table margarine is now being imported from other States and, if this quantity is necessary to satisfy the demand, there would appear to be no logical reason why local margarine companies should not be permitted to compete for a fair share of this market. Nevertheless, any alteration in the present quota for table margarine would be made only in consultation with the Commonwealth and other State Governments, in accordance with agreement reached previously at meetings of the Australian Agricultural Council.

As to the effect of margarine sales on the consumption of butter, the Minister believes that there is room for both products on the local market, and that the consumer could not and should not be denied the right of a choice between butter and margarine. However, the Minister is of the opinion that the synthetic product should be clearly identified and its ingredients unequivocally stated on the package so that intending purchasers are made fully aware of what they are buying. The Minister has stated strong views on this point to representatives of both the Australian Margarine Association and the dairying industry who have discussed the matter with him in recent weeks. If the manufacturers are not prepared to do this voluntarily, he will have no hesitation in seeking to enforce such a requirement by legislation.

KINGSTON BRIDGE

Mr. CURREN: I understand that tenders have been called for the construction of the Kingston bridge and the two smaller associated bridges. Also, I have noticed that construction of the causeway on the eastern approaches to the bridge is almost completed. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when the calling of tenders will close and when the work on this important bridge will be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Tenders for the construction of the bridge were called on June 3, 1970, and will close on September 1, 1970. Assuming there are no undue complications when considering tenders and allotting the contract, it is expected that work will commence late this calendar year. The contract provides for completion within two years from the date of acceptance of the tender. The bridge should therefore be completed during the latter part of 1972. The construction by contract of the earthworks and embankments on the eastern road approaches is in the final stages of completion. The District Council of Loxton is undertaking the construction of the western approaches and the work is approximately 30 per cent completed. The programming of the final completion of the road approaches will be timed to coincide with the completion of the bridge.

POVERTY

Mr. GROTH: The *Advertiser* of July 7 contains an article headed "Healing Our Sores of Poverty" which states that about 250,000 low-income families, representing 1,000,000 Australians are living below a miserably low poverty line, and that this has triggered repercussions of political and social concern throughout Australia. Will the Minister of Social Welfare instigate an investigation of this matter to find out the situation in this State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am indebted to the honourable member for raising the matter. The figures he quotes are indeed disturbing. One of the early projects that I have in mind when the new Director of Social Services and Aboriginal Affairs takes office is a survey of the situation in South Australia with the object of identifying the areas of need, of ascertaining the availability of State services and their suitability for alleviating the suffering that undoubtedly exists, and also of identifying the areas about which representations to the Commonwealth might produce useful results.

WASLEYS CROSSING

Mr. EASTICK: Everyone in South Australia was shocked by the recent accident that occurred on the Wasleys road about two miles from Gawler, in which 16 people were killed immediately and as a result of which another person died subsequently. The bitumen road over which this crossing passes is used extensively by the students and staff of the Roseworthy Agricultural College and by persons commuting to Wasleys, Mallala and other points west thereof. Reflectorized signs,

which give the impression, although it may be only an optical illusion, that the effective width of the crossing has been reduced, were placed at the crossing recently. These are causing difficulty for persons using the crossing, particularly at night when cars are travelling in both directions. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport therefore say whether this is the only work that is to be done on the crossing, or whether it is only a temporary measure until electrical warning lights are installed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As does everyone, I share the honourable member's concern regarding this tragedy. I am unable at present to give the member the information he seeks, but I will obtain it for him and provide him with a report as soon as possible.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Work that had been progressing for some time along Greenhill Road, slowed down recently because of inclement weather. Another section between King William Road to a point just east of Unley Road is to be completed. On the park lands side of the road there are "turn left with care" notices. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Highways Department has taken steps to ensure that similar signs will be posted on the Unley Road side when the section of work to which I have referred has been completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information for the honourable member and inform him accordingly.

DEEP SEA PORTS

Mr. VENNING: Last year I asked several questions about the urgency of providing deep sea ports in South Australia. The Minister of Marine would realize that a seismic survey was undertaken at Wallaroo and that certain information was made available to this House. I point out to him that an urgent situation is developing in this State regarding the shipment of wheat. In comparison with the position obtaining in South Australia, seven vessels are at present waiting in Sydney Harbor to be loaded with wheat. It seems that New South Wales will have a record grain shipment this year, whereas we in this State will, because of our lack of deep sea port facilities, have a carry-over of 118 per cent of the base quota. If the present position is permitted to continue, the base quota in this State could be reduced. Will the Minister ascertain the present situation regarding the development in this respect of Port Lincoln and also of Wallaroo?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member says that we in this State are in a difficult position regarding grain shipments because of our lack of deep sea ports, but I would go even further and say that we are in this position mainly because of lack of planning, particularly over the last 10 to 20 years. However, money will be allocated in this year's Loan Estimates for work to be carried out at Port Lincoln. Although I am not aware just how much has been set aside, the honourable member will obtain that information when the Loan Estimates are introduced. Regarding future development in the Wallaroo area, it is recognized that a second major port is required in this State, and I am currently having discussions with representatives of the Marine and Harbors Department about the formation of a committee that is to investigate the most suitable site for a second port. I hope that this committee will consist of the same persons who investigated and recommended the construction of a deep sea port at Port Lincoln. As I am not sure whether I have covered all the points raised by the honourable member, I will examine the question tomorrow, and, if he desires further information, I will obtain it for him.

Mr. FERGUSON: I listened with much interest to the question asked by the member for Rocky River about wheat shipments from South Australia in which he said that South Australia would be at a great disadvantage compared with other States because of its lack of deep sea ports. I remind the House that a deep sea port is being established at Port Giles, and I understand that ships of up to 40,000 tons will be able to berth there. Will the Minister of Marine say whether the facilities at Port Giles have been completed and, if they have, whether they are now available to shipping?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is expected that the work at Port Giles will be completed by the middle of August and that the facilities will be in use for the 1970-71 grain harvest.

PAYNEHAM ROAD CROSSING

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question asked by the member for Ross Smith concerning the construction of a pedestrian crossing on Payneham Road, which is now in my district?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Payneham council has conducted several investigations but is unable to establish justification for the installation of a pedestrian crossing at any

one location. The Road Traffic Board has had discussions with the council and it has considered that the installation of median islands with openings at all side streets would assist pedestrians attempting to cross Payneham Road. The council will be invited to submit an application to the Highways Department for consideration of the installation of median islands along the Lower North-East Road between O.G. Road and Montacute Road.

NARACOORTE REMEDIAL CLASS

Mr. RODDA: The Minister of Education may have had discussions with his departmental officers regarding the establishment of a remedial class at the Naracoorte Primary School. Some students in the Naracoorte district require this special type of instruction, and I believe that departmental officers have examined the possible setting up of such a class at Naracoorte. As I understand that both a teacher and a site for such a class are available, will the Minister say what progress is being made on this innovation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I cannot reply to the honourable member immediately, I will have the matter fully investigated and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

PRISONERS' CLOTHING

Mr. McRAE: I understand that by Executive action the facilities for hanging felons at the Adelaide Gaol are being removed, a step that I consider is long overdue. I refer also to the clothing of inmates not only of the Adelaide Gaol but also of other of Her Majesty's gaols. Men on remand (who, in our system, are presumed to be innocent at that stage) and persons being punished are compelled to wear these clothes, and it is hard to imagine a more degrading costume. It comprises surplus Army boots, khaki trousers, grey shirt (usually ragged) without a collar and with some odd sort of black lining, a short black jacket, and, of all things, to top it off, a brown baseball cap. One is tempted to ask whether this uniform is worn because of our State's financial position or whether it is the mad creation of some prison fashion designer, a hangover from our convict days or, perhaps, a deliberate attempt to degrade those in prison. I cannot help thinking that those who designed this costume had the last purpose in mind. Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to consider this matter, bearing in mind that I am not asking that the clothes be of any Saville Row design but that I consider the present position to be not in keeping with any reasonable sort of human dignity?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Personally, I agree entirely that prison dress should be in keeping with human dignity. I will take up the matter with the Chief Secretary and give the honourable member a reply.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states:

The present policy of the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee is to allot quotas only to units that have previously delivered wheat. Thus, if a person purchased a property that has had a delivery history during the prescribed period, he would be entitled to a quota allocation based on the deliveries made from that property during that period. However, a person who wished to grow wheat for the first time in the 1970-71 season would not be eligible for a quota allocation.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Works any figures relating to intakes into the reservoirs following the useful rains over the weekend?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did not expect to be asked this question, but I carry with me daily reports of intakes into the reservoirs so that I am not caught on the hop if an honourable member does ask a question about the matter. I am pleased to report that the total storage has increased by about 2,000,000,000gall. since a question was last asked on the matter. The following table sets out the present storages:

<i>Reservoir</i>	<i>Storage gall.</i>
Mount Bold	6,184,900,000
Happy Valley	1,570,000,000
Clarendon Weir	55,700,000
Myponga	4,212,200,000
Millbrook	1,235,300,000
Kangaroo Creek	852,300,000
Hope Valley	563,000,000
Thorndon Park	113,100,000
Barossa	585,500,000
South Para	6,885,500,000

The total storage held is 22,257,500,000gall. and the increase in storages in the 24 hours ended at 8.30 a.m. today was 545,900,000gall.

EYRE PENINSULA SCHOOLS

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the Tumby Bay Area School and the Port Lincoln High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The new Tumby Bay Area School is being designed, and it is expected that tenders will be called at the end of 1971 or the beginning of 1972. The

major additions for the Port Lincoln High School are being sketched at present and it is expected that tenders will be called in the latter part of 1971. Inevitably, it is not possible to say precisely on what date tenders can be called and, unfortunately, the design stages of these major projects are long and, of course, include the period involved in getting a report from the Public Works Committee.

PORT GERMEIN ROAD

Mr. McKEE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport get from the Highways Department a report on proposals for redesigning the main highway through Port Germein and on any alterations being considered in relation to the road running through that township?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT VOTING

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Local Government say why the Government is interested in introducing compulsory voting at local government elections and how the community will benefit from such a measure?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not desire to go deeply into this matter now, and, as it will be explained fully when the Bill is introduced, I do not think it proper for me to do so. At this stage it is sufficient to say that we strongly hold the view that every person in society is associated in some way with local government affairs and that we consider that the people should have a say in running those affairs. This is why we will introduce a Bill later. I repeat that I consider it improper for me at this stage to enter too deeply into a matter that will come before this House later in legislation.

SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister and the Director-General of Education do all that is possible to ensure that social studies textbooks are made available for the general public to peruse?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member wishes to buy copies of textbooks, I have no doubt that these can be supplied to him at the normal price, provided that this would not interrupt the provision of such textbooks for schools. The honourable member will appreciate that we have to be sure that sufficient supplies of textbooks are available to meet the needs of schools at the beginning of each year, but, provided that that condition is made, I see no reason why text-

books produced by the Social Studies Textbooks Association cannot be sold to members of the public. It might be a profitable venture if the demand became sufficient, for the department (as the Social Studies Textbooks Association is a non-profit organization) to increase the price of the books and use the profit for important development purposes in the textbook field.

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say who are the members of the committee that chooses textbooks for social studies in secondary schools, and how such members are selected?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Fitzgerald, an officer of the Education Department, is Chairman of the Social Studies Curriculum Committee. The Chairman of the Textbooks Association, who is responsible for the preparation of these textbooks, is Mr. Tulloch, a Methodist lay preacher and Vice-President of the South Australian branch of the Scripture Union. The members of these various committees are not subject to Ministerial appointment, although the appointments would be considered by the Director-General of Education, in consultation with persons working in the particular field. It is, therefore, a professional matter purely within the department, the formal appointment being made by the Director-General.

ARMED ROBBERIES

Mr. BECKER: During the past six years, five of them as President of the South Australian-Northern Territory Division of the Australian Bank Officials Association, I have been concerned at the increase of armed hold-ups of bank officers and members of the public. I am concerned at the injuries and psychological damage caused to victims, and consider that some deterrent is required to prevent these crimes, although I acknowledge the efficiency of our Police Force in this regard. Will the Attorney-General investigate the possibility of amending existing laws in order to provide severe minimum penalties that will discourage armed hold-ups in this State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I share with the honourable member his concern for those who suffer as a result of the activities of armed bandits. Unfortunately, however, it by no means always follows that increases in penalties produce a reduction of crimes. Although I will consider this matter, as a matter of principle I would be reluctant to increase minimum penalties, or indeed to prescribe minimum penalties, which would have the effect of depriving

the judge of a discretion as to the penalty to be imposed. So many factors personal to the particular prisoner before the judge and peculiar to the case itself arise that it is an extremely dangerous legislative course to deprive a judge of a discretion as to the penalty he can impose. Armed robbery is an indictable offence, which means that it comes before a Supreme Court judge or, when the new Act is proclaimed, it will come before a District Criminal Court judge. Those people will be experienced judges, and I consider that the House can safely leave to their judgment the punishment to be imposed. Judges habitually bear in mind that one of the important factors in imposing a penalty is the need to deter others who may be minded to commit similar offences.

TEA TREE GULLY SCHOOL

Mr. BYRNE: At the request of the Tea Tree Gully Primary School Committee I inspected that school last Saturday, in order to observe its poor condition. The only solution to the problems existing at this school would be to replace it. On June 24, 1969, I was told by the then Minister of Education that a plan for rebuilding this school had been prepared and that the Public Buildings Department had prepared a plan for clearing, grading, and developing about 2½ acres adjoining this school at a cost of \$9,800. This land had been acquired by the department to provide additional playing ground for the children. None of this work has been done, although the money was then allocated for it. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report setting out what stage the planning for this school has reached?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that we intend to proceed with the plan to replace this school, and the design stage is now being processed. We hope that we will be able to go to tender for the work in the first part of the latter half of next year and that the school will be ready for occupation by the end of 1972. I will obtain the necessary information for the honourable member soon about clearing land to provide for additional playing space.

INTERMEDIATE COURTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the weekend I heard, or saw, the first reference that the Attorney-General has made publicly to the intermediate courts' jurisdiction legislation, and he has just referred to it in this place. I was

delighted, both a moment ago and when I was reading the *Sunday Mail*, to see that his views on this legislation, apparently, accord almost precisely with mine, and this despite the bitter and almost successful opposition which his Party put up to the legislation when it was before the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you going to be self-righteous, too?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am just pleased that the Attorney-General has had a beneficial influence on his Party and has made members of it see the sense that I could not drum into them during the last session.

Mr. Coumbe: I wonder how long it will last?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know: it will depend on how good a man the Attorney-General is, but I doubt that he will be able to keep it up for long. I am delighted that apparently he has been able to go ahead with the legislation despite the fact that the then Opposition opposed every clause, certainly carrying to a division every question put on the legislation. That does not matter, however: the fact is that it is apparently going ahead. Can the Attorney-General say when it is likely that the legislation will be proclaimed and when further appointments to bring the number of judges to the figure he mentioned (six, which is the number I had in mind as the number of District and Criminal Court judges) will be made in addition to the two already made? Finally (and this is the third part of my question), my estimate was that we needed another nine magistrates to bring the subordinate judiciary up to full strength, and five of those appointments were made before we left office. Can the Attorney-General say when further appointments are likely to be made?

The Hon. L. J. KING: In answer to the first part of the honourable member's question, it gives me unalloyed pleasure to find myself in agreement with the honourable member on any topic, and this is one of those very delightful moments which I now experience. The target that is aimed at for the new judges appointed to take up their offices and for the new court to be operating is September 1. I say that that is a target date, because it depends on some factors, including completion of work on the necessary accommodation. I am sure that my colleague is doing everything in his power to ensure that September 1 will be the date on which we can commence. Further magistrates will be appointed soon.

AGED COTTAGE HOMES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Last week, in answer to a question I had asked, the Attorney-General suggested that I ask again this week whether there had been any developments in the situation surrounding Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated, because there was to be a conference yesterday between him and representatives of the Aged Cottage Homes board. Has the Attorney-General a report on the matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: A conference took place yesterday between the Chief Secretary and me, representing the Government, and representatives of the board and their legal adviser, at which conference the matter was explored. I indicated, in answer to a question asked by the member for Alexandra last week, that, if at this conference some explanation was proffered by the management, I would make that explanation available to the House. An explanation was delivered, by arrangement, to my office this morning, and it runs to five foolscap pages. I think the honourable member would agree with me that it would be inappropriate for me to try to put that information before the House in answer to a question. However, I will invite the solicitors for Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated to condense the explanation if they would like me to place it before the House. The conference that took place was largely devoted to exploring the possibility of reaching a solution that would be satisfactory to all parties. In consultation with the Chief Secretary, I have made some suggestions to the board which I understand the board was to consider, possibly at a meeting held last night. I am hopeful, as I indicated in my speech last week, that, with the good offices of the Government and with goodwill on all sides, a satisfactory solution can be reached. I do not think that at this stage I would be contributing to the situation by making any further public comment on the matter. However, I assure the honourable member that negotiations will be pursued, and I hope that a solution that is satisfactory to all parties can be arrived at.

RURAL MARCH

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Premier say whether he will be representing the State Government tomorrow at the rural march, and can he indicate whether the Commonwealth Government will be similarly represented?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly will be speaking to those taking part in the march tomorrow, as I understand will also

the Leader of the Opposition. As to representation of the Commonwealth Government, I know only what is in the papers, and the papers have said that the Commonwealth Government is not going to be there.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you are photographed with the Leader of the Opposition, will that make you a member of the L.C.L.?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not certain; it just depends on what kind of propaganda the Liberal Party wants to pay for, I suppose. I have been in touch with Dr. Patterson who, I understand, is coming tomorrow and will be there.

NAILSWORTH TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. CUMBE: For some months negotiations have been taking place between various parties regarding the Nailsworth Technical High School and the possibility of building an assembly hall on the site of the present school in such a position as to permit that hall eventually to serve the new school when it becomes co-educational with the existing Nailsworth Girls Technical High School. When I was Minister of Education, I received a deputation from the Nailsworth Boys Technical High School Council at which we discussed certain aspects of planning. Members of the council then went away to consider the plans. Can the Minister of Education say whether the council has returned to him with submissions, or has he any further information on the provisions of an assembly hall at the Nailsworth Boys Technical High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the honourable member's question. Some correspondence has been entered into relating to this matter but, as I cannot recall the exact details, I will get a detailed report.

ROYAL PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HARRISON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last Thursday as to when the Royal Park High School would be ready for occupation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that the target date for completion of the Royal Park High School is January, 1971. The school should be completed and ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1971 school year. We are proceeding with planning on that basis, and the completion of this school means that there must be certain rezoning of high school areas in the general vicinity of Royal Park and the establishment of certain optional

areas where children who live in those optional areas will have the choice of two or more high schools. This matter is also being actively considered, and the final outcome of rezoning should be known within a few weeks.

WHEAT POOLS

Mr. McANANEY: Last year I asked questions in order to ascertain when back wheat pools were to be finalized, but no satisfactory answer was received from the Wheat Board. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to take up this matter with the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry to ascertain why these pools are not being finalized?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and to obtain a report for him.

COST OF LIVING

Mr. JENNINGS: Today's *News* refers to the recent rise in the cost of living in this State and in other States. Can the Premier explain the rather intriguing statement attributed to the Leader of the Opposition that the recent rise in the cost of living has been the result of the recently announced increases in service pay in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The cost of living increase shown in the price indices was for the quarter ended June 30 this year, and for two of those months the Leader's Government was in office. The price indices do not reflect projected wage increases announced after the end of the quarter and could not conceivably do so. That fact apparently does not seem to bother the Leader.

WOOMERA ROAD

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when the sealing, which I understand will be carried out soon, will take place on the Port Augusta to Woomera road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

SWANPORT BRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked him last week about the construction of the Swanport bridge?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The construction of the bridge to be erected near Swanport is scheduled to commence in January, 1973, and to be completed by mid-1975.

GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: On the morning of July 9, I had the pleasure of inspecting with the Minister of Education the Gladstone High School, where the Minister announced that he expected the new high school at Gladstone to be ready to open in 1972. Can he say whether that programme depends on further financial allocations for education by the Commonwealth Government? Also, can he say whether he inspected any other schools in my district during his trip to Port Augusta?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The new Gladstone High School will be of Samcon construction. Although there are month-to-month changes in the Samcon programme and it is usually likely that if one gives a firm date one can be caught out, I can say that the Samcon programme should be proceeded with much more rapidly than a programme involving major construction works. I believe that the expectation that the new Gladstone High School will be ready at the beginning of the 1972 school year can be held with some confidence. Regarding the overall programme, we hope that the Commonwealth Government will provide for this financial year additional funds for school building throughout Australia. Perhaps that Government is holding back the announcement until a date a little closer to the Senate election, or it may be made when the forthcoming Commonwealth Budget is introduced. Therefore, at this time we must be certain that we have a sufficient programme to take advantage of all the moneys available to us. Naturally, to some extent the current design and construction programmes make fairly optimistic assumptions about finance available. If some of these assumptions turn out not to be correct, we could be in difficulty in relation to our forecasts. I point out to the honourable member that the survey of educational needs conducted by the State Education Departments was agreed to by the Commonwealth Government, which admitted, certainly by implication, some responsibility in relation to any conclusions the survey turned up. The survey has been completed, and it shows in every State a tremendous need for additional finance not only in relation to current expenditure but also in regard to the school-building programme. Therefore, we could

expect that the Commonwealth Government has a moral commitment at least to provide additional funds for the State this financial year and in the financial years ahead so that we can make real inroads in replacing the many unsatisfactory schools currently existing in South Australia.

Regarding the second part of the honourable member's question, I am not sure of the boundaries of his district. On the Saturday, I looked at the Peterborough Primary and High Schools and at the Orreroo Area School, but I understand that they are in the District of Frome. I have not yet had time to visit any other schools in the honourable member's district. However, I have accepted an invitation to go to Jamestown later this year.

AIR RIFLES

Dr. TONKIN: I was alarmed to read in last night's press further reports of the use of air rifles, this time in relation to shooting of household pets in the Hills area. I do not wish to labour the matter, but every day that this situation persists we run the risk of further tragedies occurring. In view of the reports of youths shooting pets with air rifles in the Adelaide Hills, can the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether any decision has been taken regarding the control of air rifles?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will do my best to expedite a reply to the honourable member's earlier question and bring it down as soon as possible.

DENTAL NURSES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I received today a letter drawing my attention to the salaries paid to Royal Adelaide Hospital dental nurses. Part of the letter states:

These salaries are less than that paid to a nurses' aide, who undertakes a comparable one-year training course. The Royal Adelaide Hospital dental nurses' salaries are 50 per cent less than those of the dental nurses employed by the Public Health Department, whose training is the same but whose duties are limited to assisting in very simple dental procedures.

The letters goes on to explain that at the end of May, just before the election, the matter was taken up (I presume with the Public Service Board) and I gather from the letter that so far no action has been taken to improve the situation. Will the Attorney-General there-

fore take up the matter with the Chief Secretary and inform me what action the Government intends to take and when it intends to take it?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

KANGAROO ISLAND SETTLERS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, a reply to my recent question regarding the plight of Kangaroo Island settlers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands has informed me that no official reply, other than an acknowledgment, has yet been received from the Minister for Primary Industry to the request made to him, in a letter dated May 20, 1970, that a Commonwealth officer come to South Australia to examine and discuss the economic position of war service settlers, particularly those holding blocks on Kangaroo Island. However, a further letter has recently been written to the Minister for Primary Industry asking whether he has yet reached a decision on the request.

The economic position of Kangaroo Island war service settlers was recently discussed informally with a Commonwealth officer who was here on another matter, with the result that Lands Department officers are now preparing information that would be valuable should discussions take place.

At 4 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Mr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What numbers of professional staff (bachelor degree or equivalent or higher qualification) were employed in the various departments under the Minister's control at July 1 in each of the years 1966 to 1970 inclusive?

2. What number was appointed during each of the financial years from 1966-67 to 1969-70?

3. What number (a) resigned, (b) retired, or (c) died, during the same period?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In reply to the honourable member's question, I have a statistical schedule relating to staff movements under the control of the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Minister of Local Government, and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF MOVEMENTS IN DEPARTMENTS UNDER THE CONTROL OF
THE MINISTER OF ROADS AND TRANSPORT AND THE MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FROM JULY 1, 1966

(Bachelor Degree or equivalent or higher qualification)

Department	Number employed as at 1/7/1966	Number appointed 1966-1967	Number (a) resigned (b) retired (c) died	Balance as at end of financial year
1966-1967				
Highways	102	37	(a) to (c) 5	134
*Railways	59	1	(a) 1	58
			(b) 1	
			(c)—	
State Planning Office	7	1	(a) 1	7
			(b)—	
			(c)—	
Metropolitan Tramways Trust	12	—	(a) to (c)—	12
TOTAL	180	39	8	211
1967-1968				
Highways	134	11	(a) to (c) 7	138
*Railways	58	1	(a) 1	56
			(b) 2	
			(c)—	
State Planning Office	7	3	(a) to (c)—	10
Metropolitan Tramways Trust	12	—	(a) to (c)—	12
TOTAL	211	15	10	216
1968-1969				
Highways	138	23	(a) to (c) 12	149
*Railways	56	5	(a) 3	56
			(b) 2	
			(c)—	
State Planning Office	10	1	(a) 2	9
			(b) and (c)—	
Metropolitan Tramways Trust	12	—	(a) to (c)—	12
TOTAL	216	29	19	226
1969-1970				
Highways	149	21	(a) to (c) 17	153
*Railways	56	4	(a) 2	58
			(b) and (c)—	
State Planning Office	9	3	(a) 1	11
			(b) and (c)—	
Metropolitan Tramways Trust	12	2	(a) 1 (b) 1	12
			(c)—	
TOTAL	226	30	22	234

*Information regarding the number of qualified accountants, graduates of economics, etc., is not readily available.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Government Tourist Bureau (New Building),

Port Augusta (Augusta Park) Primary School,

Port Augusta (Willsden) Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 16. Page 102.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): Many young people who are forced by lack of family communication and support to attract attention to their difficulties, or to seek help for their problems by committing an offence, may well be helped as a result of a first appearance before a juvenile aid panel. However, some will offend again and will appear before the Juvenile Court. These young people are much more urgently and seriously in need of help, and that help must be specialized and carefully decided on. This does not mean that there is a need to abolish reformatory institutions, as for some these are the best way back to society for young offenders. Other young offenders, however, may need psychiatric care and treatment, and in between there will be many young people whose needs lie between the two extremes; counselling, group therapy and a showing of the way back into conforming to the ways of society may be needed.

The problem confronting the Juvenile Court is to decide which course is best in relation to each child. The treatment of young offenders in this and in other countries has lagged sadly behind modern thinking. Indeed, we are almost in the Middle Ages in some respects. I will use a medical analogy, for which I hope members will forgive me because they will be hearing a few more later. We are almost at the same stage as when blood letting was the only treatment available for every medical ill. In the Middle Ages, if anyone collapsed or was ill, the standard practice was to call for the local surgeon or barber to take a pint or two of blood.

I think all members would be familiar with the story about the collapse of King Charles II who, after a seizure, was surrounded by an army of physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries.

Despite all their efforts and four days of bleeding, cupping, fomenting, purging and poulticing, the King died. I am afraid that is what tends to happen a little with our young offenders now. In modern times venipuncture or blood letting is still used as treatment for some few diseases, although not many, as it has a specialized use. However, modern medicine has realized the importance of investigation to establish the causes of disease and to ascertain the best method of treating it. All this is part of the added expense in the practice of medicine nowadays.

In the same way, investigation may well help establish the best means of treating the young offender. I do not comment on the work of the people in the reformatory institutions, other than to say that they are doing a remarkably good job when one considers the conditions under which they work—the high case loads and the facilities available to them. However, there is a great need in this State for an assessment centre to which young people can be sent. Such a centre would be staffed by social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists, who would conduct investigations into the causes of the juvenile's activities and problems and report to the Juvenile Court, which should have the benefit of the results of these investigations before deciding on the disposition of the child, particularly a disposition that would involve deprivation of liberty. I consider that an assessment centre must be conducted on a daily attendance basis, and I strongly oppose the practice that has tended to arise in the past of remanding young people in custody as a punitive measure. Only in extreme circumstances should a child be remanded in custody.

While I am dealing with this subject, I also say that I am opposed to imposing suspended sentences as a form of punishment. I oppose the example penalty that is sometimes imposed: because a young person appearing before the court may be the last on a long list of persons appearing in that week on a charge of committing a particular offence, he is made an example of. If we wish to get young people back into society there is no justification for this action. Much harm can be done to a young person who has tried to draw the attention of society to his problems. He has apparently been rejected by his parents' indifference and, when he appears before a court, without adequate investigation having been made in relation to him he is sent back to custody—locked up by society, not helped by society.

Finally on this subject, I think there is great need to establish in this State attendance centres similar to the facilities employed by the Police Traffic Division to educate traffic offenders. The young offender would be asked to attend an attendance centre for a set number of hours after school and at weekends, and he would have lectures and group discussions and give some form of community service so that afterwards he could again play some part in the community. This form of treatment as punishment would be particularly suitable for children involved in shoplifting, larrikanism, and other peer group offences.

It was impossible to sit in juvenile courts in North America without becoming acutely aware of the problems of associated drug dependence. Almost every learned judge to whom I spoke there said that there had been a tremendous change in the pattern over the last three years or four years. Whereas three years ago or four years ago it was the exception to find a young person appearing before the court and also being involved with drugs, now it is the rule, and the 12-year-olds to 14-year-olds are particularly susceptible. The major problems, of course, are the narcotics (such as heroin), the stimulants (the amphetamines), and the hallucinogens (lysergic acid diethylamide), but the judges believe that the crime rate in North America is directly related to the increase in drug dependence.

The so-called hard drugs involve physical dependence, tolerance, and psychological dependence, and these factors lead to an urgent desire for money to maintain supplies of what have become essential dependent drugs. As a result, breaking and entering, robbery with violence, and prostitution by young people are becoming more and more common. I am afraid that here there is a "head in the sand" attitude that is all too common. It is said, "It cannot happen here," and, "It cannot happen in our community." I am sure that it can happen in our community and it is beginning to happen in our community now, and the pattern is being repeated. It is alarming to be told that we should accept marijuana as a way of life because it is no more addictive and no more harmful than alcohol; but, except in extremely few instances, young offenders appearing before juvenile courts who are drug dependants have begun their career as drug dependants on marijuana. Almost without exception they graduated from the same source and the same supplier and were actively encouraged and pushed on to hard drugs.

Here I must emphasize what I think we all know and sense: that the supply of drugs is big business. It is a well organized criminal business, organized by criminal combines. It is worth many millions of dollars a year to them and it is in their interest to encourage a tolerant attitude to marijuana and then gradually to push on to hard drugs. These people do not care what happens to our young people as long as they make their money. Only a small portion of young people, those psychologically susceptible (once again, because of family and social pressures brought about by our present way of life and closely related to our expanding population) is likely to become dependent on hard drugs, but the road back from drug dependence is long and takes a heavy toll of physical and mental health and of life itself, as well as being a heavy drain on the community.

I do not intend in this speech to discuss in detail the arguments for and against legalizing marijuana, but I completely agree with Dr. W. R. Owen, Senior Lecturer in Pharmacy at Queensland University, who has been quoted as saying that a lack of reliable scientific information on marijuana would make it extremely hazardous to legislate on its use, and with medical and other authorities who have made similar statements. As long as there is any risk that even one of our young people, because of immaturity or lack of support from either the family or the community, may turn to drug dependence through the use of marijuana, I am doubly sure that its use must not be legalized. Those mature adults who, it is said, would not be harmed by the regular social use of small amounts of marijuana must demonstrate their responsibility towards the younger members of our community by accepting the present situation and forgoing the dubious benefits of the drug. Alcohol and tobacco provide enough major community problems without introducing a third source of potential tragedy.

I was pleased to hear of the proposed punitive measures to be taken against drug trafficking. I quite agree that for non-dependent traffickers a term of imprisonment is the least penalty but I think that dependent suppliers, on the other hand, must get treatment. It is much more important for them to have treatment than to be punished. I should like to bring up the question of penalties in relation to monetary fines. To someone with a multi-million dollar business, a fine of \$1,000 or \$2,000 is nothing, and I hope it probably was not intended in that

light, but I appeal to the Government to consider imposing much larger fines, if it must impose fines on these people who supply drugs and are not dependants.

There are many other simple steps which I hope will be considered and which add up to common sense. The first is community education, and I understand that this is well in hand at present, with the aid of grants from the Commonwealth Government. This programme is carried out with films and speakers through schools and in the community. As part of this community education programme, we must remind doctors not to prescribe sedatives, tranquillizers and stimulants unnecessarily. When I say that, I mean that there are many doctors who, because they are pressed for time tend to order drugs rather than give supportive therapy. This is a great argument for the use of social workers in medical practices to take these loads off doctors in the community. There are not enough doctors, and this is one of the consequences. We must remind doctors not to prescribe unnecessarily excessive quantities of drugs, and I speak as a member of the profession in saying that it is sometimes much easier to prescribe the amount set down in the national health pharmacopoeia than to consider the exact number of tablets that a patient will need.

I think we must urge people to go through their drug cupboards and bathroom cabinets and destroy any left-over drugs, thereby discouraging their use. Many of the barbiturates, amphetamines and tranquillizers now appearing in our community and being used by young people in schools in this State are coming from that source. Some children are injecting a solution of the same brand of appetite suppressant drug as that about which I asked a question last week. I believe that this situation is beginning to present a greater and greater problem to South Australia now, and we must take urgent action. The sale of such drugs as this appetite suppressant must be controlled more rigidly, and even A.P.C. powders (I shall not mention the proprietary name, but we are all familiar with it) must be controlled more carefully. Pharmacies should be required to take effective measures to protect the stocks of these drugs from theft, and drug dependants must be encouraged to seek treatment and to be told where to apply and what is involved.

I turn now from drug dependence to problems of nursing, in which I have a particular interest. By the action of the Commonwealth Government a modification of the earlier volun-

tary health insurance scheme has provided a new scheme whereby no-one need be financially embarrassed by the need for highly specialized surgery or medical care. If the correct ethical procedure is followed, no patient can be denied access to the best possible surgical skill. Despite this, however, as a result of the shortage of nursing staff, there may well be certain disadvantages when the patient reaches the hospital. This shortage may delay admission for elective surgery and create nursing difficulties when the patient is there.

A shortage of nursing staff is not easily apparent in private hospitals but it is more obvious in Government hospitals. Here we have wonderful new buildings with the latest equipment and all the space in the world, but apparently we have not enough nursing staff to use some of these facilities. For instance, the plastic unit has not yet been opened at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, an orthopaedic ward is not being used, and neither is a general ward. The metabolic and vascular units cannot even be considered because, in the foreseeable future, there would not be enough nursing staff. Operating sessions have been reduced to single-bank operating instead of double theatres, mainly because there is a shortage of trained nursing staff to look after the theatres. Perhaps it is just as well, because there are not enough nurses to look after patients coming from a double-bank theatre system. Elective admissions are being put off, and there are waiting lists for some surgery of up to 12 months or more.

The major shortage is one of junior trained staff. Sisters in charge of wards have had unnecessarily heavy burdens placed on them because of the shortage. The Adelaide Children's Hospital, which has always been a popular hospital for trainees, has had to advertise recently for staff. Something is not right. I understand that very few graduates from the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the last 12 months have returned this year as staff nurses and junior sisters. I further understand that a recent suggestion has been made that it should be considered necessary for each nurse on graduation to spend a further six months before she could be registered. If it is considered necessary to advance further the standard of nursing experience as a staff nurse and give added confidence in handling patients and staff, I agree that this is an excellent idea. However, this suggestion has been regarded by some nurses as a reflection on the standard of supervision and practical training of trainees in the wards, because of a shortage of trained ward

staff. Other nurses regard it as a strategem to ensure a constant supply of staff nurses.

I can only pass on to members the opinions that have been expressed to me by members of the nursing profession, but the fact that they are being expressed by so many nurses is most disquieting. Trainee nurses have complained that they are expected to accept responsibilities for patients beyond the level of their training, particularly on night duty, without adequate and close supervision. We can allow for the natural timidity, the lack of confidence, and the peculiar feeling of isolation in a ward at night but, if these girls consider that they lack skilled help easily available, that must have a significant effect on their attitude to nursing, particularly on that of a conscientious girl. We cannot blame them if they are not willing to continue when they can do better financially with less responsibility in other fields outside hospitals. On one hand, we hear and see evidence of a shortage of nurses, both trainees and junior sisters: on the other hand, we are being reassured by senior nurses and administrators that no major problems exist.

I have the greatest respect and regard for senior nurses, matrons, and administrators, who keep our hospitals running, and I have no doubt that the general public has the same respect. They have a natural loyalty and devotion to their profession, and are jealous of its reputation. We can expect them to be reluctant to divulge publicly anything that might damage that reputation or lessen public confidence in the standard of nursing care, and they usually prefer to shoulder the extra loads and added responsibilities to maintain their standards. However, there is a limit to how far this can go. If this limit is being reached, an inquiry into all aspects of nursing must be pursued vigorously. In the last day or so we have heard or seen that the Government has authorized the Public Service Board to open negotiations on the question of nurses' salaries and boarding charges. No promises have been made and this, I suppose, is as good a way of ducking the issue as any, as this action may get the Government off the hook.

However, although salaries are important, it is only one aspect, and many other factors relating to the conditions of nursing should be considered, because many of these are within the sphere of Government action. Many trainees and junior sisters have expressed a fear of putting their points of view to senior nursing administrative officers because of the degree of discipline that is part of nursing training. They must be encouraged

to state their opinions and be reassured that nothing but good can come of it. While discussing hospitals, I wish to raise the subject of the State Government subsidy to private and community hospitals. I am not surprised that community hospitals receive a \$2 for \$1 subsidy on capital works, because they play a tremendously important part in our community health services and deserve all the help they can get. However, I am surprised to find that the church governed hospitals (Calvary, Memorial, and St. Andrews) receive a \$1 for \$1 subsidy only. I believe that they play an equally important role in the health of the community. Their patients are not required to pay higher fees; their patients are not more able to give generously to building funds; and they have the important additional role of training nurses for our community. From these three hospitals about 120 nurses graduate a year, and these hospitals must be helped to advance this programme of community aid. At present, however, they are seriously hampered, in rebuilding and modernizing the hospitals by what seems to be an unfair discrimination.

It seems that we are all familiar with the terms "population expansion" and "population explosion", but we tend to think that it is something going on in other countries like India or Africa but not happening here. We have a population expansion: in fact, we have been encouraging it. It has reached a stage where we will have to look hard at the state of our population. In the last few months we have heard about crisis after crisis—a crisis in education, a crisis in nursing, a crisis in pollution, and a crisis in social welfare. I do not believe that these are crises. I believe they are simply the manifestations of a population expansion that is now beginning to catch up with our community. The problems that will be caused by the doubling of our population by the turn of the century will be almost unbelievable, but I do not think anybody has sat down and taken a hard enough look at them. The financial burden of providing services to a bigger and bigger and younger and younger community will fall on a relatively smaller and smaller number of income earners. That is how the population structure is moving and, for this reason, capital expenses must be spread around more widely and used more efficiently. Among other things, I can see the time, in the not so distant future, when we may well consider introducing two shifts at schools, doubling up on the staff, and using the facilities available there to their fullest extent. The same thing can be said of universities.

Getting back to an earlier part of my speech, one of the factors causing juvenile delinquency and people to become susceptible to drug dependence is the social pressure we put on our young people by our demand that they perform well in examinations. There are not enough vacancies for them in our universities. If we cannot afford to build more universities and provide more facilities, let us make the utmost use of the facilities there. This may sound strange now but any thinking person can see where we are heading.

As regards health, we must place far more emphasis on domiciliary services and the nursing of patients at home, and on the use of hospitals for more specialized procedures. I have dwelt mostly on social welfare and health matters because I am so interested in them, but I repeat what I said previously: the social welfare, health and wellbeing of the community are not the prerogative of a Socialist Government: they are something in which the Liberal and Country League, as a Party, is vitally interested. I go further and say that we are better able to promote such programmes because we are concerned with finding the vital factor, the money with which to pay for them and support them.

Mr. Hall: Our performance shows that.

Dr. TONKIN: It does indeed. If we are to translate our concern for the people into effective action, we must make sure we can find the money to do this. If the present actions of the Government are any guide, I doubt whether the administration of the State's finances will provide sufficient funds for the long-term health and social welfare needs of this State. I look forward to the return of an L.C.L. Government in the Forty-first Parliament. I support the motion.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): At the outset I desire to add my own congratulations to those already expressed to the Speaker on his election to that most distinguished office. I am certain that his activities during the life of this Parliament will reflect credit not only upon himself but also upon the distinguished office he occupies. I also add my congratulations to those already expressed to the Premier and to his Cabinet. Without doubt, these people are dedicated to their job and will reflect credit upon their respective departments, which they will administer without fear or favour and for the reason that the departments have been instituted—the welfare of the people of this State.

I congratulate all members either re-elected or elected for the first time to this House.

Also, I thank and express my appreciation to the Assistant Clerk of the House and his staff for the magnificent manner in which they have assisted me and, I am sure, all new members in the settling-in period of this Parliament. I found myself (perhaps I am in an unusual position in this respect) on occasions wandering around the corridors of this enormous building looking for a particular place but unable to find it. I was often rescued by members and the staff. I hope this will not continue, but it has been my experience.

This, the Fortieth Parliament of South Australia, is indeed a memorable one, because it represents, with the brief exception of the period between 1965 and 1968, the first occasion for decades when the will of the majority of the people of this State has been given effect to. Of course, we are aware that this situation arose because of the infamous gerrymander that prevailed for so many years in this State. This gerrymander has largely been overcome, but not completely so, because we have not yet a situation that represents one vote one value. I hope the future will see that situation come about.

South Australia, because of its election and the installation of a Labor Government on the Treasury benches of this House, can confidently look forward to a long era of effective and well-planned government by this Government, which was overwhelmingly endorsed by the people of the State. The fact that it was placed on the Treasury benches with an overwhelming majority indicates a mandate for all policies enunciated by it at the time of the election.

His Excellency's Speech detailed the policy items of the Government that were so wholeheartedly embraced by most voters in the State. I should like to comment on one or two of them. The first is the proposed amendments to the Industries Development Act. It is intended by the Government that these amendments will make it possible for the Government to acquire an equitable number of shares in any new industry established in this State or in any industry expanding in this State. This is a laudable action, and it is long overdue. We see on every hand organizations, monopolies and big firms established in this State making astronomical profits yearly.

The average person in the street is amazed when he or she reads of these enormous profits. It is right and proper that the State, whose resources make it possible for these profits to be amassed should share in the profits made by these firms. The people of this State

know very well that these firms and combines that operate here are operating purely and simply because of the geographical situation of the commodities they wish to use within their particular industry. In other words, they want the resources of South Australia to benefit their particular industry or organization.

It is always amazing to me, when I read of the tremendous profits being made by so many of these firms, to look back over a period of 12 months, or possibly two years, and realize that members of the trade unions employed by these firms have almost invariably during this period approached the management of these firms seeking a rise in their living standards by way of increased wages and have been refused. Immediately a wage increase is granted to the labour force of this State following a national wage case, we hear the cry that this will have to be absorbed: "We will have to pass this on to the consumer; he will have to absorb the increase." No mention is ever made that the management of these firms at this stage already probably knows that these enormous profits are pending. Management insists that the consumer (the worker) must absorb the cost of his own wage rise, and I believe that this is entirely wrong. These firms that make such staggering profits should be required to absorb all over-award payments and national wage increases. Indeed, these profits are proof positive that the firms concerned can afford to absorb such increases. I consider that the participation of the Government in the affairs of these companies through the purchase of an equitable number of shares in them will go a long way towards assisting in this regard.

Another item in which the Government intends to interest itself is public transport. It is generally recognized that neither the South Australian Railways nor the Municipal Tramways Trust is operated, at this juncture at any rate, in a manner beneficial to the State. Therefore, the Government intends to form a transport department under a Minister who will have the task of co-ordinating the services of these two public utilities as well as the services of other branches of public transport. This in itself could be a great advantage to South Australia in regard to the anti-pollution policies of this Government, because if the workers (the travellers) of this State can be given a good fast service, with adequate connections to and from their place of work, they will probably take advantage of this service and leave their private vehicles at home, thus greatly contributing to a reduction in air pollution.

Prior to the advent of the Labor Government in 1965 the Workmen's Compensation Act in this State was considered to be the worst of any such legislation in the Commonwealth; it was, in fact, an archaic Act. The previous Labor Government immediately set about rectifying the position and removing some of the anomalies that existed. The first anomaly it removed was one that it had tried to remove for many years during the regime of Sir Thomas Playford: that was the anomaly arising from the fact that workers in South Australia were not covered by workmen's compensation while travelling to and from their place of work. However, workers in this State now rightfully enjoy that advantage. Although that was one of the amendments that the Labor Government made to the Workmen's Compensation Act, nevertheless many anomalies still remain. One anomaly relates to the meagre and inadequate payment made to a man who is injured on the job and forced to go on to compensation.

This payment is \$40 a week for a married man and \$27 for a single man. In either case this is not sufficient for a man who is injured in the employment of a particular firm, as previously he may have been earning much more money at his job. His injuries have prohibited him from working and he has had to forgo this additional money simply because the firm has not made any more generous provision for him in relation to workmen's compensation. Another anomaly under the Act at present is the inadequate payment made to a dependant or to the estate of a workman who has died as a result of an accident occurring on the job. The sum paid in this respect is grossly inadequate and must be increased.

Then there is the situation involving unwarranted delays in the payment of compensation. These delays virtually "starve" a workman back to work. For instance, a man working for a firm receives a knee injury and may be on compensation for two or three months; he eventually returns to work but, after a period, he may leave the employ of that firm and go to work for another firm. Whilst he is at the second firm, he suffers from an aggravation or recurrence of the injury to his knee and is required again to go on to compensation. However, to his dismay, he finds that the insurance company responsible to the firm for which he currently works is not the company that paid him as a result of the injury that occurred while he was working for the first firm, with the result that a quarrel

immediately arises between the two insurance companies concerned.

The company connected with the man's current employer says, "This is not a fresh accident; it is a recurrence of a previous injury and, therefore, the previous insurer is responsible." On the other hand, the first insurance company says, "It is not a recurrence; it is a fresh injury and, therefore, the second insurance company is responsible." So, there is an argument to determine who shall be responsible for the payment of this man's compensation. This goes on in my personal experience; it has taken as long as two months, and the result almost invariably has been that the workman concerned has gone back to work not because he has been fit to do so but because he has been able to convince his doctor that he is much better than he really is.

He gets the doctor to clear him in order to return to work although he is unfit to work. That man has been "starved" back to work. The anomaly arising from this position must be rapidly removed from the Act and provision made so that immediately compensation is due on a weekly basis it is paid by one company or the other. The Government or this Parliament has the responsibility of determining who is actually responsible for the compensation payments, but one company should pay immediately payment is due, and the companies involved can fight it out afterwards as to which one is actually responsible.

I am firmly convinced that the major factors governing the lack of nursing staff in this State are the atrocious conditions of work imposed on the dedicated people involved and the grossly inadequate pay they receive. Whether they be trainees or senior sisters, they are grossly underpaid, and their working conditions are not comparable with those in other industries and professions. The Government intends to do something drastic in this matter, for it intends very quickly to investigate the working conditions and salaries of these dedicated nurses. The Government will increase their salaries and ensure that their duties are lightened. It will ensure that a nurses training college is built as a college of advanced education. Once these nurses and sisters have passed through this college they will be assisted by a recruited force of junior nurses who will perform the more onerous tasks, thereby freeing the more senior nurses and sisters for the more advanced tasks of looking after the patients for whom they are responsible.

I concur with the member for Bragg (Dr. Tonkin) in respect of the alarm created

throughout the State because of the reported increase in drug trafficking here. The Government is aware of the problem and intends adequately to tackle it. It intends to launch an intense campaign to educate the public about the harmful effects that will be experienced if people persist in taking drugs without medical supervision. The Government intends, too, to impose drastic penalties on anyone caught trafficking illegally in drugs because, after all, these people (if they deserve that term) are the dregs of humanity: they are people who are prepared, for their own profit and well-being, to introduce addictive drugs to gullible, weak-willed people purely and simply so that they have, in effect, a ready-made market for their vile products. They are prepared to launch young people on a life of sorrow, degradation and ultimate death in order to gain their own desires and enrich their own pockets. I know that the Government will take stringent action in respect of this matter.

There will be intense debate upon most of the matters coming before this House; there will probably be strong opposition to some matters, but I am sure that, if there is one matter upon which there will be unanimity, it is the problem of protecting the people of South Australia, particularly our young people, from the harmful effects and degradation that results from taking drugs.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Having listened attentively to the knowledgeable speeches from members who have already spoken in this debate, it is with some reservation that I now rise to make what will be my first (but by no means my last) speech. As a "new boy" seeking all possible information regarding the procedure, obligations and duties as a member of Parliament, I have been most grateful for the friendly and willing assistance extended to me from all sections of the Parliament House staff and, indeed, from members on both sides of the House. The impressive Speech of the Governor's Deputy left no doubt about the strenuous sessions that must surely confront us. I know that my vigorous and demanding years of community service, particularly the last five years as mayor of an active and progressive city, will stand me in good stead and serve as an apprenticeship for the exacting days ahead.

I found His Excellency's reference to tourism most encouraging for, as the member for a constituency that lends itself to tourist attraction, I wish to speak at some length on this subject. Glenelg, linked as it is to Adelaide by one of the best arterial roads in South Australia, calls

for the utmost financial and practical support from the Government. In any successful venture it is first necessary to assess the amount of money required and the amount available. We must look closely at the natural and local attributes, the potential and the facilities of the area. I believe that Glenelg has as much to offer as has any seaside town in the State. It is one of the places most likely to attract visitors from other States and overseas. Its nearness to Adelaide makes it possible for the tourist to change, within 30 minutes, from the pleasures of swimming, fishing, boating, etc., to the hustle and bustle of Adelaide and its many diversions.

Although having room for extension, accommodation in Glenelg is highly satisfactory, for most tourists will find themselves staying only a short distance from the beaches, shops and amusement centres. Catering services have been well planned and, at the various hotels, restaurants and cafes, the tourist can choose dishes to suit all tastes. Australian, Asian or European cuisine is available. At a time when South Australia needs to take full advantage of her resources, the economic benefits of tourism cannot be overlooked. The increase in consumer goods and services provides employment for many people, and the potential financial reward is unlimited. Some years ago the United States Department of Commerce said:

If the community can attract a couple of dozen tourists a day throughout the year, it would be comparable economically to acquiring a new manufacturing industry with an annual payroll of \$US1,000,000.

It is estimated that in Britain a town has only to attract one oversea visitor every night to earn a gross annual revenue of \$A1,750. In South Australia, as a whole, we have so much more to attract tourists, for our climate and beaches are equal to any in the world. We must remember that the tourist, having paid his own expenses to reach the place of his choice, comes prepared to spend much money in the pursuit of pleasure. Therefore, it is obvious that we must see that everything is there for his seeking. There will be a larger demand for food, drink, films, clothing, souvenirs, petrol, transport, and so on. Thus more employment will be created, with the Government benefiting by way of both direct and indirect taxation.

Domestic travel in Australia has grown rapidly during the past 10 years, and the widespread economic growth taking place in Australia indicates an even greater movement

in the years to come. If we are to benefit substantially, the Government must recognize the fundamental role of the travel and tourist industry and the consequent possible stimulation of potential investments. Adoption of planning and research as a basis for the development and promotion of travel within the State must be considered and encouraged, with the inclusion of good roads which make it possible for tourists to return to the place of commencement without retracing the same route, thus widening the scope and attraction to individual towns and parts of the State not normally associated with tourism. The travel and tourist industry, then, should be understood as an overall industry, involving a high degree of skill and experience in the management of its various segments. As it is therefore essential that the utmost co-ordination be maintained between the Government and local government authorities, I ask the Minister of Local Government to consider this project seriously. At the same time, I urge the Government to provide the necessary finance to support materially the advancement of tourism, the benefits of which are so eagerly sought by other States and countries which already appreciate the rewards following this type of big business.

His Excellency also included in his Speech the intention of this Government to introduce a Bill to provide for amendments to the Local Government Act the most significant of which are aimed at enabling councils to enter the field of services to the aged (and I will be most interested to hear more of this), and at providing adult suffrage and compulsory voting at council elections. It is that last amendment about which I feel some concern. Although I agree that it is the duty of all people to take an active interest in the welfare of their city, I know from experience that many are not civic or community minded, preferring to leave such things in the hands of others. It is then left to the candidates seeking council election to supply that personal touch that can then create greater interest, thus ensuring that, if the privilege to vote is exercised, it is with a specific purpose in view and not just to avoid payment of a fine. It can well be assumed that, if a ratepayer bothers to go to the poll, he will first assess the integrity of the candidate he honours with his vote. Thus a truly democratic way of life is upheld. I may add here how surprised I am to find any form of compulsion as part of the Government's future plans in view of the recent demonstration by some Government members against

compulsory National Service registration; or would some reservations be permitted in regard to all who felt that compulsory council voting was against their conscience?

There is also the question of cost to the individual councils. I am aware that in answer to my previous question to him concerning this the Premier replied that, under the system of the computer as used today, the cost for the printing of the rolls would be small, but there is far more to an election than just the printing of the rolls, as I think most honourable members will agree. Also, all councils would have to set a higher rate of taxation to cover the extra costs, and this would surely create further hardship for the ratepayer, particularly in the less established areas where so much work has to be carried out if residents are to enjoy the best facilities. In my own district, which is one of the oldest, though not the largest (it covers only two square miles), in South Australia, the works programme last year amounted to \$55,705. This gives a clear picture of what might be necessary in the new housing areas that now stretch far out from the metropolitan area. In view of the obvious results, I urge the Government to consider all these things before taking such a drastic step.

Whilst on the subject of compulsory voting, I shall turn my attention to the Government's renewal of the proposal to alter the age for voting to 18. In this proposal I agree with it in part. I trust that some consideration will be given to deleting the word "compulsory" from the provision. True, many young people today have a far more futuristic outlook than we had at their age but it is equally true to say that to force them to such an important and far-reaching decision if they have not had the opportunity to learn the full pros and cons of politics is to make a farce of the whole procedure, the compulsory vote becoming nothing more than a misguided vote. Thus we would lose the very ideal for which we legislate. It seems to me a necessity to make voting for all those between the ages of 18 and 21 voluntary, with an automatic reversion to the compulsory vote immediately people reach the age of 21.

I will devote the next part of my speech to the Surf Life Saving Association which vitally needs Government assistance. I have had the honour to be the President for the past two years. I understand that a communication has been forwarded to the Premier but, for the benefit of members who are not *au fait* with the work of the association, I will

elaborate further. An intensive investigation into the association's projected income and expenditure indicates that, unless the annual grant is increased substantially, the activities of the South Australian Surf Life Saving Centre will have to be curtailed. The volume of administrative work has now shown the necessity for a part-time clerical administrator and a public relations officer. Much of the association's business is now carried out by voluntary officers, quite often at personal expense, despite the small honoraria paid (the largest is \$100 paid to the honorary secretary). Much expense is incurred by the necessity to send instructors and examiners to country towns where surf life saving clubs are in existence or are proposed to be established. The formation of new clubs is essential as development opens up more beaches and facilities to the swimming public. The amount of \$1,300 provides only the minimum essential life-saving equipment (for example, first-aid kit, reels, and binoculars) and does not cover the clubhouse or the surf boat. Individual clubs are the only units of the association with enough manpower to undertake fund-raising ventures or to solicit financial support from those people who use patrolled beaches and thus have the advantage of the basic life saving service. A recent study indicated that to provide just the basic life saving service on the metropolitan and near coast beaches costs about \$50,000 a year. About \$4,000 a club is needed. Very little assistance, if any, is received from the seaside councils.

As the world leader in surf life saving, the Australian association is looked to by other countries to participate in periodic exchange visits of instruction teams. The exchange of ideas is invariably reflected in improved rescue and resuscitation techniques and the development of more effective rescue gear and equipment. All of this reflects creditably on the community and its Government. There are many more points on which I could dwell but I will make best use of my time by quoting figures which show beyond doubt the urgent need for a very substantial increase in future grants by this Government. Without this increase in financial assistance, the work of the Surf Life Saving Association cannot continue in South Australia. In 1968 the present Minister of Education stated that, in the event of the return of a Labor Government, he hoped that a substantial increase in the grant to the Surf Life Saving Association would be made, because it played an important role in the community and a very

active role for our youth. The Minister also quoted the amount of \$10,000 as being the minimum grant. Therefore, I hope he will lend his voice to the support of my request for a more substantial grant to this very commendable organization. I will now read the figures as shown for the annual operating expenses of the South Australian State Centre:

Annual Operating Expenses—S.A. State Centre

	\$
Administrator and public relations (salary, part time)	2,500
Administrator's car allowance and expenses	200
Salary, typist-clerk	2,500
Expenses and honoraria, honorary officers	700
Printing and stationery	900
Postage, telephone, etc.	900
Accommodation and travel	700
Awards, trophies, engraving, etc.	150
Public relations, entertainments, etc.	150
Equipment, repairs and replacements	700
Capital reserve	600
Surf House expenses and maintenance	400
Assistance to State instructional team	600
Gear improvement research	300
Formation of new clubs	1,300
Assistance for equipment, existing clubs	3,000
Recruiting promotion	1,000
International activities	500
Medical panel expenses	100
Miscellaneous operating expenses	800
	<hr/>
	\$18,000

The expected annual income which the State Centre would expect to receive under present conditions is:

	\$
Government grant	5,000
Affiliations, interest, etc.	1,000
Donations	1,000
	<hr/>
	\$7,000

Therefore, it can be seen clearly that, without additional aid, the annual operating deficit will be about \$11,000.

I now draw the attention of honourable members to the important question of child-minding centres and the suggestion by the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department that the supervision of them be left in the hands of the Government social welfare workers. Although this may have some force, I would like the position more fully discussed before a direct ruling is given. At the present time, several councils take considerable interest in such centres and it is obvious that they are in a far better position to give on-the-spot attention to any

problems that may arise from time to time. It is possible to maintain a more personal approach to the centres than could be the case if they were placed in the wider sphere of Government control, with its larger demand upon the time of the social worker. The time taken for and expense of travel to the desired area and the period that must elapse because of the follow-up process, do little to commend the system of centralization, particularly when one considers the vast distances of some towns in South Australia from Adelaide and, in many cases, from each other.

It must be remembered also that buildings must comply with individual council regulations, and the council health inspectors come very much to the fore in these matters. Every facility is at hand if kept under the jurisdiction of councils, and I can visualize many difficulties arising if the Government decides to remove all child-minding centres from the councils. When a candidate seeks council election, he does so with the knowledge that all matters concerning his ward will come under his personal observation and be his special interest, so if there is a child-minding centre in his ward he will make it his business to see that it conforms to all regulations and that it is always available if needed. All councils take a personal pride in the activities conducted within their boundaries, and this applies no less to the services created to help both parents and children. Often, a council will set aside playgrounds or suitable land especially adaptable for the use of children and their betterment and, on some occasions, councils have been the prime instigators in establishing the necessary building or perhaps equipment. I have the strong opinion that, in the best interests of the children and indeed of the community at large, child-minding centres should be left solely under the control of councils. Indeed, I advise the Government to give financial assistance where necessary, in order to ease the self-imposed burden on the councils and ensure the best possible conditions for the children, whilst safeguarding the individual attention they enjoy at present.

The Attorney-General has said that more powers have been given to the Prices Commissioner in order to protect the consumer and I draw the attention of the Attorney to methods now used by some ladies hairdressing salons. A few weeks ago, an elderly lady went to a wellknown salon and asked the price for a razor cut, which is a special type of cutting, necessitating first a shampoo, which is included in the price. Accepting this, she duly sat

down and, through the shampoo, the attendant casually said, "I have put a touch of nourishing cream on your hair", and chatted about the hair. When the lady paid the bill, she was asked for \$3.50 instead of the stated price of \$2. On querying this, she was told, "Well, you had a lot of extras" (none of which had been asked for or agreed to prior to their use). Some weeks later she went to another salon, only to find it to be a branch of the previous shop so, being more aware this time, she asked the price, which again was stated to be \$2.

Although a little embarrassed, on this occasion she stressed that she required the razor cut only without any extras whatever. The same procedure was followed, and at the end, she was asked for an excess of 95c. As I have stated, this was the case of an elderly lady, and she could have been an age pensioner, in which case the extra amount, small though it might seem, could have created a hardship or may even have been her fare home. The point I am making is the way in which the price was raised without the person's consent and, in most cases (as in the first visit I have quoted), the person not being aware of such a probability, especially when a request as to the price was made before accepting the service. This holds a hint of stand-over tactics, for there is no gainsaying the receptionist's terse "You have had the extras." The customer can only pay and, unfortunately, pay any amount that is required.

It should be necessary for the salon to show the price for a service, and how much, the possible requirements or improvements would individually cost, and then the customer should accept these extras if she wished to have them. She should not have them unknowingly thrust upon her afterwards. I trust that the Minister will consider this matter. In closing, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the appointment to your high office, and thank you for the courtesy you have shown to me in my short time in this House. With my fellow members, I agree that the Premier showed great wisdom in naming the honourable member for this office, and I wish him well in his difficult and exacting duties.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion and, in doing so, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to your high position. Also, I congratulate the Premier, the Chairman of Committees, the Ministers, and all members of this House for being successful in their elections. I thank the staff for the help they

have given to new members, and I am grateful to the people of the District of Salisbury for the responsibility they have placed in me. I pledge myself to work in their interests. I thank the Labor Party for having selected me to contest the seat of Salisbury, and I specially thank those who assisted me and for the time and effort they put into such a short campaign.

My election to this Parliament probably would not have been possible had it not been for the reaction of the people after the 1968 election. Public demand called for the redistribution of the electoral boundaries, and the Liberal Party, the then Government, had no alternative but to introduce legislation dealing with this question. For this I am grateful to the people of South Australia.

In this country we have a most outdated, outmoded, and unjust system of wage fixing. I refer to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, to which State industrial tribunals are tied. It is a system designed to give protection to one class of people, and that class is certainly not the working class. Rank and file discontent with arbitration decisions, after shameful employer-inspired delays in court hearings being tolerated by the commissioners, is a major factor in the discontent. Tom Dougherty, the Federal Secretary of the Australian Workers Union, was a supporter of the arbitration system for many years, but in February of this year he strongly criticized it. When a person like Dougherty criticizes the arbitration system, one can be sure that there is something wrong with it. He said that there was a real need for an overhaul of the present system of arbitration. Recently, the union suffered a further setback when the commission handed down a judgment after an inquiry into the hours of work and overtime clauses in the Federal Pastoral Award for station hands. For the past 24 years, most workers in this country have enjoyed a 40-hour week: station hands, employed by wealthy squatters and working under the worst possible conditions, have been subject to a 44-hour week to be worked over 5½ days. This is a deplorable situation.

In the *Australian Worker*, official organ of the A.W.U., of Wednesday, July 8, 1970, appears an article on page 1, that states that the Full Commission, comprising Kirby, President, and Moore and Williams, has said, in its reasons for judgment:

We consider it would be unwise to attempt to alter piecemeal an existing quite complicated award provision or to express any views as to

its meaning. On the material before us, those in the industry find it workable.

Who of those in the industry would find it workable? It would be only the wealthy squatters. We have decided to leave it as it is, so here we have Commissioners bringing down decisions affecting workers and refusing to implement hours of work that are applicable to other people in the industry: I name the shearers.

We wonder why there is discontent in industry today. It is my guess that, after the federal executive of the union meets later this month, strong action will be taken against this decision. Therefore, we can place the blame only upon the arbitration commission if the union decides to introduce a campaign that would lead to a stoppage. Manufacturers of today are subject to high profits (in all probability the highest ever) and, where the market price is unsuitable, they withhold the sale of their goods. On the other hand, workers who have only their labour to sell are subject to court orders and prosecutions where they take direct action. Employers are quick to act in this direction knowing that they will receive the sympathy of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Lengthy employer-caused delays should not be tolerated by the commission. I bitterly criticize the invasion of lawyers into the arbitration courts. In every case, whether it be major or minor, we find a Queen's Counsel and a junior together with the employers. Legal points have become the order of the day before Commissioners, and that was never intended.

Let us look at a major dispute not long settled in South Australia, in the cement manufacturing industry. For years workers in this industry have been subject to unjust decisions relating to wage increases at the hands of the industrial tribunals. It was only after several unsuccessful wage applications that the workers in this industry decided to take strike action to gain a wage increase. They were justly entitled to do so, especially when one looks at the profits the cement bosses are making. I am critical of the bosses' organization, the Chamber of Manufactures, in its handling of this dispute and many other disputes in South Australia. The Chamber's policy that no over-award payment shall be introduced by employers and the refusal to negotiate with union officials while workers are in dispute causes long delays in reaching settlements.

Members of this House will recall that I asked a question last Thursday about wage increases for nurses in South Australian hos-

pitals, where a shameful situation has developed. It should not be allowed to continue. The Matron of the Royal Adelaide Hospital earlier this year was quoted as saying that, because of a staff shortage, there were 100 vacant beds in the north and east wings. Such a shortage can be brought about only because of discontent at wage rates and conditions. Although many hospital beds are unoccupied, the nursing staff is still over-committed. The nurses are working excessive hours. Many trainees and nursing aides are being asked to accept responsibilities for which they are not trained. This is threatening the standard of patient care. In an award increase this year, \$104 was taken away in increased board. How can this be justified? I have touched only briefly on the nurses' problem. There is much more one can say. However, the previous Government, although aware of many of these problems, did nothing to improve the situation.

I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition considered that this new Government would not be as foolish as the last Labor Government. It appears to me that the Leader of the Opposition himself, when Premier, was the one who was foolish because it was he who put his members' heads on the chopping block knowing that his Party would be better suited to fight an election on one issue alone—the Dartmouth dam. However, the people of South Australia on May 30 tidied up any thought that the present Leader of the Opposition had of fooling the people into voting his Party into office. The trade union movement has never gained any benefit for its members from approaches to L.C.L. Premiers or Ministers. Let us take the Workmen's Compensation Act and the number of submissions put forward by the unions for benefits under that Act that they were always refused, especially cover while travelling to and from work. However, it is interesting to note that it took a Labor Government to give the workers of this State what they required. Of course, it will be a Labor Government that will further improve the Workmen's Compensation Act and, I hope, make it one of the best in Australia.

Let us look at the approaches made to the previous Government for increased service pay to Government employees. The submissions amounted to nothing. Many Liberal supporters during the campaign said that the L.C.L. stood to benefit all classes of the community, including the working class; but they were only kidding themselves. We have heard so much about fair play. I ask the members of the

Opposition: what kind of fair play did they introduce when they sidetracked the previous Labor Government's intention of appointing an inspector under the Shearers Accommodation Act?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): In supporting this motion, I should like, first of all, to make a few statements with which I think everyone will agree. Every member sympathizes with His Excellency and Lady Harrison on his recent poor health. We hope he is shortly to be restored to full health and will be able to carry on his duties in every way. He has had a particularly difficult time with his health, and unfortunately Lady Harrison, too, has had some illness. In the time they have been able to travel about South Australia, they have made a great impression by the dignity of their deportment and their friendliness.

I, too, congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to office. I am confident that you will uphold the traditions of the Chair. The Opposition has a special interest in the impartiality of a Speaker. It does not demand of a Speaker that he be completely free of any kind of political bias when it comes to making up his mind on casting votes and that sort of thing, but we believe he is a valuable and important safeguard for free speech in Parliament. Therefore, it is an important office for the people of the State. To the Ministers in carrying out their duties I offer my best wishes. I think that people in the community do not always appreciate just how hard Ministers have to work. In fact, at times they do not appreciate that members of Parliament, either, have to work hard. However, Ministers are under a heavy strain at times and they deserve support and all the help possible in carrying out their duties, so as to ensure that they are not given an unfair burden of work. In regard to the choice of Ministers, there is not one who I would say does not have a conscientious outlook and who will not do the very best he is capable of doing in carrying out his duties.

Having said that, I am by no means satisfied with the way in which members opposite have acted recently as an Opposition; nor am I completely satisfied with their actions, as a Government, since coming into office. I am particularly dissatisfied with the way in which the Government assumed office. By switching from its previous attitude to the Dartmouth-Chowilla situation, the Government voted in this House for something that it knows it cannot achieve and has aligned itself firmly with

what is known as the two-dam policy; "contemporaneously" is the word which I think the Government itself uses in this respect. I doubt that the Government has a care in the world about the present water situation. The Government is hoping that, by its other activities, people will gently forget about the critical situation that may develop in South Australia if we do not ratify the agreement, which is prepared for us and which every other Parliament involved has already ratified. It is a bad situation that is complicated by the difficulties experienced as a result of the attitude of the former Speaker who, as everyone knows, was an Independent and whose actions were, to say the least, not always predictable. It is the case of a person who spoke too much and, I think, too often. I believe the major difficulty arose during March, 1969, when the former Speaker addressed a meeting at Loxton. I wish to quote from an article in the *Advertiser* which, I think, gives the key to the difficulties facing Mr. Stott in this respect, as follows:

Mr. Corcoran said at Millicent yesterday that the following exchange was tape-recorded at a meeting at Loxton on Thursday:

Mr. Stott: Do you want me to vote against Dartmouth even if it is a no-confidence vote in the Government?

Voices: Yes.

Mr. Stott: All right, I will.

Mr. Corcoran called for Parliament to assemble to put Mr. Stott's alleged new attitude to the vote.

Members can see Mr. Corcoran's helpful attitude in this matter, of course, to have the issue resolved. The article then states:

Mr. Stott yesterday denied having said the words attributed to him. Asked how he would vote if the Government declared the Dartmouth Bill to be a vital measure, he said, "That is up to the Government."

I will not quote any more of that article; but it is a case of Mr. Stott's having talked a good deal on this matter and of having got into a difficult situation over it. What was the position facing the previous Government regarding this matter? The previous Government had honestly concluded that the Dartmouth dam was the proper solution to our future water problems; it did not deny that the Chowilla dam was a valuable project, but it believed that Dartmouth was a better project for the State to adopt at the time. The previous Government signed an agreement with the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of the two other States concerned (New South Wales and Victoria), proposing that the Dartmouth dam be built. This agreement included, among other things, an undertaking that each Government would put the

question to its Parliament in the current session or next session of Parliament: if Parliament did not happen to be sitting at the time, the matter would be considered in the next session.

The Hall Government was faced with a situation wherein this agreement had been signed and ratified by all Parliaments concerned, except that South Australia had not ratified its part of the agreement. I think it is a tremendous tribute to the Leader of the Opposition in that, as Premier, he decided that he would not run away from a problem such as this: he did the honest, straightforward thing and put the question to Parliament, thereby doing what many people approved of. The result is well known. The previous Government was faced with two amendments to the relevant Bill, both amendments being extremely important because they sought completely to alter the sense of the agreement. One amendment was an Opposition amendment, which I will not need to trouble about but which was defeated; the other was an amendment moved by the then Speaker which the Labor Opposition decided to support and which was a complete contradiction of what it had previously been advocating.

By its support of that amendment, this Government is saddled with an attitude that I do not think it can live up to. In any case, we have since heard virtually nothing about this matter. For several months, every Parliament involved, except the South Australian Parliament, has had this agreement ratified, and here is the one Parliament which stands to benefit more greatly from the agreement than would any other Parliament but which is still not taking up the matter. The Premier says he is going to renegotiate the agreement, but judging from public statements made about this matter I think very little encouragement of this action seems to be emanating from the other States. We have heard very little about it. Time is passing, and the whole project should be operating before the end of the decade. Yet no progress whatever can be reported at present. During this session the Opposition will be asking for some results to be shown. The Government will be under close scrutiny in the conduct of its affairs both from within and from without Parliament. In this House the Opposition will watch the Government as an Opposition should. We will criticize it when we think the Government is going wrong and we will demand at the same time the proper consideration and facilities that an Opposition should receive.

L

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What do you mean by "facilities"?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister has been sitting there, and he asks me a question that will obviously be answered in the next sentence. So, why bother to ask it? The reply the Minister is so anxious to receive is that by "facilities" I mean anything that will help the Opposition to decide its attitude on the questions that come before Parliament. I shall give one example of an occasion when the Opposition did not receive co-operation. The Opposition in this House has no representation on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. The Opposition has received very unsatisfactory treatment from the Government in respect of this matter.

When this matter was debated recently, we were told that, because there were more people from our side in the other place on the committee, we should not have any representatives from here. The Premier brushed aside our complaints by saying we were making a sham fight. He said that he had been unable to get agreement in 1965 and that he could not obtain it now. He then said that the Opposition was making a sham fight. However, the sham was on the Premier's side: that was a sham because the Premier had not tried to get agreement with the other place.

Although he said, "We could get no undertaking of any kind, nor can we now", he had not tried to get agreement. In the other place a question was asked of the Chief Secretary, who said that, as far as he knew, no approach had been made. I followed up the matter in this House by asking the Premier a question the next day about this statement. The Premier did not deny it, but he said that he had had discussions, but those discussions took place (he did not say this, but I know it now) after he had made that statement. So, when the Premier said that the Opposition was making a sham fight, he got out of it by making a mis-statement to this House, and we do not appreciate it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What have you done to persuade Liberal members in the Upper House to allow a Labor member of that place to be a member of the committee?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister is asking me questions that, frankly, I am not interested in answering at present. His question is completely outside the criticism that I am making. My criticism is about the way the Premier treated the Opposition, and

I will not accept statements about sham fights when we find that he did not tell the truth in his explanation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have not answered my question.

Mr. Coumbe: The Minister is living up to his old reputation of asking questions and answering them himself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Government has shown that it is aggressive. For example, the Minister of Works, without any provocation whatever and before Parliament had sat for one day, said that the previous Government had concealed Engineering and Water Supply Department assessments made by the Valuation Department. It was so silly: he had obviously completely missed a statement that had appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser* a month or two earlier. It was a silly error, and the Minister of Works very wisely dropped the matter as soon as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out his error. However, it is not good for a Government to commence by making that sort of aggressive statement. A Government has enough work to do in answering the Opposition when it criticizes the Government. A Government that sets out to attack the Opposition without provocation is either very touchy or in danger of getting itself into much trouble by being over-eager, as the Minister of Works did on that occasion.

The new Government has appointed a press secretary to each Minister; this has involved a new expense for this State, although it is not unique in Australia. The Premier has said that the expense will be met out of savings made through eliminating alleged wasteful expenditure that was undertaken by the previous Government, or something like that. However, he has not pointed out where the savings will be made. I can only say that the Government will be closely watched by the Opposition on this matter, too. I know some of the press secretaries personally, and I have a very high regard for them. I believe they will carry out their duties very well, but I will be interested to see what duties they have to perform, whether those duties relate to mere propaganda or to useful information that will benefit the State, and whether those duties relate to issues that the Opposition wishes to debate in this House. I can see that there is benefit in having an efficient and highly qualified press secretary for each Minister but I can see, too, that if the system gets out of hand, it can be bad

for the Opposition, and it can also embarrass the Government.

In a propaganda sense, the Government could be over-exposed, which would not help it in the long run. We have seen what has happened to Governments that have appeared to have the wind blowing their way completely. In England, the Labor Government appeared to be an odds-on favourite to win the last election, but it was tipped out. Its defeat could be due partly at least to over-exposure by its publicity organizations. I do not blame the Government here for wanting to put its ideas forward through press secretaries: I can see some merit in this. However, I point out that there could also be a danger. The outcome will depend mainly on the instructions given by the Government to these officers.

Since coming to office, the Government has set out continually to make a bitter assault on the Commonwealth Government generally and on Mr. Gorton in particular, and this is something with which I strongly disagree. The Government has pulled no punches, and it has lost no opportunity to blacken the Prime Minister, if it could possibly do so.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: We've only been saying what many of your members have been thinking.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I can see that this process will be carried on for a long time yet, and its origin is purely political. By far the most vocal member in this respect is the Premier who, before he went to the Premiers' Conference, insulted the Commonwealth Government, as he did while he was at the conference, and yet on returning he complained about the bad treatment he had received (I think "lousy" was the word he used). Almost the first thing he said on coming to office was, "Oh well, the Commonwealth will have to be brought to heel." He has thrown insults effectively at the Commonwealth. He has not come out of the Canberra conference nearly as badly as he would like us to believe. He will continue in this way.

I want to deal with matters that are perhaps slightly outside the ambit of this Parliament and, in doing so, I want to compliment the Prime Minister on the job he is doing. In this House, we do not (or should not) deal with foreign policy or national security, but we have been caused to think about these matters as a result of the Premier's attitude in regard to National Service. The Prime Minister, who is being blackened, has the enormous responsibility of defending Australia's security against forces both within and outside

the country. I believe he is doing a good job. We can make and have made plenty of criticisms of the Commonwealth Government, but at least we have tried to see the problem that that Government is up against. When the Commonwealth is trying to deal with inflation, it is easy for the Premier to say, "Give us special relief in South Australia because it is particularly tough on us." When the Commonwealth is trying to defend the country by buying equipment, it is easy for the States to say, without the slightest thought of the costs being undertaken by the Commonwealth, "We want more money." The Commonwealth Government has these responsibilities.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall never tell the Commonwealth Government, "We want you to provide funds to this State in competition with funds that are to be spent on the defence of the country." There has been much fun and clamour about the defence expenditure of the Commonwealth Government and there has been much criticism of the kinds of weapons that Government has ordered. Some of those criticisms may be justified and some may not but the point is that the Commonwealth Government alone has the responsibility for defence, and defence is more important than the requirements of the individual States and we must be careful to ensure that that defence is not undermined in any way and that the Commonwealth Government's foreign policy is maintained.

The Australian Government's record in New Guinea is marvellous and a credit to it that is recognized throughout the world. True, there is criticism in the United Nations, but obviously only from biased sources. Every honourable member has heard unbiased observers praising the Commonwealth Government's record, and the Prime Minister, who is so unpopular with members of the present Government here, is responsible for maintaining our defences and for maintaining order in New Guinea. It is easy for Mr. Whitlam to go to New Guinea, stir up dissident tribes there, and leave the problem for Mr. Gorton to solve. Mr. Whitlam addressed the dissident tribes in New Guinea and visited their leaders, who were in gaol at the time, and praised those leaders and insulted the white settlers there. Whether some were good and some bad, he insulted them indiscriminately, then returned home, leaving a problem that is much more difficult to solve as a result.

On issues of this sort, I am with the Prime Minister and I am against the blackening of his name. I am also with the Commonwealth Government on National Service. Australia has no more serious problem to face than its protection against forces either overseas or inside its shores, and National Service is surely the most tolerant requirement that any country could devise, as it has proper release provisions for conscientious objectors. Our National Service Act is one of the most tolerant and moderate laws that could have been devised, yet the Premier of this State is on record as saying that he would defy it.

How will we in this State get on when the Premier is faced with people who are defying the law? A newspaper photograph shows a Mr. Manolas, a Virginia market gardener, wielding an axe to threaten anyone who comes on his property to install a water meter. How can this man be answered, when the Premier of the State said that he would defy the National Service Act? What will happen to the national defence of this country? We must not assume that we would have the luxury of having one year, two years or three years to prepare for a war in the future. That is what has happened in the past. Australia has never been under immediate threat at the beginning of a war, but we may well find ourselves under immediate threat at the beginning of another conflict. Naturally, nobody would expect us to be able to defend ourselves against any super power without assistance but there is, nevertheless, a tremendous need for a proper defence system, which can be maintained only by people observing the National Service Act, which is, providing trained young men to defend our shores. We would rather have those young men to defend us, trained as they are and properly equipped with expensive equipment, than have them trying to repel tanks in streets and all that sort of thing which we know has happened in eastern Europe.

Many people in this community were shocked by the Premier's statement, and the members sitting behind the Government front bench know it. They know very well that there are large national groups in this country who have experienced what we know about only as an academic experience—loss of freedom. Those people are particularly disturbed about the Premier's attitude.

Mr. Langley: Oh, come on! ...

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In my opinion (and I am not modifying my statement in any way) what the Premier has done in saying that he would defy the National Service Act as a young man eligible for national service is shameful. I shall not listen to the prating of the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) who knows that what I am saying is true and sincere. He should be agreeing with it, but he is a political type of person and all he is doing is acting like a parrot and saying some things that I cannot hear and am not particularly interested in, anyway. The fact is that the Premier has done the wrong thing in saying what he did; he has not pleased many people in our community.

I want now to talk about the members who moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. They made speeches with which I think they can be satisfied, from their own point of view, and I commend them. The member for Spence (Mr. Crimes) and I, incidentally, have something in common: we have both been opposed at elections by the same man. Mr. Rieck opposed me, too, when he stood as an Independent. I endorse what the member for Spence says, that he is a gentlemanly man and a good honest opponent. The Attorney-General, naturally, as one would expect of a man who has been put into the Government straight away, made a competent and sincere speech. Many of the things he said were sound, but I did not appreciate one point he made when he was outlining the evils that our present law can get people into: he used as an example an organization of which South Australia can be proud. He instanced the situation regarding Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated, a situation which he said should be remedied, and went on to criticize it. I agree that his criticism was not in strong terms, but the Attorney-General has held up that organization as being one that would offer old people, who have little or no possibility of obtaining legal advice, an agreement that was quite inferior to an agreement they already had. It was to be inferred from his statement that the organization was in some way trying to mislead the elderly people or was giving them a poor kind of deal.

The Aged Cottage Homes organization has received much criticism in the past from one particular quarter: the Labor Party at election times. The organization has housed over 500 old people, and these old people live happily in circumstances in which they enjoy peace of mind, but at election times meetings have been held arousing their feelings and raising fears

and doubts in their minds regarding the treatment they have been receiving from the organization. Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated was established as a result of the activities of the Pensioners League, one of the leading lights in the organization being Sir Keith Wilson, who is one of the most unselfish and most active voluntary social workers this State has ever known.

Mr. Millhouse: The Attorney-General knows that, too.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is a charitable organization that started in 1951, its purpose being to provide homes for aged married couples and single persons so as to give them security in the latter years of their life. The then Prime Minister (Sir Robert Menzies), who, in 1953, laid the foundation stone in the first block of four flats of this establishment, was extremely impressed with the aims and activities of the organization. Largely as a result of that impression, he implemented Commonwealth legislation to provide a subsidy for this type of organization. That subsidy at one stage was provided on a \$1 for \$1 basis, and it is now a \$2 for \$1 subsidy, so the Commonwealth has a two-thirds interest in the capital outlay in connection with these homes.

The Chairman of the organization (Sir Keith Wilson) and the members give their time voluntarily and never draw anything from the fund that exists. The only thing to be considered in their case is the work and the amount of time they contribute to the organization. Although Sir Keith Wilson did not ask me to say this, I happen to know that he and Lady Wilson have over the years given more money to the organization than anyone here may imagine: they have donated \$11,000 to it. Therefore, it can be seen that the organization could scarcely be written off as being one that would work against the interests of old people or one that was careless in offering old people new contracts in place of old ones.

Although I am not a lawyer, I believe that what these old people have been offered represents a great advance on what they had in the first place. In fact, basically the agreement to which the elderly people concerned were parties was an agreement drawn up by the Commonwealth Social Services Department. Over the years, in the view of the Social Services Department, it became necessary to change that agreement. It was put to these people that they could change the agreement for a new one if they wished, but they were not

forced to change. They were given a letter setting out why they should change. I will not read the letter now.

Mr. McKee: Read the letter: it is important.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I would like to make my own speech in my own way. The organization set out an offer for the old people to change from one agreement to another. Under the original agreement the tenants had the responsibility of paying for rates and taxes and repairs. In return for that, they paid \$1 a week security to the organization, to cover those costs. As time went on that payment became inadequate, and the obligation to maintain those flats in good repair fell upon the tenants. Under the new agreement they were relieved of that obligation. They were to pay \$1.50 a week plus 20 per cent of any increase in the pension or supplementaries, and the obligation of paying rates and taxes and maintaining those flats was to be taken over by the organization. That was the basis of the change. Most of the 550 tenants are happy. The organization has had trouble in only five cases, in connection with which it has had to seek a solicitor's assistance to obtain payments.

The Hon. L. J. King: Aren't they losing their rights to stay in the flats?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Some of the flats that are the property of this organization are falling into disrepair and it has had to move on some of the tenants (I think in only five cases). One case actually reached court and was settled only a few days ago. In most cases these people have security and peace of mind—except at election time, when people come along and make speeches to them. I do not appreciate the way in which it was done. The Attorney-General has made a few statements about the change from one kind of agreement to another and about the way in which some of these people have allegedly lost their rights. I point out that what happened was that the people who have changed from one kind of agreement to another no longer have the obligation to maintain those flats and to pay rates and taxes. I could spend much time in reading those forms of agreement so that members could understand the details. I could read copies of the letters written to the tenants, but I am satisfied that the board has been working, in its own mind, in the best interests of the tenants and, to my way of thinking, it has certainly served the tenants well.

The Chief Secretary recently wrote to the board asking for a conference, which was

held yesterday. The Attorney-General was present at the conference. The Chief Secretary asked—and put in writing—two things of the organization. First, he asked that occupants who had signed the original form of agreement and subsequently converted to a rental agreement should be given an opportunity to reconsider their decision. It was suggested that some arrangements should be made for them to have independent advice and to have the facts explained to them so that there could be no doubt that they were clear as to the full implications of the decision. This form of agreement was supplied to people by the Commonwealth Social Services Department, which would not want any other form of agreement, and it must be remembered that it is paying two-thirds of the capital cost of the buildings.

I spoke to the Chairman of the board, who told me that it was doubtful whether the Commonwealth Government would agree to any change. However, the organization will write to the Chief Secretary. Although I do not have the final draft, the letter will be something like the following: if the Chief Secretary supplies names of any occupants who claim that they were pressured into signing the new agreement or who would not have signed had they received legal advice, and if the Chief Secretary submits a request in writing from such occupants to revert to the original agreement, together with an undertaking to make up the costs which have accumulated, the board will consider allowing them to revert to the old agreement. That is the form of the reply that the Chairman is thinking about at the moment.

The Hon. L. J. King: I hope that, for the sake of negotiations, he has second thoughts.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: After discussion with the board, the letter will be written. However, I have been authorized to say what I have said. The second thing the Chief Secretary has said is that the complaints that have been made about increases in rent should be dealt with by the appointment by the Government of an appropriate officer to look into the financial basis of the increase, the board to place at the disposal of this officer such information as he may require. The object of this suggestion is that the Government officer should satisfy himself as to the justification for the increases so as to be able to satisfy the occupants on this point. The board does not agree that the State has any rights in this matter, as the Commonwealth has put up about two-thirds of the

money. Over the years, the Chief Secretary has received audited statements from which he could easily see the costs involved and that there was nothing wrong with the charges being made.

The Hon. L. J. King: Under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, the State issues the licence under which this money is collected from the public.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What I am pointing out is that this organization is working under Commonwealth law with Commonwealth money, and the State is not contributing anything to it. In those circumstances, why should the State ask for investigations to be made, for the agreement to be changed, and so on? I do not hold with what the State is doing. I believe Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated should be left to deal with the Commonwealth Social Services Department, from which a large part of its funds comes. Most of these people are happy and have peace of mind. I think that only bad can come from criticism such as the Attorney-General has made. He did not even ask the organization for its side of the story. He simply held it up as an example of something that was wrong and ought to be corrected.

The Hon. L. J. King: I did not say that, but you are convincing me from what you say.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although he did not use the word "evil", he pointed to the problems of people who do not have easy access to legal advice and then used them as an example. When I asked him what explanation the board had given him for this apparent injustice, he was unable to tell me, because he had not been to the board and he had not asked the board about this. No doubt he had been in touch with some of the few people who were unhappy. When I asked him the names of those people, he said that there were many people at the meeting. I can say that most of them are happy. I hope this matter will be handled very much more gently by the Attorney-General than it has been in the past. This organization, which at great cost in time to itself is setting out to help these people, should be supported and encouraged, not harried by speeches in the House containing information from one side only such as the Attorney-General gave us in his maiden speech. In that respect only am I criticizing his speech. I did not agree with everything he said, but in other ways I found that it was a commendable speech.

One other matter that he mentioned (and every member on the Government side who

has spoken has mentioned it) rather surprised me, and that is that members of the Government are still not satisfied with the electoral redistribution. Not one of them has ever given one atom of credit (I would not expect any of them to do so) to the man who brought this about. More than anyone else, the Leader of the Opposition brought this electoral redistribution into force, and not once has anybody on the Government side admitted that. When one hears Government members say that the electoral system is still unjust, one wonders just how far they want to go. It shakes me to think that they are still unhappy about the redistribution and still think that it is not fair. I can tell them that people in the State, generally at least, think that it is a fair redistribution.

I expect from His Excellency's Speech that there will be quite serious attacks upon capital in this State. This Government, which is setting out to attract industry, must realize (and it will realize one day) that to attract industry it has to attract persons, for industry is not something that is impersonal. If the Government intends to attack capital by means of greater succession duties and other capital taxation, it will discourage people from coming to this State. The only way we can attract industry here and get it to prosper is to have industrialists coming to this State because it is a State in which they want to live and because they feel they are living under a moderate Government that ensures that their costs are kept within reasonable limits.

The poor old M.A.T.S. plan, which was so good, is now to be pulled to pieces again by yet another expert. The people, who we thought would at least know who would be affected and who would not, are now to be left once more in a state of uncertainty. Many properties have been purchased, and the lines on the photographic maps in the M.A.T.S. plan now mean less than before because no-one knows who is to be affected. If we are to understand anything from the Minister's answers today (and there is little one can understand from them), Dr. Breuning is to be told of Government policy and then is to make some sort of recommendation having in mind what the Government's policy is. If in the short time he will be in South Australia he can find out what is Government policy, he is a brilliant man, because no one else seems to know. The Government has changed its mind on the M.A.T.S. plan more than on anything else and the history of the plan is bad and a terrible disappointment to the people of South

Australia, who consider that the Adelaide area should be a place of free traffic movement. However, Adelaide will be like the Saragossa Sea, with no movement between industries and people unable to get to and from work. The M.A.T.S. plan was not only a freeway plan but a balanced public transport plan, but, although we do not know for certain, it seems that the plan will be backed away from. If Mr. Breuning can help, I hope he acts quickly, because we know that travelling on freeways is three times or four times safer than is travelling on other roads, and we want something done about the lack of movement in our city and the increasing road toll. I am sorry that the problems of the rural industry are so severe and, naturally, people on the land are most disturbed about the position. Although I will listen to everything that is said at the rural march tomorrow, I do not agree with the criticism of the Prime Minister for not sending a Minister to Adelaide. He was asked to send a Minister to the march and said some weeks ago that he could not do so, because the Budget discussions were in progress. Recently, when asked again he sent this telegram:

In reference to your further letter of June 22 as stated in my letter of June 16 all Ministers will be in Canberra engaged in pre-Budget discussion. I therefore regret that I am unable to nominate a representative to speak at the march.

That is the reply from the Prime Minister, but his attitude has been described by the use of unpleasant epithets about arrogance and so on. Every Minister must be in Canberra this week. Cabinet commenced discussions last Monday morning and probably will be meeting until Friday night. If reports are correct, Cabinet will consider many submissions from primary industry asking for assistance. The Minister for Primary Industry should be in his place in Cabinet for these Budget discussions doing what he can to solve the many problems, not at marches, listening to grievances. I thank members for their hearing and have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I, too, support the motion and I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to that office. I also congratulate my good friend the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. I also congratulate the other members who have spoken in this debate. The member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman), who has just resumed his seat, is my next-door neighbour geographically. Before the dinner adjournment the honourable member referred to the appointment of

press secretaries. I suggest that he ask his Liberal and Country Party colleagues in the other States how the system works there. The *Advertiser* of July 11 of this year reports that in New South Wales the Premier has four press secretaries and that the other 15 Cabinet Ministers each have one. The Leader of the Opposition there also has a press secretary. In Queensland, the Premier and seven other Ministers have press secretaries. In Western Australia, the Government has a sort of contract system with public relations firms; and the Government pays the bill. One wonders whether the information given to the honourable member by the Liberal Party Governments in those States would be all that efficacious, because one wonders why these communications could not allow a Liberal backbencher to be here tomorrow for the rural march. I congratulate the member for Glenelg (Mr. Mathwin) on his maiden speech. In a local government sense, I was one of his constituents for some years and I pay a tribute to his services to the community. I congratulate the member for Bragg (Dr. Tonkin) on his concern for social welfare. I think he will find this Government rather more sympathetic to some of the points of view he put than the Government which he aspired to sit behind.

I stand here and find myself hoary with age, so old in fact that I could have been elected for a seat in another place. This is something that some honourable gentlemen present could not do at the moment. I refer to the members for Eyre (Mr. Gunn) and Playford (Mr. McRae) and certain other honourable gentlemen who have been considerable ornaments to this place down through the years who also would have been denied this at the time they were first elected to Parliament had they been elected to that place. I refer to the member for Mitcham, who was 25 years of age at the time of his first election, and the present Premier, who was 26. I refer also to the late Sir Robert Nicholls, who was 25 when first elected to this House in 1915; also Mr. Hawke, sometime Premier of Western Australia, who first graced this House in 1924 at the ripe old age of 23; and the late E. G. Theodore, who was first elected to the Queensland Lower House in 1909 at the age of 24 and who in 10 years' time was Premier of that State. Just to round off the story, we remember that Pitt the Younger was 24 when he was Prime Minister of Great Britain. All these honourable gentlemen, it may be said of their

first election, would have been denied a seat in our Upper House because of their youth, and this has always been regarded by me as a most extraordinary provision in our State Constitution.

It is difficult for a new member to decide exactly what subject he should address himself to when he first gets up in this House. I have tried wherever possible to choose topics that may be avoided or not extensively referred to by honourable members. Like the member for Bragg, I pay a tribute to the gentleman after whom my own constituency is named. Mawson encompasses the southern end of the metropolitan area. I pay a tribute to Sir Douglas Mawson after whom the electorate is named. Mawson was a graduate of Sydney University, where he studied under the geologist Sir Edgeworth David. He was attracted to this State by Professor Howchin's reports of ancient glacial rock formations in the Adelaide Hills. In Adelaide he associated with Sir William Bragg and Sir Charles Todd. Truly, one might echo the words of the Scriptures—"there were giants in the earth in those days." The pre-Cambrian bedrock, which forms the core of the Mount Lofty and Flinders Ranges, was his special interest and he was the first in Australia to identify radium-bearing ore. In 1903, Mawson made the first thorough going scientific survey of the New Hebrides and four years later accompanied the Shackleton expedition into Antarctica as surveyor, cartographer and magnetician. Mawson and two others reached the South Magnetic Pole and were the first men to do so. In the following years he set up radio bases in the south, wrote *Home of the Blizzard* and was Professor of Geology at Adelaide University from 1920 to 1952. He led the Banzare expedition in 1929-30 and was made a foundation fellow of the Australian Academy of Science in 1954.

Our knowledge of the uranium-bearing ores of Mount Painter and Radium Hill, of the physiographic history of Lake Eyre and the stratigraphy of the Moorlands coalfields is richer because of Mawson's pioneering work. I was in a lecture room of students who, in 1958, stood in silence to honour the passing of a great man. This biographical circumlocution may seem at first sight to be little connected with the contents of the document we are considering here this evening, but Mawson epitomizes the sort of pioneering scientific spirit which must inform all governmental programmes. We

only progress as we unlock the secrets of nature, as we push back the frontiers of knowledge. Treasures are there to be wrested from the earth, sea, and even the air. I therefore welcome paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech, which states:

Encouragement and assistance will be given in the discovery, development and exploitation of the mineral resources of South Australia and the Mining Act will be revised and modernized to ensure that complete and exhaustive surveys (both geochemical and geophysical) are made of our mineral potential, while protecting the rights of small prospectors and miners. Steps have already been taken towards the establishment in South Australia of the Australian Minerals Foundation which will make South Australia the centre of mining studies for the whole of Australia and this project is supported by my Government.

The discovery of copper at Kapunda and at the Burra in the last century put South Australia on the map and, indeed, rescued the Wakefield scheme from disaster. Rich mineral discoveries in the West in recent years have rescued the nation from a balance of payments crisis. News from the North of this State in recent weeks reminds us that only a few years ago talk of inland oil discoveries was satirized as being the product of the occasional abandoned jeep with a leaky crankcase. Our vast inland covers great treasures. We were once the continent's granary; we may yet become its quarry. In the West, such a development has meant a bonanza for a few. For the rest, it has been mainly rising prices, especially in respect of land.

I ask of the potential South Australian minerals boom that its fruits be widely and equally shared and that due regard be given to conserving the treasures above the surface while the minerals below are being commercially exploited. I commend the Premier's interest in research as embodied in his policy speech. This, of course, applies to the manufacturing as much as to the extractive sector. We expect to see the outgrowth of such things as an economic resources survey, market research, and an industrial research institute at my own campus (Flinders University) as the Government's policy is given legislative and administrative effect.

If we claim the scientific adventurousness of men such as Mawson as part of our modern heritage, we claim also the heritage of the great social reformers and thinkers who have been associated with the drive for humanity in legislation and for a narrowing of the gap between those who have and those who have not.

Eighty years ago, this drive (this crusade welling up from the hearts of the masses, stung into action by the industrial upheavals of the depression of the 1890's) brought into being the Australian Labor Party. Labor's first great success was the return in 1891 of 36 members to the New South Wales Legislative Assembly, a number sufficiently great to hold the balance of power between the two older, though hardly well-established, groups. One of the early Labor leaders, George Black, got up in the Legislative Assembly and uttered the historic words which remain the *raison d'être* of Labor in politics, as follows:

We have not come into this House . . . to make or unmake Ministries. We have not come into this House to support Governments or Oppositions. We have come into this House to make and unmake social conditions . . . I say quite clearly that there have been individuals in and even sections of the Labor movement that have from time to time lost sight of this fact, yet it is as relevant to our presence here today as it was then to Black. We are here not to administer but to transform. We still have slums; free education is a beach-head only partly held; the poor still live in fear of illness and with the burden of paying for their treatment; and the plutocracy still goes largely untrammelled.

Black was speaking as part of a polity which, though colonial in status, had both the appearance and reality of sovereignty. It collected its own customs duties and taxes, and the yoke of Westminster rested lightly. All this has changed. The 1901 Constitution, the end of the Braddon clause in 1909, Commonwealth income tax from the Second World War onwards, the 1920 High Court decision which allowed State instrumentalities no immunity from Commonwealth awards, the Loan Council of 1927 and uniform taxation in 1942 have all tended to centralize power and to withdraw from the States their sovereignty.

I do not deplore these developments. I am for union, not Federation; and if the present strains in the Commonwealth should force us to update what is essentially a 19th century document, then they are strains we should welcome. But the question remains: what of significance remains within the ambit of the State Governments? Was the last State election of any greater importance to the long-range aims of the Labor and progressive movement generally than, say, the recent poll for the Adelaide City Council? I believe it was. We can still determine our own priorities in public spending. We legislate on many matters of

urgent concern to the ordinary citizen—town planning, pollution control, criminal law and civil liberties. We administer over wide fields where changes of emphasis in the administration of an Act can be as thorough-going as a review of the Act itself.

Town planning is an area in respect of which much reform is needed. It is good, then, to know that the Government plans to provide additional finance and staff for the work of the State Planning Authority, that wholesale subdivision of the hills face zone will be prevented, that people will be attracted back to the city square mile, and that additional open-space areas will be acquired. Intimately connected, of course, with the planning of how and where people are to live is the planning of how to move them from place to place. Eight years ago the town planning committee produced its development plan proposals for the metropolitan area of Adelaide. The committee had at its disposal excellent people, but the approach adopted was too restricted. It made the only assumptions that it could reasonably make under its term of reference (namely, that people would continue to live in much the same way as they then lived, and that there would be few changes in the way that people moved around).

The committee produced less a plan than an extrapolation—a prediction—of what Adelaide would be like with very little planning. The report took little account of the possibilities of medium-density and high-density housing or of the extension, except in a limited way, of the existing public transport system and none at all of the new forms of public transport. I offer none of this as a criticism of the committee's work: the report was very valuable, because it showed clearly what a largely *laissez faire* approach in this area will produce. It points in one direction, but there is no imperative for us to move that way for, of all the areas in which a *laissez faire* approach will bring disaster, the urban environment is surely the most obvious example.

"M.A.T.S." (to use the vernacular) is something else again. The town planning report should be regarded as a document, a challenge, or a precautionary tale. M.A.T.S. demanded a decision. It contained some very good ideas. Its authors knew what they were doing. He who begins with the presuppositions of the M.A.T.S. Report will end up with the M.A.T.S. Report, but the presuppositions of the

M.A.T.S. Report were those of the town planning report and suffer from the same limitations. The Government has called for a review of the M.A.T.S. Report. I hope that, when the implementation of such a review is considered, the Government will judge it from the viewpoint of a truly planned city. I hope that in our approach to redevelopment we will listen to those who designed the redevelopment scheme for Kensington. This matter is set out in an article in the No. 4, 1965, edition of *Building and Architecture*. The article states: The following broad aims were decided upon:

- (1) To show that high population density can be achieved without the evils generally attributed to it; such as loss of privacy, inadequate recreation and park space, and traffic congestion.
- (2) To illustrate how a variety of types of dwellings may be used in one neighbourhood.
- (3) To provide a residential neighbourhood largely self-sufficient.
- (4) To show that the motor vehicle need not dominate, while still providing for vehicular access.

The present population of Kensington is approximately 1,200 persons (approximately 10 persons per acre). The redevelopment plan provides for approximately three times that number, with a density of about 35 persons per acre.

This population would be housed in three basic types of dwelling—single-storied courtyard houses, two-storied terrace houses and multi-storied flat buildings.

A study of the planning of the courtyard and row houses was made, and typical general plans of these types are illustrated.

It can be seen that the degree of privacy attained is better than that provided in the conventional single-unit house. Each dwelling has a garage and a high standard of accommodation is provided.

The houses are planned in groups surrounding cul-de-sacs for motor traffic and general access, and large areas of common land adjoin all houses at the rear. It can be seen that no house has access from a main road; all roads within the area have been arranged to discourage all traffic other than that required for the use of its inhabitants. This ensures the reduction of noise, danger and fumes from traffic to a minimum; it allows children to walk to school in safety, makes shopping within the area an enjoyable prospect and generally makes for tranquil social activity.

Adequate planning of the urban environment is something that did not loom large in the writings of the great Socialist theoreticians of the past. Yet those who are working for more egalitarian conditions of life are coming to see more clearly that such planning has a great relevance to their aims. Hugh Stretton in *Ideas for Australian Cities* has done us a great service by articulating many of these aims and methods. The important factors about new

districts are that they be not subdivided before they are needed and that, when they are subdivided, they be planned as a whole. This thinking is in line with developments in the newer parts of Canberra, in Woden Valley and Belconnen. Districts must provide for adequate pedestrian access to shopping and education facilities and open spaces. There must be adequate open spaces to serve a mixture of low, medium and high density housing. Motor travel within districts should be minimized and the separate districts linked by high-speed, low-priced public transport.

Perhaps the most important aspect in all this thinking is the avoidance of economic ghettos, of separate districts of the very wealthy and the very poor. In all Australian cities and, increasingly, on the fringe of their commuter belts, are areas of low-priced and even substandard housing; poorly serviced in respect of schools, medical and legal facilities and assistance for the very old, the very young, and the very hard up. There is too little wealth available locally to meet these needs. The men are away from home over long periods travelling to and from work and working overtime, which provides the extra money to keep their homes going. The women may also work because of the same necessity, so there is a lack of money, time and energy among the local residents to address themselves adequately to these problems. Stretton states:

Whatever their causes, residential segregations are steady and potent enemies of all equalities, including the most sacred and official equalities. Mixed suburbs can distribute municipal services equally to unequal rate-payers, but segregated suburbs make sure the poor get only what they pay for, including, sometimes, the municipal councillors. Segregation usually unequalizes people's access to open spaces, to parks, views, well-kept playgrounds and playing fields, sometimes rivers and beaches. It can often unequalize peace and quiet and fresh air; the poorest districts often need the most but get the least protection from noise and pollution. Segregation sometimes unequalizes the safety of the streets, always their beauty and cleanliness. In some of the big cities it is now unequalizing in the wrong direction the cost of journeys to work. There are also a number of services which plenty of the poor can pay to use individually, but which exclusively poor areas can't collectively attract (commercially) or finance (municipally).

He continues:

Mixture, on the other hand, is one of the simplest, cheapest and least oppressive ways of reducing the effects of other inequalities. If every fourth household is tough and able, that will serve to defend and improve a neighbourhood almost as effectively as if the successful occupy all of it. This is a service the rich

can do for the rest quite painlessly, without there necessarily being any direct neighbourly relations at all. Not as charity, either. A rising proportion of the skills of the rich are developed at heavy public expense: there is a conventional moral case for demanding that the rest of the taxpaying community should get some shares of the services they thus finance. The public expenditure that produces a doctor, lawyer or architect doesn't only produce those specific skills; unavoidably it also produces some more general and diffuse capacity for self-defence and public influence. Residential mixture is one effective way of returning some share of those endowments to the taxpayers who helped to bestow them.

My plea here is for greater controls on and more imaginative development of the urban environment. I applaud the suggestion made in a letter to the press recently, for a State development commission. I urge a closer look at the means whereby a professedly free enterprise Government is developing Canberra along lines of public policy. One final quote from Stretton is as follows:

Radical suburbs ought to be judged by people who live in them. They ought to be judged chiefly by housewives, but they should preferably not be judged by abnormal, meanstested populations. Only two Australian authorities design whole suburbs for normal mixed populations, including volunteers and private buyers as well as public tenants: the Canberra commission and the South Australian Housing Trust. Both should build a wide range of experimental neighbourhoods. They could offer wider choices to the people they serve, and discover some experienced preferences at last. In the nature of things people are unlikely to choose these strange devices "off the plan" without seeing them at work first.

Perhaps today's *Advertiser* should be given the last word in this, for it states:

We spend years on M.A.T.S. plans and barely five minutes on the deliberate development even on such towns as we have.

The third stream flowing over us from the past, the missing piece without which the experimental and redistributive aspects of modern Government I have already referred to are rendered soul-less, is the tradition of liberal (small "l") democracy. For many years this has been at the centre of political controversy in South Australia. Let us rehearse once more what liberal democracy should mean: that all adults have the vote, that these votes are as nearly equal in value as possible, and that in a two-Party system the side obtaining a majority of votes should also obtain a majority of seats in the Legislature. What my Party has had to say about past election results in the light of these principles is well known to all. Here I place before

the House certain facts about the results of the contest from which we have recently emerged in the hope that they may be of some use in future deliberations.

In gauging the performances of the two major Parties, some allowances must be made for the effects of the intervention of minor Party and Independent candidates. Clearly a Country Party candidate takes more votes from the L.C.L., although the results of the Chaffey contest would suggest perhaps not always significantly more than from the A.L.P., whereas the opposite would be true of, say, a Social Credit or Independent Labor candidate. A scrutiny of the second preference votes is the best guide here. Using these principles and using the Commonwealth figures for Kavel where there was not State Labor candidate, one arrives at the following results: the A.L.P. was preferred by 53.8 per cent of those who cast a formal vote and the L.C.L. 46.2 per cent. The A.L.P. won 27 seats. With a similar percentage the L.C.L. would have won 28 seats.

In his Address in Reply speech last week the Leader of the Opposition referred to the system producing "a Government which reflects (in fact more than reflects) the percentage vote of the Labor Party in this community". If by this the Leader was referring only to the normal process whereby in a system of single-member electorates the winner gets a bonus in seats, irrespective of which side wins, then the point is valid though largely empty. If on the other hand he was implying that there was a bias to Labor in the new distribution, then I hope the foregoing facts will have disabused his mind of that notion. I include here also his colleague in another place who, from his speech in the Address in Reply debate, would seem to me to require a crash course in the cube law. Bias against either Party is not the only ground for criticism of our electoral system.

As indicated by the Attorney-General in his maiden speech last week, we have still not attained our ideal of one vote one value. The so-called Dauer-Kelsay index, which expresses the total enrolments in a bare majority of the smaller electorates as a percentage of total enrolments in all electorates, gives us an idea of how representative in a one vote one value sense this House actually is. Obviously, in a strict one vote one value system the index will be slightly in excess of 50 per cent. At the election it was 41 per cent. This is a large-scale improvement on the 23 per cent situation that obtained before the redistribution,

but it is well below the 47 per cent achieved in the re-allocation of Commonwealth boundaries in South Australia recently. It is in fact little above the point at which State Legislatures in the United States of America begin having their legislation rendered invalid by the Supreme Court, and remember that we are dealing with a dynamic and not a static situation.

Of those electoral districts that are growing rapidly, my own is a prime example. The A.L.P.'s submission to the 1969 Electoral Commission included an electorate named Lonsdale which differed only marginally from the eventual Mawson. Stretching to the limit the allowance for changing demography, this district had an enrolment of 13,684. By October, 1972, it was estimated that this would have increased to 21,073 and, by April, 1976, to 31,336. Mawson District, emerged from the redistribution with an enrolment of 14,201 and at the time of the election this year the enrolment had increased to 16,563. In the same period the enrolments in Gouger, Heysen and Frome dropped by 475, 512 and 280 respectively. The enrolment in the Frome District is now down to 8,296. If we are not to return to the pre-redistribution situation, we must establish machinery independent of the political process for the regular redistribution of electoral boundaries. No more than two elections should pass without such a review.

I return to my main point with a quotation from Commonwealth *Hansard* of part of a speech made by Mr. Archdale Parkhill, at one time Postmaster-General and Liberal M.H.R. for Warringah, and any honourable member who knows the North Shore of Sydney will understand that Mr. Parkhill was no supporter of the Labor Party. He said:

I personally am not prepared to accept the principle that the vote of a man in one part of Victoria should carry a greater voting strength than the vote of a man in another part of that State. The citizens of this country should have equal voting strength, and their votes throughout the country should be of equal value.

I have tried to be as constructive as possible in these remarks. I have been conscious of the fact that certain courtesies are afforded new members and to exploit one's immunity from interjection would be, to say the least, unfair. However, since my time for speaking has not yet ended, I feel moved to comment on the recent campaign. The campaign showed, above all else, that the expenditure of large sums of money and the use of pro-

fessional advertising techniques do not necessarily shift significant blocks of votes, that the electorate at large is more closely attached to the cause of civil liberties than some have hoped or feared, and that we are now dealing with a population which is sufficiently sophisticated not to be put off by scare propaganda based on the Communist issue.

My attachment to the first of these three propositions goes further than the fact that, if money did play a significant part in the electoral results, the gentlemen opposite would win every time. I consider that the mass media techniques and the soft sell mean that truth suffers and the *non sequitur* creeps in. It was said, "For two years my Government has been able to balance its Budget and that is why we have been able to spend so much money on . . ." Give that to a first-year class in logic at the university and see what they make of it!

My second point refers to the issue of the appointment of Queen's Counsel. It is one thing to put a political test on a legal appointment but another to boast of it and expect to win votes by that. This is basic and fundamental. There should be no disagreement between political Parties on issues such as this. Would we concede that school-teachers who have militant political affiliations should be denied the opportunity to become senior masters, headmasters and inspectors in their chosen profession? Would we say to militant people, "You will be allowed, irrespective of your education qualifications, to follow only a manual occupation," noble though such occupation may be? I should hope not.

The third point is similar to the second. I am now pleased that the Democratic Labor Party ran its advertisements and that the mysterious sources put up their money. We can now say that they threw the lot at us and we won through. Indeed, we can go further and say to the professional red baiters, "Comb through all the school textbooks if you want to and call for your witch hunts, but you will finish up with a damp squib." I believe the wiser heads in the Liberal Party realize the limitations of such an appeal.

The present Liberal Party was formed in the years during the Second World War, the basis of its formation at the time being its adherence to private enterprise, a rather woolly and nebulous basis but one that served as a real boon to anti-Labor supporters. This rallying point ran up against the quicksands of office after 1949. How could it provide any sort of

standard when the Government, for electoral considerations, was forced to maintain so many Socialist enterprises and the social welfare programme, although allowing it slowly to atrophy? Something else had to be found, and the events of the early 1950's found the issue: it was anti-Communism. The reason for the stagnation that has occurred at the Commonwealth level and in many States of Australia is that they have been ruled by Liberal Governments whose *raison d'être* is a sterile anti-Communism and little more. The Liberal Party is going through a reappraisal right now. For the sake of the improved health of political dialogue in Australia, let us hope that something more constructive emerges.

In conclusion, I join with other honourable members in deploring the continued carnage in Vietnam. I trust that, as the debate on the issue continues in Australia, Australian society will show its willingness to tolerate dissent, because I number myself among the dissenters. I thank the House for its courtesy in listening to me and pledge my co-operation at all times in the proper dispatch of business.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): At the outset, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on attaining the highest honour it is in the power of this House to bestow. As a new member, I have not had the opportunity to get to know you, but from what I have heard I believe you will carry out your duties with that fairness and impartiality which is so necessary in your position.

As member for Flinders I have the honour to follow one of the ablest and most respected men who has sat in this House. Sir Glen Pearson entered this Parliament in 1951, and in the 19 years that he served his electorate and the State he held seven Ministerial portfolios, culminating in his appointment as Treasurer in the previous Government. I mean no reflection on past or present holders of this position when I say that he was undoubtedly one of the ablest Treasurers that this State has seen. Some of the measures he took to restore South Australia to financial equilibrium were not popular, even in his own Party, but he had the courage and integrity to do what he and the Government that he served considered to be necessary.

I feel very humble following a man such as this, but at the same time he has set me an example that it is my ambition to emulate. Too often, a "politician" is taken to mean a man who talks a lot and says nothing, or a man who says one thing and means another, but this could never be said of Sir Glen Pearson. He was what a politician should

be—a man of the highest principles and utmost integrity. And now, after a service to this State that has been fittingly recognized by Her Majesty, he has gone into a well-earned retirement. I am sure that all members of this House, whether politically opposed to him or not, will wish him well in his retirement.

This State, which we are all proud to serve, was settled 134 years ago. Who were these first settlers? They were, in the main, farmers who came to wring from this new and rather harsh land the products of the soil. They braved hostile natives, droughts, and floods and developed South Australia for their descendants. Are we to let this effort over so many years go for nothing? Do not the people who developed this State count at all? No other State has such an overwhelming proportion of its population living in urban developments. Two-thirds of the population of South Australia lives in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Taking all other towns as being urban, only a little over one-sixth of the population can be described as being rural dwellers. And yet this one-sixth of the population provides one-third of the total net value of production and over one-half of the oversea exports. Is this group which has played, and is still playing, such a significant part in the economy of South Australia to continue to lose its voice in the Government of this State? This is exactly what the advocates of one vote one value would have happen. The Attorney-General in his maiden speech made a very strong point of the importance of one vote one value, as did the member for Florey this afternoon. The Attorney-General conceded that far-country areas should have a small loading in their favour. But why should it be only those areas? Where does he draw his line? Far or near-country areas have comparatively sparse populations. This is part and parcel of the size of holdings necessary to make a living. We know that the Attorney-General is not only voicing his own views on this matter: it is his Party's policy. What do Government members want?

As a result of my Party's Government, the electoral boundaries were altered. My Leader is proud of what his Government did in this matter, and he has every reason to be. He put the relevant Bill through the House knowing that, of necessity, it must go against his Party in an election, and events proved this to be so. We now have 28 metropolitan seats and 19 country seats, and a Labor Government with a large majority; and the so-called gerrymander has gone for ever. But has it? It

seems now, from statements made by the Premier and the Attorney-General, that the present Labor Government wishes to introduce a gerrymander that would be far worse than any ever seen. They seem determined that these people, who developed this State and who are now responsible for such a significant part of the economy, will lose the small voice that they have. Again, why do they want to do this? It seems to me a little like kicking a man when he is down.

The farmer is down at the moment (down, but I believe very far from out). But there is no doubt that he needs help at the moment to be allowed to recover, as I know he will. Times are hard now; many farmers have walked off their farms, and many more could be forced to follow. Make no mistake about this: unless conditions for the man on the land improve, and soon, this whole State, city and country alike, will feel the effects. The farmer over recent years has been subjected to heavily increased costs. We may say, "So has all industry", but almost every industry, except farming, has been able to pass most, if not all, of these costs on to its customers. On the other hand, returns to farmers have been dropping at an unprecedented rate. Wool is the classic example of this: we all know the disastrous prices in this year's sales. The price of wheat has not dropped but, because of world over-production and the consequent inability to market all of our wheat, quotas were introduced.

The net result was the same: the farmer's income was seriously curtailed. But his costs were not curtailed; they continued to show the 3 per cent to 5 per cent increase which has been going on for years. In the light of all this, what encouragement is there to remain on the land? We all know of the drift to the city. How we look at this probably depends on our point of view, but the fact remains that, in 1921, 39 per cent of the population lived on the land, and in 1966 it was 17 per cent. Today, it is probably less than that and tomorrow, who knows? I maintain that a group that is responsible for such a large contribution to our economy deserves consideration. Of this large contribution, my own area, as well as that of my colleague the member for Eyre, is responsible for more than its share of rural production. In 1967-68 the Western Division grew 46 per cent of the State's wheat, and it has been over one-third for years. It grows almost one-third of the State's barley, and it has 16 per cent of the State's sheep. All this is achieved with a

comparatively small proportion of the population.

For too long the man in the country (I speak now not only of the farmer but also of people in country towns) has had to make do without the amenities which the city dweller takes for granted. I do not mean only in the fields of entertainment and sport, and so on; these often need large populations to support them. Even so, I believe that Government assistance should be given to enable more entertainment to be taken to country towns, both light and cultural entertainment. But the main thing I wish to speak of at the moment is education. Why should a child, just because his parents choose to make their life in the country, suffer the lack of educational facilities, subjects and courses which his city counterpart takes for granted? Why should parents have to do without so that they can afford to send their children to the city to complete their education?

In the light of present economic conditions in the country the proportion of children sent to boarding schools will be markedly reduced. But I maintain that it should not be necessary, anyway. The country child should be able to receive the same education that the city child receives. I have recently been to several schools in my area; two or three are very good, and some are adequate at the moment, but there are some which are appalling for teacher and student alike. Most of the schools concerned need new amenities to a greater or lesser degree, but there are two which must be replaced as soon as possible. I refer to the Tumby Bay Area School and the Port Lincoln High School. The over-crowding and the sub-standard conditions under which the staffs and students operate make the replacement of the schools essential. The story of the Port Lincoln High School goes back a long way. Its construction was approved by the Playford Government, dropped by the Walsh Government, and had again reached an advanced stage of planning by the Hall Government. I sincerely trust that it will not be dropped again and that the present Government will continue with both this and the Tumby Bay school. I was disappointed today to hear that this project will be delayed for six months.

My next point applies not only to country schools but to schools everywhere. Too much emphasis is placed on the necessity for local schools to raise funds for what are actually edu-

cational essentials. Admittedly these funds are subsidized by the Government, but this is not sufficient. I must emphasize that I am not speaking here of canteens and swimming pools, for which extra subsidies have been promised, but what I say does apply to libraries, which I consider to be an educational necessity. As well as from teaching aids, etc., some amenities are essential. As an example, new schools being built have floor coverings. Yet the Port Lincoln Primary School, which is an old school but one which will need to be used for some time yet, has been told that, to have its floors covered, it will be necessary for the school to raise half the cost—about \$1,200, a sum far beyond its capacity.

The subsidy system leads to one big area of inequality—what I call the “have” and “have not” areas. One area may have a preponderance of comfortably-off parents, with the result that its schools have more amenities than has an area of low-income earners. Certainly, if the wealthier parents wish to provide their children's school with some extra services (a swimming pool, for example), that is reasonable enough, but it should not apply to basic essentials, and this is what is happening under the present system. As I said earlier, all children should have an equal right to education, and I am not speaking here only of country *versus* city, but of children everywhere.

A lot of publicity has been given recently to certain textbooks used in some secondary schools. The Minister of Education on opening day had a very full answer to an obviously pre-arranged question on this matter. I wish to make it clear that I have no objection to a child learning about the political system of Australia or of being taught to think for himself—quite the contrary, in fact. But, if politics are to be taught, let them be taught impartially. The Minister said that the book gave a balanced picture of Communism, but I do not recall seeing any mention of the purges in Russia in the 1930's, or any mention of the 100,000 North Vietnamese slaughtered by Ho Chi Min—people whose only crime was that they differed politically from their rulers.

The Minister did not mention that the A.L.P. platform was printed in full with certain words and phrases underlined. This emphasis, Mr. Speaker, has been added by the writer, yet there are still people who say that this book has no political bias! If A.L.P. policies are given, why are the policies of the Liberal Party, the Country Party, or the Communist Party not given? If the political system of Australia is to be taught in our schools—and I

think that it should be—then let it be taught fairly and impartially.

This question of amenities in the country is a very large one, but one area of prime importance is the question of transport, particularly roads. I know that this is a very large State, with long distances and a small population, but better roads are essential. During the years 1965-68 the road allocation for the western division was drastically reduced. This reduction has been partially restored, but it is still far short of what it was prior to 1965. In view of the productive capacity of this area, to which I referred earlier, this allocation needs to be increased still further. I am not looking at this question from a comfort point of view, although I must admit that it would be nice to be able to travel without being covered in mud in the winter and choked with dust in the summer. The main reason why country roads must be upgraded is for the transport of commodities. The horse- and buggy days have gone; our grain, our live-stock and our wool are moved by heavy transport. Fast shipment of goods is economically essential in these days. However, these same heavy transports play havoc with poorly constructed roads and the roads play havoc with the vehicles, adding yet another cost burden on to the farmer.

Country towns on the whole suffer badly from a lack of good roads, footpaths and kerbing. Most councils that I have anything to do with do the best they can with the funds available, but these funds are not enough. We all want to stop this drift to the city, and one small way which will help is to enable the councils to provide the normal comforts of life. Another normal comfort of life which we tend to take for granted is electricity. The Electricity Trust of South Australia is doing a wonderful job. This is an example of the far-sightedness of Sir Thomas Playford. All of the old District of Flinders is reticulated with power, but there are still large areas in the northern part of the new district that have no electric supply. The trust is co-operating with local power suppliers to enable them to upgrade their generating capacities so as to reticulate surrounding areas with the single wire earth return system, and some areas are now covered in this way. However, there is a limit to how far the generating capacities of these local stations can be upgraded, and the supply of bulk power by the trust to enable the whole area to be reticulated will be necessary.

When the new line was built to connect Port Lincoln with the power station at Port

Augusta, it was routed through Rudall rather than by the shorter, more direct route down the gulf. This was done so that bulk power could be supplied to the areas of which I speak. However, this cannot be done until the substation that is planned for Rudall is built and operational. I should like to see this project pressed on with.

Every South Australian should know something about water and its source of supply. Most of us in this State have our own views about whence South Australia's main water supply should come. I await the results of the Premier's negotiations with interest. In taking the large view, we must not lose sight of the small. I am not speaking here of the Murray River water controversy, or of the problem of water for the State generally, but of one small area. Wheat farmers, because of quotas, are being forced to diversify. They want to carry more sheep or cattle to augment their incomes, which are being curtailed by quotas. However, for properties to carry more stock, reliable supplies of water are essential.

On Eyre Peninsula generally this is no real problem as most of the peninsula is reticulated from the Tod trunk main. However, there is quite a small but very productive area near Port Lincoln (the Wanilla-Edillilie area) which has the Tod trunk main to the north of it and the Uley Basin main to the south but is not reticulated. Although this area is very good grain country, that is not much help these days. Its stock-carrying capacity could be significantly increased if there was a reliable source of water. This is one way in which one small group could be helped by supplying a main to this area, and I would be grateful if the present Minister of Works would continue the investigations started by his predecessor.

Some 80 years ago a house was built in Port Lincoln for the police sergeant. This house, which was a normal three-bedroom bungalow, is now the police station and provides the office accommodation for a force of 14, including the detective staff and a woman police officer. There have been complaints in this House of cramped office accommodation for members, but I think we would all agree that we are not badly off when we think of conditions such as I am speaking of. Port Lincoln is the headquarters of a division, and yet this is the best that can be provided. The single men's quarters are of poor standard and badly over-crowded; two men have to sleep in the recreation room. What is badly needed

here is a new building with modern office accommodation and acceptable bachelors' quarters.

Usually when we speak of primary producers we tend to think of farmers, but we must not lose sight of the fact that there are other forms of primary production. One of these which concerns my district is fishing. Port Lincoln is the major fishing port in Australia, and this industry plays a significant part in the State's economy, including export revenue. There have been strong rumblings of discontent in the fishing industry in recent months, one of the biggest bones of contention having been over the granting of fishing licences for the various fisheries. I believe that the basic idea of the licence system is a good one; it is aimed at conservation, and this is something that is essential if we are to preserve stocks of fish for years to come. However, the system is producing some cases of real hardship owing to the inability of some men to get a licence to do the only job they know. One of my constituents who had been a cray fisherman was forced to sell his boat a few years ago for financial reasons. At the time that he sold it, licences to fish crays were not necessary. But now that he is in a financial position to get back into the industry he cannot because he cannot obtain a licence. As I said, the licensing system is probably necessary to conserve stocks, but who knows whether this line is being drawn in the right place. A constant and increasing research study must be made into all the major areas on all the major types of fish so as to ascertain as quickly as possible whether it is economically and conservationally sound to grant more licences for any particular fish. The Director of Fisheries, Mr. Olsen, is a dedicated man who is carrying out his job in a very able manner, but I think Mr. Olsen would be the first to admit that there is still a lot to learn in his field, therefore he must be given research facilities which will enable him to speed up this aspect of his job as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been elected to the Parliament of South Australia, and I am proud to support the political Party to which I belong. My Party is irrevocably opposed to Socialism, and by "Socialism" I mean the stated policies of State control of the means of manufacture, distribution, and exchange. The Attorney-General mentioned his belief that all men should have equal rights. Of course they should have equal rights.

However, he brought this up as if it was his own original thought. I believe in equal rights for individuals to make their own way in life. I believe in equal rights for an individual to engage in the occupation of his choice and to obtain a fair and just return for his labour and initiative. I am against the concept that all planning in all fields should be undertaken by a Government and forced upon the citizens. The Government has a large programme of legislation planned, as shown by the Speech of the Governor's Deputy. At least we will be able to say that even if we are not the best governed State in Australia we will certainly be the most governed. Too much governmental control is the best way I know to kill individual enterprise, and it is on individual enterprise that this great country of ours has advanced.

Many references have been made both here and outside to the Premier's advice to young people to break the National Service law. The Attorney-General last week also showed that those were his views. He mentioned the war in Vietnam. Of course it is a horrible war; in fact, all war is horrible. However, I resent the implication, so often made, that the Liberal Party wants this war. No-one wants war, for war is always wasteful in terms of both lives and money. But do the opponents of our involvement in Vietnam suggest that we dishonour pacts made and withdraw our help from friendly countries who have asked us for this help and who look to us for guidance and aid in their struggle for development? Advocating the breaking of laws is no help. The fact that two of the people who have done this are not only members of the Government but are also able lawyers makes the whole thing incredible to my mind. I had always understood that when a practitioner was admitted to the bar he swore an oath to uphold the law. I would like to quote from a portion of a speech made by the retiring President of the Queensland Law Society in Brisbane last Friday night. He said:

Much is heard today about protests against this and that. There are many laws in force to which we may reasonably take exception on one ground or another. While it is perfectly legitimate to protest against such laws, it cannot and must not be left to individuals to decide which laws they will obey and which they will not. It is quite wrong, both legally and morally, for any person or group of people to openly advocate violations of the law. We all have a duty to uphold the law; the alternative must in the long run result in chaos. Unfortunately, there are some people in our midst who hope for this.

I think that quotation, Mr. Speaker, expresses better than I can what must be the sensible attitude in this matter. I do not intend to use the full hour allowed me for this address. I hope in the years to come that there will be many opportunities for me to speak. Before closing I thank the electors of Flinders for giving me the honour of representing them in this Parliament. I assure them that their interests, no matter what their field of endeavour, will always be foremost in my mind.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important occasions in my life. To be able to sit in the gallery and witness Parliament in session is in itself a privilege, but to be a part of Parliament, to participate in proceedings, to represent in this House the people of my district, constitutes a great honour. New members are probably experiencing the same feelings and I sincerely trust that I, along with them, will be able to play a constructive part in the legislative processes designed for the good government of our State.

In supporting the motion before this House, I pay tribute to the excellent manner in which the new members who have spoken in this debate have introduced themselves to Parliament. I add my congratulations to those already offered to you, Sir, on your appointment as Speaker and to the Ministry on their appointment to their very high office. These appointments will react, and, indeed, have already reacted, favourably in the affairs both of Parliament and of the State. To the staff I express my deepest gratitude for their help and guidance over the past weeks.

I am, of course, very appreciative of the great support given me, as the representative of the Labor Party, by the people of my district. The very good vote recorded reflects the great service rendered both to his State and his electorate by Mr. Lin Riches, the former member for Stuart. I am deeply indebted to this man, for if it were not that he could put the best interests of the State before his personal good and so vote himself out of Parliament and into an early retirement, I would not be here. Many tributes have been paid to Mr. Riches upon his retirement from Parliament, where he served for 37 years, and from local government, where his service covered a span of 39 years, for 33 years of which he was mayor of Port Augusta, but a tribute has not been paid previously in this House by a person whom Mr. Riches so ably represented for so many years in his dual capacity. He is a kindly and humane man who never turns a deaf ear to

those in need and few will ever know the full extent of the help given by Mr. Riches to all sections of his community, for he never publicized the good deeds he performed. For many years the name Lin Riches had been synonymous with that of Port Augusta as Port Augusta is synonymous with Lin Riches. The two are one and will always be, for he retains a special place in the life of Port Augusta as I am sure he does in the life of his friends in this House.

I have inherited an electorate well disposed towards Labor policies but I have also inherited a great responsibility. The electors of Stuart having become accustomed to the very best representation deserve nothing less in the future. This is the task I have ahead of me, a task I will try my utmost adequately to fulfil.

It is not good that Adelaide should contain such a high percentage of South Australia's population. Decentralization is necessary but before industry and population can be decentralized there must be decentralization of amenities. To attract people to live in the country, housing must be provided. Education facilities should be adequate, transport readily accessible and cheap health and hospital services available. And not the least of the requirements is that there should be no financial penalty imposed upon those who chose to be country dwellers. I am pleased that the Government has acted quickly in upgrading certain amenities at Port Augusta. Three new schools are to be built, preparatory construction work on the new hospital has commenced, tenders for the bridge over Spencer Gulf will close soon and tenders for the construction of the Port Augusta to Whyalla railway will now be called. I understand that a new gaol is to be built at Port Augusta but I remain neutral in my belief whether that is an amenity or not.

These projects will naturally provide employment in the area and so give an impetus to local business for I hope local contractors are able to secure their share of the construction work. In addition, not only should the Housing Trust programme for house building in Port Augusta continue but the rate of building should increase. There is a waiting list in that city of about 12 months. While the provision of all these facilities will encourage people to come to and stay in the country, there remain two vital ingredients for successful decentralization—industry and lower living costs. I believe that, if South Australia can be developed into Australia's industrial centre, the northern city complex of Port Pirie,

Whyalla and Port Augusta can become the heart of that industrial centre. This city complex is strategically placed to cater for markets in both eastern and western States by use of the Indian-Pacific railway, so why cannot industry be convinced of the advantages of building there? The answer is costs, which discriminate blatantly against provincial areas. This Government will encourage and assist by financial involvement any viable industrial undertaking prepared to establish works in the northern cities. As this policy becomes better known, it will bear fruit.

However, cost discrimination will still react against the ordinary citizen who has to pay much more than his counterpart in Adelaide for his house, his petrol, his beer, his wines, and his spirits. In some cases even meat is dearer. These are not all the commodities that are more expensive but merely a selection to indicate the areas of additional costs. I anticipate that the Prices Commissioner may investigate this matter and, should he be able to reduce the prices of these and like commodities, a lengthy step towards decentralization will have been taken. An area of great need is the employment of women. Recently in Port Augusta and Whyalla figures show that for 27 employment vacancies 280 women applied. It would be gratifying to see industry starting in these cities that would cater for female employment.

Aborigines also find themselves in difficulty as very little worthwhile local employment is available to them. There is fast developing a particular problem with Aboriginal children which can be remedied only by prompt action. The Port Augusta High School has the following numbers of Aboriginal children attending: Fourth year, 1 boy; third year, 4 boys and 5 girls; second year, 8 boys and 6 girls; first year, 12 boys and 16 girls. It can be seen that from the end of the 1971 school year there will be coming from the high school a steady stream of Aboriginal children ready to take a useful job in the community.

The tragedy is, of course, that up to this date anyway there have been no jobs for them in Port Augusta: or, rather, there is ample work but not for Aborigines. I appreciate that, if an Aboriginal child has exceptional ability, employment can easily be found but, as the bulk of the school-leaving children will fall in the average intelligence group, they are competing for available job positions with white children and, even if they have the necessary educational qualifications, the result of their inquiry is inevitable—no work. In

a town with over 900 Aborigines not one boy is apprenticed by the railways or Electricity Trust. No Aboriginal is employed in their administrative offices and not one Aboriginal is employed in a business house. What encouragement do the children have who are currently attending high school? Can we blame them for adopting a cynical attitude towards our argument that, if they obtain an education, they will find lucrative employment? "Where are these jobs?" they can ask, for there is no practical demonstration in Port Augusta to substantiate our argument. I believe that, irrespective of the job necessity, positions must be made available in Government departments at Port Augusta for Aborigines. I do not believe that this should be a permanent feature but a policy for only as long as it is necessary to provide a tangible indication of our proposition that education equals employment.

This Parliament is to be commended for processing the Port Augusta to Whyalla railway Bill with the minimum of delay. The ridiculous situation of Whyalla not being linked to the Australian railway system will shortly be remedied. Whyalla's very existence depends upon the building of ships and the manufacture of steel and, as such, should be linked both to its markets and sources of supply by the most economical and efficient of land transport systems (rail). Although the completion of the rail link will enable steel to be railed to markets anywhere in Australia within 36 hours, there still remains an obstacle to direct contact with Adelaide: the change of gauge at Port Pirie. Action to connect Adelaide to the standard gauge system must not be delayed. The Government is aware of this, as it is also aware that, of necessity, any standardization programme must include the major industrial areas of Adelaide.

Port Augusta as the city of heat, flies and dust storms is a fallacy that should be laid at rest. Port Augusta is a city that provides the best all-year weather in South Australia. It is a city with unlimited tourist potential that should be tapped. Ideally situated as a base for Flinders Ranges tourism, it also provides the best facilities for aquatic sports. However, in this regard it has one failing: the extremely high rise and fall of the tide. It is my belief that, if financial assistance was provided to retain a high level of water in that part of Spencer Gulf north of the bridge, a prosperous tourist industry could be developed including the building of holiday homes, caravan parks,

etc. There is much to offer in the Northern parts of this State which must be developed.

Turning away from matters relating to my district, I wish now to refer to a subject that causes me considerable concern. It has already been touched upon by other more competent speakers in this debate, but it is one of such immense importance that I feel I must refer to it; that is, the quality of life as being experienced by the people of Australia. Not being an economist, an industrialist, or holding shares in any company, the term "quality of life" cannot be represented to me in balance of payment statements, in budget surpluses brought down by Treasurers, in large profits made by companies, in our mineral wealth being squandered to overseas interests, or even in the living standards of that section of the community that can well afford financially to live in the best possible manner.

Rather, the quality of life of the people of Australia, more particularly the people of South Australia whom we represent, is best judged by referring to statistics showing how many people are living in poverty. How many children will never receive a decent education because of the inadequacies in teacher training and school accommodation, and because of the cost of education? If the quality of life of our community is good, why cannot young people expect a university education? Why is it that growing old is a crime? Elderly people who have worked all their lives, so that we can have a better society to live in are themselves forced into poverty and degradation because we refuse to cater adequately for their needs. Why is it that people cannot afford to become ill?

The latest Commonwealth health scheme does little to alleviate the problem of lower income earners who, in fact, cannot afford the health benefit premiums. The inability of people in this category to pay for medical treatment means that people are not receiving the care they need and that, where doctors are called, the mental pressures relating to paying the bill merely adds further sickness to these unfortunate people. Let us think about the position of the physically and mentally retarded members of our society and about the little that is being done to train them to fit into the community with dignity and pride in their ability to perform worthwhile tasks and so not depend on charity.

I wonder what Aborigines think about the quality of life we expect them to endure. These people are no less human beings than is any member of our community, and yet they are discriminated against. Lucrative

positions are not available to them; education and health facilities are limited; housing is inadequate; and little has been done to encourage the Aboriginal to be proud of his heritage and his race. We do not wish him to become a black whiteman; he must retain his own identity so that he can enrich our culture.

Earlier tonight I referred to statistics. I do not intend to submerge the House in innumerable statistics for there is only one statistic that needs to be quoted, and that was quoted by Mr. Justice Nimmo, who conducted an official inquiry into health insurance in Australia. He states that 1,000,000 Australians are living below a miserably low poverty line.

I hope that the tragic importance of that statement is not lost upon members, as it obviously was upon the mass media. *The Australian* was the most generous of the daily newspapers read in South Australia. It gave about one-third of a column on the front page. If other newspapers reported at length on this problem I did not see their reports. Contrast this with the lavish reports accorded to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and Hamersley in relation to their profits over the year 1969-70. The newspapers gloated and gloried in the profits made by these companies. The headlines were outstanding. The space was available to carry the good tidings to all, including (I imagine) the 1,000,000 people living below a miserable poverty line.

Mr. Justice Nimmo said that he was appalled at the extent of poverty in Australia and suggested as a remedy increased child endowment and a full investigation, so that the responsibilities of the Commonwealth, State and local government and the voluntary organizations can be defined properly and their efforts co-ordinated. That an investigation be commenced is of the utmost importance, because poverty is self-perpetuating. One million in need today will mean 2,000,000 tomorrow unless remedial action is taken.

Mr. Justice Nimmo also stated that there is poverty in the low-income groups in all the affluent countries except Scandinavia. I am sure that the political orientation of the Scandinavian countries accounts for this fact, and I am equally certain that justice to the lower income groups will come only from Labor Governments. The present Government accepts that it is not sufficient for the Parliament of South Australia to abdicate any responsibility in the matters I have mentioned

merely by saying that, after all, they are a Commonwealth Government responsibility.

The State Parliaments, through their very Constitutions, are much closer to the needs of the people and, consequently, are better placed to make these needs known. Social welfare, education, health and Aboriginal affairs are all areas of State responsibility and, if finance is not forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government to adequately maintain these services, the States should unite and with a loud voice condemn the Commonwealth Government and recommend that the people take corrective action through the ballot box.

I put it to members that the Labor Party is concerned about the things I have been speaking on, and I am sure that members opposite are also concerned. So, I ask them to join with the Labor Party in requesting the Commonwealth Government to put its priorities right. The Commonwealth Government is continuing to spend millions of dollars to fight an unjust war in Vietnam. It squanders millions of dollars on defective armaments, all on the pretence of combating Communism in South-East Asia, while with callous indifference to the plight of the Australian citizen it is creating in this country the very conditions guaranteed to encourage the spread of Communism here. Less money spent in the extinction of human life and more money spent in improving the quality of life of the average Australian should be the course to follow, for people are more important than things and future generations will judge us not by the profits made by companies or by budget surpluses but by the standard of living enjoyed by the most underprivileged section of our society. Above all else, I believe our responsibility as representatives of the people is the welfare of the people, and should we not keep this principle in mind when introducing and debating legislation we are not worthy to be representatives of the people. I support the motion.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In rising to speak for the first time in Parliament, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on being elected to your office. I also extend my congratulations to the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. I commend the mover and the seconder of the adoption of the Address in Reply for the manner in which they spoke, even though I do not agree with what they had to say. I would like to express gratitude for the assistance which has been rendered to me by members of the staff and members of

Parliament, who have helped me to settle in and understand the procedures of Parliament.

I am very conscious of the privilege and responsibility that the electors of Eyre have placed in me by electing me as their member with a substantial majority. The campaign conducted in Eyre was fought in a very fair and most gentlemanly manner, and I pay a tribute to my two opponents for the way in which they fought the election. It was fought on politics, not personalities. The Eyre District, being the largest electoral district in South Australia and comprising 49.3 per cent of the area of South Australia, contains many varied industries, the foremost being wheat-growing. The effect of wheat quotas would have caused as much hardship in my district as anywhere else in the State. I am, of course, aware that wheat quotas have affected every wheat-growing district in South Australia. However, in Eyre there are some new ground farmers, and farmers are still developing large areas of country and have gone into financial debt to develop their farms. They are now faced, in some cases, with economic ruin due to the necessity to enforce restrictions. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the increase in production in South Australia, being one of the traditional wheat-growing States, has not been a major factor in the over-production of wheat in Australia.

Basically, I believe that the low wool prices have caused large areas of land which were not previously used for wheat-growing to be brought into production in New South Wales, to the detriment of the traditional and genuine wheat-grower. I believe that action should be taken to prevent large commercial concerns from growing unlimited amounts of wheat in New South Wales, and other areas, and also that primary-producer taxation concessions should only be available to rural producers who derive 80 per cent of their income from rural production. I believe that if this move was instigated, a great many hardships, which are today experienced by all rural producers, would be alleviated. There is no place for the Rundle Street farmer (for people farming mainly to save taxation) in today's serious crisis in our rural industry.

With the need for diversification, caused by wheat quotas, there is a growing need in the District of Eyre (which is not only the largest district in South Australia but also the driest) for several urgent water schemes to be instigated without fail. First and foremost is the Kimba-Polda water scheme, which will

serve one of the leading wheatgrowing areas in this State, an old and well-established rural community that has been given a shocking deal in the past by Governments from both sides. The Polda-Kimba main should be treated as a matter of urgency and money should be provided to have it completed immediately. The longer it is left, the more it is going to cost. If all people are equal, there can be no justification for the non-completion of the main.

Over the years the cost of carting water to Kimba has been a complete waste of money when one considers that, if this money had been put towards the construction of the new main, it would have been for the betterment of all people in South Australia. I would also like to know what plans the Government has to expedite the building of this main, as anyone who has had any experience in water carting knows that it is one of the most futile occupations that one can carry out. In the Ceduna area, as members of the Public Works Committee who recently visited the area will be aware, the need for speedy action in replacing the Minnipa-Ceduna main is overdue. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Works will seriously consider the proposals put to that Committee.

There are several other areas that need reticulated water supplies, such as Port Kenny, Venus Bay, Mount Cooper, Mount Damper, Andamooka, and Coober Pedy to name just a few. In his Speech, the Governor's Deputy states that the Government intends to increase succession duties. During the recent election campaign the Government said it would give a better deal to the man on the land. If it increases succession duties on rural properties, how can it justify this statement? Succession duties are one of the most vicious, unjust, unfair and hated taxes which can be levied. I point out that 2.9 per cent of the population pays 52 per cent of succession duties. If the Government wishes to assist the rural community, it should abolish succession duties on all rural estates below \$100,000. I have picked the figure of \$100,000 because a farming property of this value in many cases would be providing only a very meagre income for a family farm.

The problem of freights faced not only by rural industry but also by all sections of the community in my district cannot be emphasized too strongly in regard to its effect on far-flung and outlying areas. I believe that people should not be forced to pay ton-mile tax on unsealed roads, and I also believe that

the communities at Andamooka and Coober Pedy, which pay large amounts of road tax, should be exempted. To give an example, one carrier pays \$70 a trip on a road which has not seen a grader for over two years. Of course, this justifies the removal of this inequitable form of taxation on these communities. I believe that negotiations should be undertaken with the Commonwealth Government to have a petrol tax imposed on all motorists. This would not only be fairer but also the tax would be more easily collected and far less of a burden on the country people.

Whilst on the subject of freights, I sincerely hope the Government will see fit to make the necessary arrangements to have barley shipped through Thevenard as a matter of urgency. No doubt the Minister of Agriculture is aware that a number of barley growers in the Thevenard Division get very little out of their first advance on barley because the majority of their payment is swallowed up with freight to Port Lincoln. I sincerely hope that the Government will do everything possible while dredging operations are in progress in the Thevenard harbour to ensure that the harbour is developed to its maximum possible capacity so that the benefit of larger ships will be available to the producers in this area.

I wish to say a word or two about the Eyre Highway. Speaking as one who has travelled on this road only recently, I do not think this Government can use the excuse of the Commonwealth Government to avoid its responsibility for sealing the Eyre Highway to Yalata Mission. I believe it is the responsibility of the State Government to provide adequate roads for its tax-paying electors, of whom there are many as far afield as Yalata.

The Attorney-General, in his maiden speech, referred to the Legislative Council. I would like to state here quite clearly and categorically where I stand. I support the bi-cameral system of government. I believe that the Legislative Council is a necessary part of the Parliamentary system in South Australia, and I consider that the criticism which has been levelled at the Council by members opposite over the years is unjust, unfair and without foundation. I support the present franchise of the Legislative Council and consider that the members of the Council have always acted in a manner which has been in the best interests of this State as a whole. In my opinion, Government members have attacked the Council for sheer political purposes. An example of legislation which was defeated by the Council and which benefited the people of South Aus-

tralia was the Walsh Government's proposal on road transport. No doubt the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), as well as the Minister of Works, will well remember this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I turn now to education and would briefly mention that in my electorate I have a number of schools which need replacing urgently. During the election campaign, the Australian Labor Party promised much in education but until the present moment we have seen very little. I would like to know when some action is going to take place. I remind the Minister that in most schools there are a number of small matters which could be rectified very simply. To give an example, in most schools there are no fly-wire screens fitted, and in one particular instance it took three years to get screens fitted to the windows. As every member will agree, this is a ridiculous situation. A number of schools need to be rebuilt and some now schools need to be relocated, such as Streaky Bay, the proposed new school at Karcultaby, extensions to Elliston school, and a new school at Coober Pedy.

I refer now to social studies school books. I am one who believes that politics should be taught in schools, but I believe that all political Parties should be given an equal coverage. I attended a meeting at Cummins recently for the sole purpose of gaining some information and finding out what the views of the parents were concerning these school books. I consider that the social studies text books within the schools are politically biased in favour of the Australian Labor Party; they fail to give an adequate coverage of the L.C.L., D.L.P. and the Country Party, and should be withdrawn from circulation and replaced with social studies text books giving all Parties the same coverage, thus enabling children to make up their own minds on politics.

Much has been said about Vietnam. I support our involvement in Vietnam because I believe that we should be so involved. I support the National Service Act, and I cannot for the life of me understand why people should be opposed to our involvement in Vietnam when they say they stand for civil liberties. Our sole aim in Vietnam, as all members would know, is to protect the rights and the integrity of a small independent country and to allow its people to survive against the Communist hordes from the north.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that I can have a friendly working association with all members, even though at times I will differ greatly with the views of some of them. I

hope that I shall be able to look back on my time in Parliament and be able to see that I have been of assistance to the electors of Eyre and of South Australia generally.

Mr. BROWN (Whyalla): Mr. Acting Speaker, I, too, join with other speakers in congratulating the Speaker, the Ministers and the Premier in their election to their important offices, and I wish them well for the future. As you are no doubt aware (and as I am sure most members here are aware), I represent only a part of the industrial city of Whyalla. This evening I want to deal with some aspects of the city of Whyalla, because it is time we realized that this is the biggest city in the State outside the Adelaide metropolitan area. Undoubtedly, Whyalla is the greatest example of decentralization of industry in this State and, perhaps, in Australia. However, there has been extremely little decentralization of what goes with industry, and I refer to the ordinary people who are responsible for production from industry. Our opponents opposite, of course, have mentioned the sorry plight of the rural people of this State and their problems in surviving under present conditions. I represent the working class people of Whyalla, who have been in great plights throughout history and are still struggling for existence against the monopolies of this country and other countries. I assure members opposite that these people will continue to struggle and, in the final analysis, will win.

I want to refer to the problems of decentralization of industry, particularly in relation to my association with Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and Whyalla, and I remind the House early in my speech that this year that company has made a profit of \$59,000,000, which is a record. I do not think that that is too bad for a company that is mining the natural resources of this country, and I also point out that the company has now entered the field of oil and, lo and behold, has struck oil in Bass Strait. Whyalla has been important to B.H.P. and, I may say, to the Commonwealth Government, but in the early years the city had few houses. The people lived in shacks until pressure was exerted on the company regarding land, and when it was decided to build a steel works in this State, Sir Thomas Playford's Liberal Government and the B.H.P. Company decided that adequate housing was necessary.

As you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, an agreement was entered into to build about 500 to 600 houses a year in Whyalla. Those houses are probably the most unattractive and

boring in design that has ever been envisaged by mankind. Nevertheless, it is pleasing that this year there have been changes in the design and a \$4,000,000 contract has been let to A. V. Jennings Pty. Ltd. to build houses in one part of Whyalla, and when the houses have been built that area will be an attraction.

The education position in Whyalla under the Playford Liberal Government was a shambles. It was not until 1965, when the Labor Government came into office, that the system in Whyalla was improved. I hope that this will be maintained by the Government now in office. Hospitalization, which is so necessary in any community, was begun in Whyalla by the company as a private enterprise venture and the hospital was then handed to a board. Now it is a Government hospital, for which the Labor Government is responsible.

Shopping facilities are a necessity in decentralization of industry, but at one time shopping facilities were being provided in parts of Whyalla other than those where houses were being built. As regards transport, Whyalla is 250 road miles from the city of Adelaide and is, therefore, isolated.

I welcome the recent measure passed in this House concerning the rail link between Port Augusta and Whyalla, which for some 18 years was a political football of the Commonwealth Liberal Government. From memory, I think it was promised at each Commonwealth election by the Liberal Party but after each election it was conveniently shelved. There was no doubt in my mind that neither the Commonwealth Liberal Government nor the B.H.P. Company supported this rail link. It is only in the past 12 or 18 months that the B.H.P. Company has supported it. This is borne out by the fact that it now has road contracts with road hauliers who use the Port Augusta to Whyalla Road—to the detriment of the road itself. Nevertheless, it is a pleasure to know that this rail link will at last be built. It is obvious that it will help the whole State and the Commonwealth, too. I hope the present Government will be successful in standardizing the railway gauges within this State.

During the growth of Whyalla, social legislation had to be considered. Without any shadow of doubt—and I had plenty of experience during the Playford Government when the social laws were the worst of any in the Commonwealth; I need refer only to the drinking law of 6 o'clock closing—when people were recruited to go to Whyalla, particularly by the B.H.P. Company (they were

not attracted there but were recruited there) they were not used to that kind of legislation because, in the main, they came from Europe or Britain. To come to such an unholy situation where 6 o'clock drinking prevailed was beyond their understanding. The industrial laws during the Playford regime were outmoded. In fact, they were the worst in Australia.

I come now to workmen's compensation, about which I may have an opportunity to speak later in this session. I want for the moment to refer to one particular case, because I think it is a glaring example of the real problems with workmen's compensation when we talk about moral and social laws and the needs of the community. Members may recall the press statement made on May 8 in the *Advertiser*, when there was a record settlement for workmen's compensation for this State. I refer to the Monaghan case of some \$73,000. This man was a migrant tradesman recruited to come to Whyalla from Britain by the B.H.P. Company. He was a married man with a family. He came to Whyalla in about April or May, 1964; he was a capable tradesman with a great personality. He was efficient and a fine man to know. It did not take him long to realize that to work for the B.H.P. Company he worked for the lowest wages and the worst set-up possible. It did not take him long to leave that company. In fact, he left in about August of that year to work for a firm called Wardrope and Carroll. Through his employment with this firm, he was sent out on loan to the German firm of Lindy's which was a subcontractor to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. This man, who was an efficient electric welder by trade, was ordered to go into an enclosed gas cylinder that was being erected in connection with the B.H.P.'s basic oxygen steel-making plant.

We found out afterwards that the B.H.P. Company knew that, in fact, if someone went into this enclosed cylinder and struck a match in it, it was dangerous; yet this man was ordered to go into it and to do electric welding. He went in and struck the arc, and words could not describe what happened. He became a raging inferno, but somehow he came out of that cylinder on his own (no-one really knows how he did so), and he was rushed to hospital. His wife, who was a trained sister in the Whyalla Hospital, was told not fewer than four times in the first week that her husband would not live until morning. However, by

will or by some other means, this man lived, came to Adelaide, and was under care for many years.

We issued a writ for damages in his favour, but at one stage we did not know on whom we could serve it, because this man was an employee of Wardrope and Carroll, and he was on loan to the German firm of Lindy's which was, in turn, a subcontractor to the B.H.P. Company. After about two years we finally ascertained that we should serve the writ on the German firm, and this involved its being served overseas. The accident happened in about November, 1964, and the settlement sum was paid out in April or May of this year, so that the man had to wait about 5½ years for settlement. One can imagine what he went through during that period. The man to whom I have been referring received \$73,000; if he were still employed in Whyalla he would be earning about \$100 a week, counting the usual overtime, and over-award payments. He was previously a competent pianist and at the time of his accident worked in a part-time capacity at the Hotel Whyalla, where he was receiving about \$4 an hour for his talent as a pianist.

I estimate conservatively that between the ages of 39 and 65 that man would have earned \$130,000; and he would have enjoyed good health and life generally. However, he is now working at Bedford Industries for a few cents an hour, and we talk about workmen's compensation! The workmen's compensation law, as it is at present, even though it was improved by the previous Labor Government, was considerably curtailed by the Liberal members in another place, and I am wondering just what role the Liberal Party intends to play in that place concerning future legislation introduced by this Government. Despite the poor amenities in Whyalla, the workers at least have the honour and privilege of building the best ships in this country and, without a doubt, given half a chance by the Commonwealth Liberal Government of the day, they would build the biggest and best ships in the world.

I refer now to social welfare. At one stage the Opposition referred to the great part that the social welfare officer plays in the community. Over the years I have been associated with many social welfare officers, and I am still associated with them. They do a wonderful job. However, I wonder whether, if the system under which we live were designed to alleviate social problems, there would be

any need for these officers. If we spent our time and energy removing the causes of social problems, perhaps less money and time would be needed for so-called remedies.

Turning to what I call moral laws, I believe that it is the responsibility of Parliamentarians to consider seriously the laws they are passing. They should consider whether a law is correct, whether it will benefit the people generally, and whether it is, in fact, a law deliberately passed by a section of Parliamentarians purely and simply to aggravate a certain problem. I refer to what a previous speaker referred to, the National Service Act. However, unlike the previous speaker (who said that the Act was wonderful) I condemn it for what it is—a deliberate provocation. It sends youths to an undeclared war and, perhaps, to their death. As late as today I received a letter from a Whyalla youth who is a trainee industrial chemist. His period of National Service has twice been deferred. However, he has no doubt that sooner or later he will have to join the Army and possibly go to Vietnam. It worries him not from the viewpoint of fighting for his country but from the viewpoint of the National Service Act being immoral. He sees his present work as providing a useful service to the community.

The penal clauses of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act were deliberately enacted by certain Parliamentarians to antagonize the work force of this country. I am pleased to say that the workers have opposed it, and opposed it well. If a moral problem exists, the law should ease that problem, not intensify it. We talk about arresting and gaoling people as an answer to this problem, but I sometimes wonder who is really wrong. I know who is legally wrong (because of the law), but I wonder who is morally wrong. This is the important point that we should consider. I do not think that ordinary people in this country or in any other country deliberately go out to break any law.

Finally, I point out that I have taken over from the Hon. R. R. Loveday, the previous member for Whyalla. He was well respected in Whyalla, and I know he was well respected in this House, too. I wish him and his wife a long, healthy and wealthy retirement. I hope that in some small way I can be as successful as he was in this House.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): With others who have spoken, I have pleasure in supporting the motion; I know that all members will have pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. Jennings: Don't try to put words into my mouth.

Mr. RODDA: That includes my loquacious friend from Ross Smith. The Labor Party could not have chosen a more worthy candidate to represent a seat that bears such an illustrious name. The fact that we find ourselves on this side of the House does not surprise—

Mr. Clark: Anyone.

Mr. RODDA: I was going to say that it does not surprise the member for Elizabeth. What happened at the election serves to remind us that we must face our masters, sometimes at irregular intervals. The early election removed rather prematurely some of our distinguished colleagues who chose to retire.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There were some distinguished Labor members amongst them.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister is anxious to interject.

Mr. Hall: He is the baby in the Cabinet.

Mr. RODDA: He is sitting in the baby's seat and, having had experience in that seat for 12 weeks, I can say it is a good seat. The situation in which members on this side find themselves clearly underlines the hazards of political life. When the Bill to change the electoral boundaries was before the House, I thought that every one of us had his head on the block; it was inevitable that some of us would pay the price of change. The last Parliament concluded so quickly that some of us had no opportunity to pay tribute to the members who would not return. I now pay a tribute to those members, including Sir Glen Pearson and the Hon. B. H. Teusner who gave distinguished service, Sir Glen as a Minister and Mr. Teusner as a presiding officer, over many years. Mr. L. G. Riches was Speaker when I came into Parliament and I join with the new member for Stuart (Mr. Keneally) in paying a tribute to him. He gave me a kindly reception when I first came here, and I remember the courtesies and kindnesses he showed me.

I also pay a tribute to Cyril Hutchens, C.B.E., and Ron Loveday both of whom served this Parliament with distinction for a long time, as well as being Ministers in the previous Labor Government. I could not forget the former member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). I think it is a pity he is not here to have the gag put on him.

Mr. Jennings: If he were here your Leader would not be.

Mr. RODDA: The member for Ross Smith can tell us about that in his Saturday article.

I am sure that the honourable member is always looking for a little bit of inspiration.

Mr. Jennings: I can't get much looking over at your side.

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member gets his inspiration from many places, and from some very funny places, too, if I am not telling too many tales out of school. Of course, another member was the "honest" Tom Casey, now the Hon. Tom Casey, who has moved to another place. Of course, the Minister of Agriculture is not unaccustomed to change, and I am sure he would have found no difficulty in moving to the other House. We remember him as an old blue, for he was a member of our Party for a number of years.

Mr. Ryan: What about DeGaris?

Mr. RODDA: I am not talking about Mr. DeGaris.

Mr. Ryan: When things are different they are not the same.

Mr. RODDA: I am talking about the distinguished Minister of Agriculture, and it is a good thing that we do take some heart from the fact that he had a decent grounding.

Mr. Jennings: Get on to "Deadly Ernest".

Mr. RODDA: The experienced members of the Government have been sitting over there bottling things up for many days, and I suppose there are comparatively few of us left for them to take it out on. I do not want to put the fear of God into the new members on this side of the House; I suppose that now they are qualified they will come within the ambit of the lash of the member for Price (Mr. Ryan).

We also lost from this side Mr. Freebairn, who could always be relied on to get under the skins of some members opposite. Another member we lost was Mr. Giles, who was Sir Thomas Playford's successor. As the Whip, I appreciated Mr. Giles, who could always step in at a minute's notice to give us a run-down on the codlin moth or some other subject. We must not forget the former member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards), who I think was a complete master of the subconscious humour. The honourable member either had the House in complete uproar or rolling in the aisles. I think the memory of the honourable member's contribution on the fauna and flora of Eyre Peninsula will live for many a day.

Another member lost to the House is Mr. Arnold. Although the honourable member did not come back, I believe he faced up with

great credit to those philosophers who went into his area and said that they would build two dams. He had to face up to a two-way ticket, with certain people up there parading as non-Socialists yet giving their vote to the Socialists, and we saw good old Peter Arnold go down by 34 votes. We will have more to say about that in the days to come.

I pay a tribute to those members from both sides of the House that are no longer with us. Although some of them were here for only a short time, they were wonderful Parliamentary colleagues. We have had quite a few speeches in this debate from the new members from both sides of the House, and I pay a tribute to those members. It is obvious that they can express themselves well and contribute much on many different topics.

Mr. Jennings: In many different directions.

Mr. RODDA: I am sure that the member for Ross Smith and a few other members will be submerged by some of the talent that we see opposite, although with the politics they espouse they will not get much assistance from the philosophers on this side, even though they will receive good fellowship from us.

The Minister of Education must be pleased that we have moved away from the "16 cockies" position to which he has referred. I think the Minister has been concerned because we have not been paying sufficient heed to him, and now we have on this side some of his academic contemporaries to do justice to his erudite statements. I am pleased to support the sentiments that have been expressed about His Excellency the Governor. Sir James and Lady Harrison have endeared themselves to the people of this State, and we express the wish that Sir James will soon be restored to good health so that he and Lady Harrison may continue to perform their duties with such distinction. We are fortunate to have that grand old man Sir Mellis Napier to step in, as he has done so often, and carry out with such distinction the duties of His Excellency's Deputy. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation, and we know that you will follow the tradition that has been set by your predecessors.

Mr. McKee: Not the last one.

Mr. RODDA: We must be fair about this. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, with your great impartiality, will acknowledge that every occupant of the Chair has been impartial. If that were not so, we would probably be on the other side of the House now. We look forward to your superintendence. Perhaps forgetting about one or two matters, I pay

my tribute to the former member for Ridley. I was Government Whip for a couple of years and had much pleasure in working with the Hon. Tom Stott. I pay my tribute in all sincerity to—I was going to say Sir Thomas Stott, but we will leave that to the Minister and his colleagues to fix up. One cannot be an Independent member of this House for 37 years without being a little more than a common cockie.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you had been Government Whip in April, would you have got Mr. Stott's vote at that critical time? Could you have done that with all your charm?

Mr. RODDA: There is not much I cannot do. I think it may be a good thing for the Minister that I was not Whip on that fateful evening in April. I was in good company. I was a Minister for 12 weeks, but I know of two other members of distinction who were Ministers for only three weeks. It is nice to partake of the fruits of office. I derive pleasure from seeing those two members back in the Ministry and they must certainly be gratified to be back. The member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) said today that people did not realize the amount of work that Ministers did and, in the short time that I was a Minister, I got an appreciation of the amount of work they have to do and the long hours they spend on official work. I tell the new members particularly that, if they see that some Ministers are not in the House and perhaps only one Minister is on the front bench, they can be sure that all the Ministers are engaged busily. When we look at some Ministers we have doubts, but they are doing a valuable job and I pay my tribute to them. The House is now expanded in numbers, and the honour for that goes to the present Leader of the Opposition, who was responsible for getting the Bill through.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: With our co-operation.

Mr. RODDA: Yes. It took some 14 years to get it through. I hope the Government increases the Ministry. I think I read in the press that there was an up-and-coming young man ready to step into it. In moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the Attorney-General made history, in that he was appointed to the Cabinet—virtually before he got here! I pay tribute both to him and to the member for Spence (Mr. Crimes) for the capable way in which they moved and seconded the motion. I concur in the congratulations that have been showered

on them but was taken aback somewhat by some of the things they said, one being that, when they joined forces with the Premier, they were not offering the same advice as he was but they did not dissociate themselves from it when he said he would recommend young men not to register for National Service.

I also read in a weekend newspaper that, when the Premier was questioned about this, he rose with a tired smile on his face and said for the ninth time that, if he was a young man, he would not register for National Service; he gave that advice to young men and said he would take the consequences. Referring to this report that mentioned "nine times", it is interesting to note that it records a secretive directive going out to the close associates of the Premier to ease up, to celebrate their first 50 days with a little rest, these first 50 days, exciting and turbulent. Were they exciting and turbulent?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will you tell us what the Parliamentary Under Secretaries did?

Mr. RODDA: If the honourable Minister will bear with me, I will tell him about it. These 50 exciting and turbulent days are mentioned but we have been looking around. Perhaps an onlooker could tell us what they were. We have had the M.A.T.S. plan revised at a cost of \$12,000, the Port Pirie line was to be reoriented and there was another major alteration. We see the Premier cited as the knight in shining armour finishing his game of bowls and calmly returning to Parliament—a 1970 Sir Francis Drake—or was it Donald Duck? The article states that Sir Donald (or Sir Francis, or whatever it is) damp-squibbed my Leader on the National Service question, and stunned my Deputy Leader and the Opposition with a curt "Yes/No" answer. Whose side is who on? God help this country if we have to have this sort of tedious prattle served up to our people when our Premier, one of the country's leaders, on a national hook-up can advise the young men of this fair land to break the law by not registering for National Service. By way of innuendo, the article chided the Opposition regarding a galloping censure motion on the National Service issue. The Opposition will not cease to remind the Government of the Premier's irresponsible statement. Immediately after that statement was made, we received a visit to this House from a young serviceman who had just returned from Vietnam and who was extremely agitated at the Premier's statement.

He said he did not know whether the Premier knew that newspapers containing statements such as the one made by the Premier were being received in Vietnam only a few days after the statements were made. This is not a good thing for people who are away defending this country. I acknowledge what the previous speaker has said on this matter; his view is different from mine. However, if this country is worth keeping, it is worth fighting for. The Premier's attitude is very much out of character with that of Sir Francis Drake. It is more like that of Neville Chamberlain who came back while the hordes were approaching, pointing his umbrella at everyone, and saying, "Peace in our time." What did Sir Arthur Lee have to say about this?

Mr. McKee: You're a warmonger.

Mr. RODDA: We can hear the old war horse in the background, in the ants nest in the green stick. If I were a young fellow, I would register.

Mr. Groth: Why don't you get over there and fight for Australia then?

Mr. RODDA: It is no use the member for Salisbury coming in so early in the piece and showing us where he stands on this issue, because he is in poor company on that side.

Mr. Clark: Do you think there is any chance of someone invading Australia?

Mr. RODDA: The member for Elizabeth may not live long enough to see it, but we may have an aggressor invading these shores. Speaking at the Returned Services League Conference, Sir Arthur Lee pointed out to those present that an immediate withdrawal of troops and an end of conscription would dig the grave of Australia and the hopes of greatness, leadership and unlimited opportunities for generations to come. I would ask the member for Salisbury to ponder that.

Mr. McKee: Is Sir Arthur running short of members for the R.S.L.?

Mr. RODDA: If he had to depend on people such as the member for Pirie, he would be running short. On Saturday, a poster was delivered to me on behalf of the Labor Party, stating:

Vote Labor . . . Labor action will ensure that there will be no Australian troops in Vietnam after June next year.

We would hope that that would be so, if a satisfactory solution could be found. The pamphlet continues:

Labor alone has told you the truth on Vietnam. The Liberals have misled you at every turn. They have not told you the truth about the nature of the war, the purpose of the war, or the course of the war. They have

only had one aim—to keep the United States bogged down as long as possible on the Asian mainland. The Liberals have needlessly prolonged the war, with all its loss and suffering. Who was the man who turned to America in order to save this country? It was John Curtin.

Mr. Jennings: Where was Menzies with his majority of members?

Mr. RODDA: We are not talking about Menzies; we are talking about the defence of this country. When the Hon. Donald Allan Dunstan is advising the young men of this country not to register, a law-breaking statement such as that is indeed bad in the interests of preserving this country, and it reflects no credit on the Premier. I do not tie all the members of the Premier's Party to that statement; some of them have expressed themselves on this matter. There are some distinguished exservicemen on the Government side, and I know that they would dissociate themselves from this. This pamphlet goes on to say that the Labor Party will provide naval and maritime facilities in the Indian Ocean. An article in last Saturday's *Advertiser* states:

Australia can draw no comfort from the revelation this week that Russia has negotiated two bases in the Indian Ocean for its ships. The Russian coup, kept secret until a few days ago, gives the increasing Russian naval influence in the area a much firmer footing.

The two bases—Socotra, a tiny island at the mouth of the Gulf of Aden, and the former British colony of Mauritius—are close to the main shipping lines to the Persian Gulf oilfields. Socotra also is smack in the middle of the Suez shipping route. If, as many observers believe, Russia aims at re-opening the Suez Canal, . . .

I hope I shall not be labelled a warmonger, but I must point out that these are practical reasons why we should be concerned about the defence of this country. Tomorrow there is to be a farmers' march in the city streets. Members will know what I think about protest marches, but the farmers' plight at present is not very happy.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What do you think about protests?

Mr. RODDA: When I have seen people sitting in front of this building and cluttering up the place, I have never blessed them. I think there are ways of bringing a point of view to the notice of the authorities other than marching down the street.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will you be marching tomorrow?

Mr. RODDA: No. You can tell my colleagues that. However, I will be going to the stadium or wherever the rally is to be held.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will you be walking?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, unless the honourable Minister calls for me in his white car.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will you walk alongside the marchers?

Mr. RODDA: I will walk down. Does that suit the Minister? We went to the people, and my Leader presented my Party's policy at a very well attended meeting in the Adelaide Town Hall. He told the people that he had a policy for the reduction of land tax and succession duties. What will this Government do about this matter? We are not very sure what it will do but, when we cast our minds back to some of the speeches made by the member who is now the Minister of Education, we realize that those speeches had a sting in their tails and that they held cold comfort for the man on the land. Paragraph 45 of His Excellency's Speech states:

Legislation will be introduced to remove anomalies in the law relating to receipt duty and gift duty and to alter the incidence of succession duty to give remissions to a spouse inheriting a house, to the inheritors of small estates and primary producing property. Other special remissions will be removed, successions will be aggregated and rates on larger successions will be increased.

I can just about see the Minister of Education writing that. People associated with the land should read what the Minister said on September 10, 1968, when dealing with this matter. What staggered me in regard to the man on the land was that in His Excellency's Speech the Government could include only two measly paragraphs about the primary producers. One paragraph said that the Government would appoint a committee to re-examine the wheat quota system and the other paragraph said the Government would consider the working of the Citrus Organization Committee. Beyond that, the man on the land looks like getting fairly cold comfort from this Government. This evening I received a telephone call from a farmer living at Millicent who asked me what the Government would do about succession duties. I am not able to tell people in my district, let alone in Millicent, what the Government will do about this. I hope the Minister of Education and other members opposite will look kindly at the plight of the man on the land.

Mr. Curren: What about the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. RODDA: The country voice in the Government has spoken. The Commonwealth Government certainly does not raise the taxes of the man on the land. The honourable

member has something to thank Black Jack and his confederates for, and he should not bite the hand that feeds him; he should be grateful for small mercies.

Mr. Curren: That is all we do get.

Mr. RODDA: It is a small mercy that got the honourable member into Parliament again. When the Premier went to Canberra, he was disappointed and kicked poor old John Gorton. Now the State will go to the Grants Commission for assistance. As a good South Australian, I will join forces to get a good deal for the State, but I do not think the Premier's truculent attitude at the Premiers' Conference was helpful. The Minister of Education asked me what the Under Secretaries did. As an Under Secretary, I went to the previous Premiers' Conference with my Leader. I feel certain that had the Leader been there this year things might have been a little different. The Premier has never gone down in history as a good negotiator. We have seen him in action at conferences. We saw him in action with regard to the median line, when Sir Henry Bolte put a twist in the line drawn below Port MacDonnell. We remember the big argument in the House when the Walsh-Dunstan Government was in power and when the present Premier gave away something that we did not want given away. Because of that we are not hopeful about the two dams.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What did he give away?

Mr. RODDA: The Minister does not want to be reminded.

Mr. McKee: What made the negotiations with Tom Stott break down?

Mr. RODDA: I hope that when the Government drafts its legislation and finally gets to the Grants Commission it has a thought for the man on the land. The member for Stuart (Mr. Keneally) this evening deplored the fact that most people live in the metropolitan area. It will indeed be a sad day for this State and for Australia if our country towns become ghost towns and the "get big or get out" policy operates in the farming community.

Mr. McKee: I think we got rid of the Liberal Government just in time.

Mr. RODDA: Well, we have heard the old cow puncher, the member for Pirie, say this many times before. Whether or not we were got rid of just in time remains to be seen. However, I think we can take credit for leaving a nice little nest egg of virtually \$3,000,000 for the incoming Government. The Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. G. R. Broomhill) has given that away, plus

an equal amount in service pay. I do not deny that people should have service pay.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How do you reckon you would have faced up to it if you had been in Government yourself?

Mr. RODDA: We are not there to do this. However, I do not know whether we would have been as heavy-fisted as is the present Government. I do not want to keep the House here all night, and it is refreshing that we can knock off when we are told to.

Mr. Clark: We are enjoying listening to you.

Mr. RODDA: I can tell from the pleased look on the honourable member's face that he is enjoying it. In conclusion, I again welcome all the 19 new members who have come to join us. I hope that they enjoy three years here, for I think it would be a good thing for the State for them to remain

for that period. I know that the member for Millicent (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) does not relish having elections too frequently, and I am sure that I do not. In fact, there are very good reasons for not having elections too frequently. I hope that we have a fruitful three years. I know I am being extremely generous in saying this, but it is South Australia and the people of this State that matter. The Government has the same cows to milk that we had, and it is going to feed them on the same grass. All I can hope is that its management has improved on what it was during its previous three years in office.

Mr. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 22, at 2 p.m.