

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

NEW INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL: The Premier announced, I think yesterday, the establishment of a new industry in South Australia by Fasson Proprietary Limited, a firm that would be making adhesives and similar types of product. Can he indicate what will be the eventual growth and size of this industry and say when it will commence operating in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have some information about this industry, but I think it would be better if I obtained a complete report for the Leader so that what I say to him will be entirely accurate.

LAW REFORM

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Just before the change of Government, I think in the last week before the election, as Attorney-General I received from the Law Reform Committee two reports (the 8th and 10th reports, I think) dealing with enforcement of foreign judgments and the admissibility in courts of documentary evidence produced from computers. I seem to remember that the committee, with reference to the latter matter, said that it had had the benefit of the advice and views of the new member for Peake. As I was disappointed not to see any reference in His Excellency's Speech to the Government's intention to legislate on these two matters, I ask the Attorney-General whether the Government intends to accept the reports of this committee on these two topics and whether we are likely to have before the House this session Bills to give effect to those reports.

The Hon. L. J. KING: In both the matters referred to by the honourable member Cabinet has already approved the preparation of legislation by the Parliamentary Draftsman to give effect to the contents of the committee's report. The omission from His Excellency's Speech is explained simply by the fact that, because of the vigorous law reform programme the Government plans, it was impossible to obtain Cabinet approval for all measures before His Excellency's Speech was prepared. Whether the Bills can be introduced this session will depend on the ability of the Parliamentary Draftsman to complete the

preparation of the legislation and on the determination by Cabinet of priorities as regards drafting and the introduction of measures. However, instructions have been given for their preparation, and the measures will be introduced into the House as soon as practicable.

IRRIGATION METERS

Mr. CURREN: Several references have been made in the past couple of years to the intention of the Government of the day to install meters on the properties of private irrigators who divert water directly from the Murray River. Can the Minister of Works say when these installations are to be made, who is to bear the cost, and what rent the divertees are to be charged?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member was good enough to inform me that he would ask this question today, I obtained from my department the following report:

INSTALLATION OF METERS FOR PRIVATE DIVERTEES ALONG MURRAY RIVER—CONTROL OF WATERS ACT, 1919-1925.

1. Cost of installation: This will vary depending on the size of pipemain and hence size of meter, the type of pipemain and its age, and the topographical location of the pipemain. It is expected that the field costs in installation will be about equal to the capital cost of the meter, and on this basis the probable costs including cost of meter will be as follows:

	\$
3in.	240
4in.	240
6in.	260
8in.	300
10in.	360

There is only a limited number of installations above 10in., and probably up to \$500 would be a reasonable installation cost for the larger sizes.

2. Rent: The present proposal is to charge 10 per cent of the average installed cost for each size of meter. This is based on allowing 5 per cent of the installed cost and 5 per cent to cover maintenance costs. It is intended to review the 5 per cent maintenance costs periodically on the actual cost of maintenance.

3. Present progress: 330 meters in the 4in. to 10in. range were received at the end of June, 1970, and the meter installation truck will be fitted out by the end of this month. A further batch of meters will be ordered shortly. Installation will commence in August, initially in the area from the border to Berri.

4. Other information: The original estimate of the overall cost of the installation of meters for the full length of the river was \$450,000, and Cabinet approval was given for this amount. This will be re-assessed after a representative number of meters has been

installed. There are over 900 current diversions, and about 1,000 meters will be required. All installations have been inspected, the pipe-mains exposed and measured and the location of the meter fixed. It is expected that it will take at least two years to install all meters.

EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. COURCELLE: Can the Minister of Education give me some information about the proposed International Education Week to be run under the auspices of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization? The Minister will no doubt recall that, when I had the privilege of being Minister, I held several conferences on this subject with interested parties, and it was willingly agreed that this programme should go ahead. Has the Minister of Education had further conferences on the matter and, if he has, will he say what is the result of those conferences and when this week is to be held?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The week begins, I think, next Monday, and many activities are involved. For example, a church service will be held on Sunday morning, August 2, concerning which numerous invitations are being sent out, and other functions are being organized locally. In view of the honourable member's previous interest in the matter, I will obtain for him a detailed report on all the activities that will take place. As the honourable member will appreciate, much has been left to local initiative, which varies from area to area. For example, in my area the committees of three schools are getting together to hold a public meeting on the overall question of education in our own society and in the world today, and various speakers will be asked to address the meeting. In other schools, other types of function are being organized.

Mr. COURCELLE: Could you give me details in your reply, for members would like to participate wherever possible?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member will appreciate, that may be possible only to a limited extent. Normally, one would expect that the member for the district would be invited to the local public functions organized by schools. I expect that this sort of approach will be adopted without departmental intervention being necessary. Where this is not done, however, I will certainly see whether it can be done.

ELIZABETH OCCUPATION CENTRE

Mr. CLARK: I refer to the strange case of the building of toilets at the Elizabeth Occupation Centre. On July 18, 1969, a letter was written to the Director asking that this

work be done. On August 13 last year a reply from the lands and building officer stated that the matter was being treated as most urgent. Nothing was heard about it for a long time and, in response to a request by the school committee, on October 28 I asked a question of the then Minister of Education, who told me that the erection of these new toilets was programmed to start in January and be completed in March. I pointed out to the Minister then that, as the children concerned were retarded, they were somewhat more difficult to manage in some respects than were normal children, and that the building of toilets while the school was in progress could cause some difficulties. The Minister was most sympathetic but, on November 18, in reply to another question, I was told that it would not be possible to commence work on the site before January 17, 1970, although action would be taken to complete the work in the shortest possible time. Work on the new toilets started at the end of January, but it is still not finished, and no-one really seems to know why. The committee has made several inquiries and written letters without much success. I point out to the Minister of Education that, although this is a particularly good school, the children are retarded, and the hold-up in the completion of the work has caused the staff great difficulty. Will the Minister of Education see whether the completion of work on this project can be speeded up?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the matter with a view to complying with the honourable member's request, seeing to it that the work is completed at the earliest possible date.

WHEAT AND BARLEY

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to find out from the Wheat Board whether the second dividend will be paid from the 1968-69 wheat pool, and also to find out from the Barley Board when the final dividend will be paid for barley for the same year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that for the honourable member.

MARDEN ROADWORKS

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked of the Premier, in the Minister's absence, on July 16 about roadworks at Marden?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is expected that the bridge and roadworks will be completed and opened to traffic about mid-October, 1970.

DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether the Public Health Department intends to establish a school dental clinic at Port Lincoln, or at some other town on lower Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall get a reply from my colleague.

STEELWORKS EMPLOYMENT

Mr. HOPGOOD: A letter that I have received from a constituent states:

You may remember my telling you that I was going to B.H.P., Whyalla, where I had been offered a job as an overhead crane driver. I had been told at the Adelaide office of B.H.P. that I would receive a basic rate of \$48.20, plus shift allowance, plus bonus. This would give me an average wage, with normal overtime, of about \$75 to \$80. However, on arrival in Whyalla I was told that I would have to work as a labourer on days and I would be trained to drive a crane at a later date. I stated that I had been offered a job as an overhead crane driver in Adelaide and, with that job and wage in mind, I had travelled 250 miles. The employment officer then argued the point for several minutes and then finally offered me a job as spare driver, based as a labourer in the boiler shop. This means I will be working on days with no shift allowance and no overtime guarantee. My complaint is this: I was offered, and I accepted, a job as an overhead crane driver on the steelworks. I was given the impression I would be working on a continuous process job paying 10 per cent on all shifts. I was also told I would receive a bonus of about 70c a shift, payable after one month's service.

Will the Minister of Labour and Industry find out whether Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited employment officers in Adelaide are misleading applicants for jobs?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated and to give the honourable member a report.

NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: On behalf of the member for Kavel, I ask the Minister of Education whether he has a reply to the question asked by the honourable member about the provision of a new building at the Nuriootpa High School.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the honourable member for asking this question on behalf of the member for Kavel. After considering the present building requirements at Nuriootpa, the Director of Secondary Education has requested that a new replacement building be added to the schools design programme. This matter is under active consideration at the moment and will be taken into account with many other similar

projects being given the same consideration at present. As I said when replying yesterday to another question about work at schools, before any work can proceed the school concerned must be placed on the departmental design programme and then, depending on the kind of construction involved, a long period may elapse before any construction work is done.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the widening of Brighton Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The southern section of Brighton Road from Arthur Street to Jetty Road, Brighton, should be completed in all respects by January, 1973. The northern section from Jetty Road, Brighton, to Jetty Road, Glenelg, including the intersection with Diagonal Road and the short remaining length of Diagonal Road, is scheduled for completion by October, 1972. However, this programme is contingent on the Highways Department being able to acquire the necessary land and the relocation of utility services.

DERNANCOURT SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: In 1966, I was informed that the Education Department owned a site for a future primary school at the corner of Lower North-East Road and Lyons Road, Dernancourt. However, at that time there were no immediate plans to erect a school on the site, and no recommendation in this respect could be made until primary school enrolments warranted it. As I realize that the department watches this type of situation closely, will the Minister of Education ascertain whether the department intends in the near future to erect a primary school on this site?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The school is not on the design list at present. However, I will inquire and ascertain what is the position.

CARTAGE RATES

Mr. EVANS: On March 16 this year, I was fortunate enough to attend, with the present Minister of Education, on a deputation of tip-truck owners that waited on the then Premier regarding the prices paid to them by quarry proprietors and those associated with the quarry industry in this State. The then Premier sent a letter to Mr. Hudson, stating that the Prices Commissioner had issued to the quarry companies new price orders, providing, first, that the maximum charge to the

purchaser for cartage should not exceed the cost of cartage paid to the carter and, secondly, that in the event of the delivered price being less than the sum of the maximum bin price and maximum cartage rate, the bin price should be reduced by at least the same percentage as the cartage rates. I am led to believe that one of the companies that supplies premixed concrete to building sites has flatly refused to abide by this ruling. I further understand that the Prices Commissioner has no power to fix a minimum price, as this regulation does. Will the Premier therefore have this matter examined and see whether quarry proprietors can be made to pay to the cartage contractors the rate fixed by the Prices Commissioner?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: I repeat that I was fortunate enough to be a member of the deputation to the former Premier about the amount paid by Government or semi-government departments to tip-truck operators employed by those authorities. The Prices Commissioner has set a rate for one tip-truck at about \$4.20 an hour and the Government departments pay about \$1 an hour less than this for the truck. Trucks cannot be operated at this rate. The matter was brought before the former Premier but, disappointed at the increase granted then, I said that it was not sufficient to compensate the tip-truck operators. As I understand a conference was to be held on this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport, will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether that conference has been held and, if it has, what is the result of it? If the conference has not been held, may I attend when it is held?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Other members have raised this matter with me privately, and I am at present considering calling a conference to examine it. I will take it up with the Premier later to determine what can be done about having discussions on it. Once that has been done, I will consider whether the honourable member can be invited to attend, and I will inform him accordingly.

ELIZABETH HOUSING

Mr. CLARK: I understand that the Premier already has a reply to the question I asked last week regarding Elizabeth housing, and I commend him for his prompt action. Will he now give the reply to the House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am always happy to help the honourable member. During

1969 the Housing Trust was able to provide families with rental housing in the Elizabeth area with a minimum of delay. In late 1969 the demand for rental housing started to increase and during the past seven months this increase has been considerable. Consequently, the waiting time has lengthened and is at present about nine months. It might be mentioned that fewer vacancies are occurring in the trust's existing 6,433 rental houses there, and that the vacancy rate has a considerable bearing on the waiting time.

At June 30, 1970, 38 double-unit houses were under construction and a contract was let in June for a further 60 of this type; work on these will commence shortly. In addition, to meet the continued demand, the trust recently let contracts for the erection of a further 153 single-unit houses in the area and most of these will be for rental-purchase. There were 57 rental-purchase houses under construction on June 30 last.

Work is in progress on the erection of a group of 33 three-storey flats in close proximity to the Elizabeth town centre and this group will be extended during the coming year by a further 39 flats. All of these flats will be let. The trust has found a real need in Elizabeth for the provision of cottage flats for aged pensioners and 58 of these are at present being built. Construction will commence on a further 20 cottage flats during 1970-71.

SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

Mr. RODDA: This morning, in company with the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and other members, I attended the farmers' march at which I was confronted by an irate farmer who said that he came from Eyre Peninsula and that he was amazed that the Minister of Education had said that a meeting had been called at Cummins by the Eyre Bible Society and the League of Rights. The protesting farmer said that this statement was wrong, because the meeting had been called by interested parents in the district. Did the Minister of Education say that the meeting was called by the League of Rights and the Eyre Bible Society and, if he did, can he say where he obtained that information?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member checks the *Hansard* report he will find a correct account of my statement last week, when I said that I believed that the meeting had been called by members of the League of Rights and of the Eyre Bible Fellowship. I did not say that it had been called by

the League of Rights, but I said that it had been called by its members.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't quibble.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sorry. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not aware that this organization has been extremely active on Eyre Peninsula on matters such as this, he should discuss the position with representatives from the area, and they could tell him about it.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister has not answered the question, and he has tried to drag the League of Rights and the Bible Society into this question. This meeting dealt with the concern of the parents of schoolchildren about the textbooks and, in view of that concern, will the Minister assure members that all political Parties will be given equal representation in social studies textbooks?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable members wants it, he can have it. The department has had many reports on the activities of the League of Rights on Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's one of the gang.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know that; the honourable member has not said so publicly, so I would not suggest that he is.

Mr. Gunn: "He" is not a member of it!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The meeting at Cummins was held on Friday, July 10. About the middle of June a confidential report about the situation reached the Education Department, and part of that report, dealing with members of the League of Rights, states:

The situation at Cummins is fairly typical. Its members are critical of progress in general and of innovation in education in particular. They are convinced of the value of formal discipline and physical punishment. The present attempts to teach social studies as a study of society are deplored as undermining the real and lasting values to be gained from a study of British History in the Cecil Rhodes tradition. Paradoxically, however, they appear to undermine school discipline by emphasizing the rights of the individual children *vis-a-vis* their teachers.

Further, a report to the department on June 5, about five weeks before the meeting that Mr. McLeay, M.H.R., addressed, states that action taken by people who were complaining about these textbooks included (and I have not said this before, but I now give these reports), first a number of telephone calls to the new member for Flinders (Mr. Carnie); secondly, a public meeting at Tumby Bay; thirdly, discussion at a meeting of financial Liberal and Country League members at

Cummins; and fourthly, a meeting of League of Rights members to consider holding a public meeting at Cummins, with the possibility of inviting a person, possibly Mr. John McLeay, M.H.R., to address it. That information arrived in the Education Department during the first week in June.

Mr. RODDA: When the House sat on April 28 and April 29 this year, on that fateful occasion the Minister, then a member of the Opposition, saw fit to be concerned about the publication *What our Schools are Doing*. Looking back to that situation in which the Minister found himself, I know that he did not know what our schools were doing. He successfully restrained the then Minister from distributing that publication. In view of the attitude that the Minister then adopted in wanting a fair go for all parents, will he give a fair go to all political Parties on the matter covered in the textbooks on the lines mentioned in the discussion at the meeting at Cummins?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a pity that the member for Victoria does not have a proper appreciation of the kind of professional standards required in the teaching profession. I had hoped that it would be clear to him and his colleagues by now that the preparation of textbooks and of the curriculum was a matter for the professional determination of the teachers concerned. So long as I am satisfied that these teachers have been acting with professional integrity and competence, I do not intend to intervene, nor should I or any member of Parliament intervene.

Mr. Rodda: Not if we are doubtful about your satisfaction?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member can do what he likes about that. As I have told the honourable member before, as long as the professional integrity of the people concerned is clear it should be left to them without there being any form of political interference. Concerning the meeting at Cummins and the events before the meeting, the integrity of certain teachers of the department was questioned. I do not intend to canvass what was said, but the teachers concerned resented the statements. The previous Government saw fit to spend \$26,500 on the pamphlet *What our Schools are Doing*. The member for Victoria said that I was responsible for restraining the member for Torrens from distributing it, but that is not true. Throughout the election campaign the Leader of the Opposition accused the Labor Party of banning it. Whilst all this was going on the member

for Torrens, the previous Minister of Education, was doing his best to get it out. What has happened in relation to this pamphlet is an interesting story. The parent-teacher council, operating through the Institute of Teachers, prepared a letter to go to parents if any school should distribute this booklet. That council was concerned to point out to parents that the booklet gave only a one-sided picture of the situation and that they should be aware that it did not deal with all sorts of deficiency within the education system. My attitude was that, so long as the letter from the parent-teacher council was inserted, I did not object to the booklet and that letter going out. However, acting on the memorandum which was prepared when the member for Davenport was Minister of Education over the events of the Commonwealth election in Kingston, which instructed headmasters that school-children should not be used as postmen, and which left it to the discretion of headmasters as to what they would do in the matter, certain headmasters refused to distribute the booklet. No action will be taken in relation to those headmasters.

PORT GILES

Mr. VENNING: I was interested to hear on the radio this morning that it was reported that the Minister of Marine had said that the lifting of the surcharge on grain deliveries to Port Giles meant a saving to primary producers of \$40,000. Can the Minister say how this figure is calculated? It had been intended that over a period the cost of the Port Giles installation would be amortized by the primary producers who deliver there, by the payment of a charge of 2½c a bushel. I am not sure whether the Minister was correctly reported, but can he enlighten me on how a saving of \$40,000 will be available to primary producers by lifting the surcharge at Port Giles?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This figure came out as a result of a question asked of me yesterday and I said that I thought the saving to primary producers would be about \$40,000. This was a figure I had heard mentioned, and it was based on the quantity of grain that would go through the facility at 2½c a bushel, and the fact that it would not be paid would represent a saving to those who delivered grain to that facility of about \$40,000. In order to check my memory on this matter, I have inquired this morning of the Marine and Harbors Department, and if there is anything that should be corrected I will put the matter right.

o

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. LANGLEY: It was reported in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, July 21, that South Australia had had the highest cost of living rise of any State in the last three months. Certain cities had various rises, but all cities had rises in house prices, repairs and maintenance. Also, senior Treasury officials are reported to be worried about the unexpected increase in the consumer price index. Today's *Advertiser* reports that the Premier has asked the Prices Commissioner to ascertain what could be done about Adelaide's rising cost of living. Can the Premier say whether the releasing from price control of building materials and many other essential commodities by the former Government has had the desired effect, as we have seen steadily rising costs since that action? Also, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to ensure the control of prices in this State, an action that was successful during the term of the previous Labor Government in improving the living conditions of South Australians generally?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since the Government has taken office I have called for reports from the Prices Commissioner about the movement in prices in areas that have so far come under the surveillance of the Prices Commissioner because either these things were previously subject to control or many complaints have been received about them. A close watch is being kept on several areas. In some areas, while recontrol has not occurred, specific requests have been made to proprietors and businessmen to keep us informed of any intended movement in prices, and indications have been given in some cases that, if prices increase without information being given to us immediately, recontrol may result forthwith. The present investigation by the Prices Commissioner is into areas of prices which are shown in the indices as having moved but which have not previously been the subject of report by him to me, so that we can keep a close watch on these areas. None of the items referred to in the report of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics is the one to which the Leader of the Opposition referred in his remarks to the newspaper yesterday, and it did not occur during the quarter.

DRUGS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health how many people are being treated for drug dependence under

the auspices of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, what types of drug dependence are being treated, and how many patients are involved with each type?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will try to get that information from my colleague.

PADDLE STEAMER

Mr. CURREN: About 12 months ago, the paddle steamer *Industry*, the work boat of the Engineering and Water Supply Department on the Murray River, was replaced by a new work boat. As the *Industry* is now surplus to requirements, an approach has been made by tourist authorities in the river districts to have the old steamer made available as a tourist attraction and museum. Can the Premier, as Minister of Development, say what action is proposed by the Government regarding this approach?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Town Clerks of Renmark and Loxton were written to on July 22 in the following terms:

I refer to your letter to the Minister of Works seeking assistance in the acquisition of the paddle steamer *Industry* for use as an historic museum. I am pleased to advise that the Government has given approval for the purchase of this paddle steamer from the River Murray Commission at a cost of \$5,000. The towns of Renmark and Loxton have made strong applications to be allotted the P.S. *Industry*. The Premier has asked that the Director of the Museum Department (Dr. Grant Inglis) and I should carry out an investigation and make a recommendation to him on which town should be favoured. I have discussed this matter with Dr. Inglis and he agrees that, before visiting Renmark and Loxton, each town should be given the opportunity to submit a detailed case in writing in support of its claim.

The basis of the application was then set forth in the letter, asking for information from each town, before the towns were visited by the two officers concerned to determine their recommendations to me.

MANNUM ROAD

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on July 16 about Main Road No. 33, which is the road from Tea Tree Gully to Mannum?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The report concerning the improvement of Main Road No. 33 between Tea Tree Gully and Mannum, to which the honourable member refers, is presently being considered by the Highways Department. No decision has yet been made on the precise form and extent of improvements to be made to this road. The priority of this work in relation to other important works and

the availability of funds for works of this category are present by also receiving consideration. At this stage, it is not expected that it will be possible to undertake significant work on this road within the next three years.

BUILDING REGISTER

Mr. CLARK: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked him on July 15 about the practice of the Australian Building Industry Register in sending out to people accounts for advertisements appearing in this register which have not been ordered?

The Hon. L. J. KING: In his question, the honourable member drew attention to what seems to be a practice on the part of this organization, which describes itself as an international publisher of trade and business directories, of sending documents in the form of accounts to members of the public, purporting to debit them with the cost of an entry in a business directory. It does not seem that any offence is committed. There does not appear to be any way of restricting these operations in South Australia, as the place of business is outside South Australia and all communications are by post. I think that the only course open to me is to warn the public (and I do so) that the mere receipt of an account does not place the recipient under any legal obligation to pay the account. If no order has been sent for the insertion of an entry in the directory, the account may be safely ignored. I suggest that members of the public should think carefully before entering into any business transactions with companies which solicit business in this manner.

QUORN ROAD

Mr. ALLEN: Recently, when in the Quorn district, I was approached by representatives of the District Council of Kanyaka-Quorn, who are worried about the delay in upgrading the Quorn-Wilmington main road, which is about 20 miles long. A deputation from this council waited on the Minister of Roads in the former Labor Government (Hon. S. C. Bevan) and presented a case for upgrading this road. The district of Quorn is particularly tourist conscious, and the people concerned, who are obtaining good results from their efforts in this regard, believe that the sealing of this road would add to the tourist potential of the area. Indeed, anyone who has travelled north on the road running through Clare, Gladstone, Wilmington and Quorn will know that this is a scenic drive for the tourist which could be referred to as the gateway to the Flinders

Ranges. However, it is disappointing to tourists to find the last 20 miles of this road unsealed. The council is concerned about its immediate works programme, and if this road were upgraded it would enable the council to proceed with preliminary work in relation to culverts and embankments, etc. Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain what is his department's policy concerning this road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was intrigued to hear the honourable member say that the council in question was concerned to have this road upgraded and that representatives of the council had waited on the Hon. Mr. Bevan, the then Minister of Roads, in order to state a case. Presumably, this must have taken place prior to 1968, and I am wondering whether these people have made any subsequent moves to show that they are really concerned about the condition of this road. However, I will comply with the honourable member's request and obtain a report.

RURAL YOUTH ADVISER

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to examine the possibility of having a rural youth adviser stationed on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to convey that request to the Minister of Agriculture and to obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

CHEQUES

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, a business house expressed concern at the number of cheques that it had received back from the bank because of insufficient funds, a situation that has probably been brought about by the increasing use of cheque banking accounts by people in order to pay their bills. However, if the practice continues of paying by cheque with insufficient funds in the account, cheques generally may no longer be accepted as credit worthy. I notice that other States are tightening up their laws relating to the passing of cheques and that additional penalties are being provided to curb the practice to which I have referred. Is the Attorney-General satisfied with the existing law in South Australia relating to the handling of cheques? If he is not, will he do something about the matter in order to protect those who issue valid cheques?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The present law makes it an offence to obtain money or property by passing a cheque, knowing that it will not be met on presentation (I am paraphrasing the relevant section from

memory). The difficulty about this is that in some cases the property has already been obtained and the cheque is passed in payment. The question which that raises is whether it should be an offence to pass a cheque knowing that it will not be met on presentation in any circumstances; that is to say, irrespective of whether it is used for the purpose of obtaining money or property. This matter was discussed at the recent meeting of the Attorneys-General of the Commonwealth and the States, and various views were expressed on the topic. I think that some of the other States may consider the matter further. However, concerning South Australia, I have called for a report on the operation of the present law and on whether any undue harshness or injustice would be brought about by a tightening of the law. When I obtain that report, I may be able to tell the honourable member what is the Government's attitude to any change.

PIPES

Mr. McKEE: For some years there have been stacks of old Engineering and Water Supply Department pipes alongside the Port Germein highway. I have received complaints from local residents and the local council that not only are the pipes an eyesore but that they have also now become a breeding ground for vermin. I understand the pipes now belong to a private individual or a company. I have been requested to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether he will take up with the people who own them the removal of the pipes as soon as possible.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will certainly look at the matter, but unfortunately it is not simple to deal with. Only a few weeks ago, whilst in the area, on inquiring I found out that these pipes had been sold to a private individual. The Highways Commissioner has told me that there is no power in the Act to require that the pipes be removed, even though they are on a public road. Although I was rather surprised to receive that information, that is the position. However, I will again take up the matter to see whether something cannot be done. If that fails, members of the House might join me, and we will remove them ourselves.

AGED COTTAGE HOMES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In a speech last week, the Attorney-General canvassed certain matters concerning Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated. As you will know, Mr. Speaker, various organizations in South Australia have broadly

similar objects to those of Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated. Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether his colleague has been informed by any other of these organizations of an intention to increase the charges (rents or otherwise) payable by occupants of dwellings erected by the organizations? If he has, will he say which are the organizations and by how much their rents have been increased?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will speak to my colleague and obtain the information required.

BREAD

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to a comprehensive question, regarding the future legislative or executive action to be taken in relation to bread, that I asked last Thursday, when the Minister was saved by the 4 o'clock bell?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: True, the bell went just as the honourable member concluded asking his question. The policy of this Government, as indicated in the policy speech prior to the election, is to provide for a five-day baking week throughout the State. I am at present involved in negotiations with representatives of all sections of the bread industry. The negotiations are at an advanced stage but, as the honourable member will know from his negotiations with this industry, there are differences of opinion between city and country bakers. At this stage I am pleased to report that these differences have been considerably narrowed, and as soon as finality is reached I will make an announcement.

SCHOOL WINDOWS

Mr. BECKER: Windows in most Government schools have not been cleaned for about three years. I understand that the cost of cleaning windows for the last full financial year prior to the maintenance ceasing was about \$250,000. As this appears to be an extremely high sum in view of the competitiveness of window cleaning services, will the Minister of Education reconsider the matter of window cleaning at Government schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer is "No". I am pleased to be able to present a united front on this matter with the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and the member for Davenport (Mrs. Steele), who were the previous occupants of the office of Minister of Education, as well as with the former member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday), who preceded them in that office and who made the original decision.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was bitterly opposed by the present Opposition.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And he was heavily criticized, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: True. When we asked the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), when his Party was previously in Government, whether he would raise the matter with the Minister of Education to get something done about it, he refused to have anything to do with it. It is estimated that, if the cleaning of windows was undertaken as a result of calling tenders, we could get it done at a cost of \$55,000 for one clean a year and \$160,000 for three cleans a year. If we were going to do it, I think three cleans a year would be necessary. If we had only one clean a year, it would be bound to rain later that day, as that would be a sure-fire way of getting rain. In view of the overall priorities that exist in education at present, I do not think it can be said legitimately that the cleaning of windows has a higher priority than the employment of more teachers, the provision of better equipment and better facilities at our schools, the expansion of teachers' college training, and so on; I believe those things have higher priorities. At present, we do not have enough finance to carry out these matters at the kind of standard we should like to see. Consequently, the decision not to clean school windows will have to be maintained.

SCHOOL FANS

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Education proceed to implement the plan instituted by the previous Government to install fans in all wooden classrooms connected to mains electricity supply?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We intend to make some progress in this area. The Leader will be aware that we are committed to expanding the school-building programme; consequently, the position regarding the installation of fans is being looked at to make sure that we do not install fans in classrooms that are likely to be replaced within the next few years. Where there is no immediate prospect of replacing wooden classrooms, fans will be installed. It may be necessary to spread the programme over a period depending on the competition of other priorities in this area.

Mr. Hall: You're using some of the funds we set aside for it, are you?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, I did not say that at all. I should think that even the

Leader would not ask this Government to put fans into a wooden classroom which, as a result of expansion of the school-building programme, would be replaced in the next year or two.

Mr. Hall: You said it would take 216 years to replace all the wooden classrooms.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That was at the rate of replacement the former Government was working at. We hope to expand that rate significantly, as I have already said in replying to questions asked by other members. If the Leader was still Premier, doubtless it would be necessary to have the full programme of fans in every classroom throughout the State.

Mr. Hall: Will you tell us what percentage of the programme will be proceeded with? Is it half?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Wherever it is necessary—

Mr. Hall: In other words, you don't know?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Wherever it is necessary to provide fans because there is no immediate prospect of replacing a temporary classroom, that will be done, but surely the Leader will not ask any Government (even though he was Leader of that Government) to institute a programme of putting fans in a wooden classroom that was about to be scrapped. If the Leader thinks more carefully about the matter, he will see the merit of the proposed review of this matter that I have arranged.

GLAUCOMA

Dr. TONKIN: Chronic glaucoma is a disease of the eyes that has received much notice in recent years, particularly through the activities of Lions Clubs regarding early detection of the disease. The disease involves an extremely insidious loss of peripheral vision at the side. This matter has cropped up in my own practice recently, in relation to an enginedriver. It is possible to detect this disease, by a simple tonometer test, long before any other symptoms become apparent to the person concerned. In view of the danger of insidious loss of peripheral vision caused by undetected glaucoma, can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the periodic medical examination of enginedrivers in the Railways Department includes the tonometer test for glaucoma? If it does not, will the Minister have this test included in the medical examination?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: All Railways Department employees are subject to periodic

medical examination. Naturally, I have not details of the examination but I understand that it is complete and thorough, with particular emphasis on sight, the specific aspect to which the honourable member has referred. I shall be pleased to ask the Railways Commissioner to refer the matter to the railway doctor for a report.

LOBETHAL PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: Again speaking on behalf of the member for Kavel, I ask the Minister of Education whether he has a reply to the question asked recently by the honourable member about heating at Lobethal Primary School.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Again I thank the honourable member for asking this question on behalf of the member for Kavel. A request for oil heating for the Lobethal Primary School was received in the Education Department on June 22, 1970. A second and later request was received for electric heating to be provided in one room as a temporary measure owing to the breakdown of the wood stove. These requests were forwarded to the Public Buildings Department and will be dealt with as quickly as possible.

FREE TEXTBOOKS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Education consider liberalizing the means test used to decide whether a schoolchild may get free textbooks?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A fairly strict means test is applied and a review of the test involves considering financial matters and how much additional money can be made available to liberalize the test, as I think the honourable member appreciates. However, I will review the position and tell the honourable member what is my decision.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

Mr. CARNIE: I noted with interest last week the comment of the Attorney-General, when moving the adoption of the Address in Reply, that he is a great believer in the equality of individuals as, I hope, we all are. I assume this comment can be extended to apply also to freedom of thought. If that is so, can the Attorney-General say whether he is in favour of compulsory unionism?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Compulsory unionism would, if it ever became a live issue, be a matter for Cabinet decision. To the best of my knowledge, there has been no suggestion that the Government will introduce a measure providing for compulsory unionism.

nor is it the policy of the Australian Labor Party anywhere in the Commonwealth to legislate for compulsory unionism. Personally, I am not in favour of compulsory unionism.

TEACHERS' CRITICISMS

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister of Education recently invited teachers to offer criticism regarding education without their being subject to disciplinary action. Was the Minister aware when he did this that all correspondence must be forwarded through the respective headmasters? Also, what assurance could there be that no embarrassment or repercussion would be felt by the teacher concerned, should the headmaster not agree with or actively dislike the criticism offered?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position strictly is as the honourable member has stated it. However, the Education Department has recognized that individual teachers have approached members of Parliament, particularly members of this House, for many years. I intend to produce on this matter a general statement that can be sent to all teachers in the State, so that any doubts they have can be clarified. In almost every case of which I am aware the criticism offered by teachers has been offered responsibly. They have attempted to draw the attention of the community to the deficiencies of the system and to the need for additional financial support. I have said in the past that teachers are correct in bringing this sort of criticism to public attention, and every time I have said this I have added that it is important that any public criticism made by the teachers regarding deficiencies in the education system should be made in such a way that the public is not antagonized and that teachers should gain, not lose, community support as a consequence of their criticism. However, teachers should not be involved in criticisms or attacks that involve personalities, that is, attacks on the person of their headmaster or on individual members of the department.

Mr. Hall: Or the Minister!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, I think that the Leader of the Opposition and other members can be subject to attack to a much greater extent than any officer of the department or any school headmaster, and this is something that occurs all the time; any person who is active in politics must take the consequences of this. No-one likes personal attacks of any description, and I know the Leader would do everything he could to discourage people indulging in personalities. I should

hope that the Leader would even discourage someone from indulging in a personal attack on me.

The advantages of public discussion are not achieved when people indulge in personal attacks. Also, the effective running of any school depends on the teachers of that school being willing to work together as a team. The headmaster, together with his senior staff, is the leader of that team, and the teachers of the school are expected to accept that leadership. To a much greater extent than was the case even a few years ago, the headmaster and his senior staff consult with the rest of the staff at staff meetings, and in school after school throughout the State staff associations have sprung up and have become most active in dealing with all sorts of educational matters and local school problems. Generally, teachers have adopted a sensible approach by offering any criticism through the staff association when it is necessary to do so, and I believe this is the most appropriate way of doing it.

There is another area of educational philosophy which is carried on professionally and in which various points of view are canvassed and criticized. This is an area in which every teacher, as a professional person, must have the complete right to express his point of view. In view of some misunderstandings and some press and television shorthand accounts of statements I have made, and to ensure that the situation is clarified, a general statement on the department's attitude on this matter will be made available to ensure that the situation is clear. I am having investigated the rights of teachers to approach individual members of Parliament, because it is inappropriate to have regulations preventing teachers from doing so.

Mr. HALL: The Minister has fully explained his attitude to the manner in which teachers may criticize education policy in South Australia, saying that as long as criticism is not personal it should be allowed and studied as to its content. In view of this attitude, will the Minister desist from branding all critics of textbooks as members of the League of Rights?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader has a reputation here for taking some small statement and blowing it up into some grandiose misrepresentation. All I said was that I believed that the meeting at Cummins was called by members of the League of Rights. It is a complete *non sequitur* to conclude from that statement that all people who criticize

textbooks are, therefore, members of the League of Rights.

Mr. Hall: How do you differentiate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not differentiating. The Leader is guilty of a logical fallacy that students concerned in our schools would pick up immediately, and it is a pity that he cannot work it out for himself.

ABATTOIRS

Mr. WARDLE: Members will be aware that a charge is levied on meat sent from country abattoirs to the metropolitan area. In the past that charge has been $\frac{1}{2}$ c a lb., although I believe that at Port Lincoln it has been $\frac{1}{2}$ c or $\frac{3}{4}$ c a lb. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture how much was collected through that inspection fee in the last financial year ended June 30 and what costs were involved in inspecting meat coming into the metropolitan area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to do that.

STOCK HANDLING

Mr. EASTICK: Members will be aware that from and including Wednesday, July 15, all buyers who kill meat through export meat-works will purchase only sheep and lambs that have been shorn or hand or machine crutched immediately before marketing. The crutching is to include a full crutch and not the pocket crutching often undertaken in some areas. One requirement of these rules and regulations was that all transports must be thoroughly clean and, more particularly, that all sale yards be clean and maintained in such condition as to enable clean stock to be delivered to the abattoir clean after sale. It has been stated that some owners who have made deliveries claim that their sheep have had to go into yards that were fouled before the arrival of the sheep. Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a report on both the effectiveness of the new measure and the number of sheep and lambs if any, that have been banned as a result of post-arrival contamination, and ask him whether there has been any significant increase in the condemnation of lambs because of bruising as a result of the additional handling?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague on what seems to be a pretty crutchy problem.

Mr. FERGUSON: The member for Light has explained something of the nature and difficulty of crutching all sheep and lambs before they are slaughtered at the abattoirs.

Anyone who has had experience in raising fat lambs will know that, if this operation takes place immediately before sheep go into the works, bruising is likely to occur. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether consideration has been given to placing a crutcher on the chain at the abattoirs to carry out this operation before skinning and dressing are done?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to call for a report from my colleague.

ABORIGINAL TRAINING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The 26th paragraph of His Excellency's Speech states, "The programmes for the training of Aborigines will be stepped up." There is no elucidation of that statement but, as it has been deliberately inserted in the Speech, can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say which programmes he has in mind and how they will be stepped up?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government's plans are being formulated and developed, and I will announce them in due course.

No. 3 DOCK

Mr. COUMBE: In 1968, I concluded an agreement with Sir John Williams, General Manager of the Australian National Line, in connection with the building of No. 3 dock at Port Adelaide. Part of this agreement stated that the State would provide some funds and that the Australian National Line also would provide some funds for some of the equipment to be installed, particularly the crane. It was also provided in the agreement that the Australian National Line, which would provide container and vehicular traffic to this State from other States, would have priority in using this dock, but that when its vessels were not due to come in other vessels could use it. At the time, it was expected that this dock would be available for perhaps K Line ships or oversea vessels that would come to Port Adelaide and use the facilities provided, and so increase trade in Port Adelaide. No. 3 dock has been completed, but I understand that the Australian National Line vessel is not yet ready to use it. Therefore, will the Minister of Marine say whether he has taken any action to encourage other vessels to come to South Australia and to use the peculiar facilities available at the dock? Bearing in mind that we want more trade to come to South Australia, and that we want to avoid vessels' by-passing the State, I point out that the facilities available at No. 3 dock are of a peculiar type that would attract vessels to this State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I accept the honourable member's suggestion as being sound. As I have not yet considered the aspect to which he has referred, I shall be happy to take it up with my department to see whether anything can be done. I appreciate the honourable member's suggestion.

BURNSIDE INTERSECTION

Mrs. STEELE: My question relates to the roadworks of not inconsiderable magnitude that have been in operation for some time on the perimeter of my district and that of the member for Bragg: I refer to the demise of the large roundabout at the intersection of Portrush and Greenhill Roads. For some weeks before the beginning of last week, there was at this intersection the most considerable concentration of men and vehicles from the Engineering and Water Supply Department that I have ever seen engaged on one project. However, I understand that their part in the demolition of this roundabout is now completed. The present situation has caused considerable congestion to traffic and not a little concern to traders in what is a vigorous shopping centre in that part of the metropolitan area. I understand that the purpose is to install traffic lights at this busy and important intersection. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say how long the roadworks are likely to continue and when it is likely that traffic lights will be installed at this intersection?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that I cannot give the honourable member that information off the cuff, but I will certainly obtain a report for her as quickly as possible.

FILM CENSORSHIP

Mr. EVANS: I believe that the Attorney-General has received a letter similar to that which I have received from the Aldgate Baptist Fellowship, which states:

We the undersigned of the Aldgate Baptist Fellowship view with concern that at present children may be taken to see films that are labelled by the censor as "Strictly for Adults Only". We support the suggested restricted classification for films (an R or X certificate) which young people under a specific age should not be admitted to see. We would ask for legislation to prohibit theatre proprietors from admitting children to films classed as restricted for adult audiences. We view with concern the call for a laxity in censorship control particularly with regard to what children are allowed to watch.

The letter states that a similar letter has been forwarded to the Commonwealth Minister for Customs and Excise, and 21 signatures then appear. Will the Attorney-General say whether

the State Government can take any action in this regard and, if it can, whether it will take that action to ensure that children are not allowed to view the type of film referred to?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The question of persons who have not reached an age at which they are able to make a mature decision about the type of film they should see is undoubtedly a very important one, and it exercises my mind as well as that of the Government. It also exercises the minds of other Governments in Australia. The Commonwealth Government has recently invited each of the States to attend a conference in order to discuss this matter. I inquired at the recent Attorneys-General Conference whether any more definite plans had been made by the Commonwealth about when the conference would take place, but the Commonwealth Attorney-General could not tell me. Of course, he is not the Commonwealth Minister in charge of this matter: the Minister for Customs and Excise is directly in charge of it. It is likely that a conference of the Commonwealth and State Ministers will be held soon. The date of that conference will be fixed by the Commonwealth Minister. It may be that, at the conclusion of that conference, I shall be able to give the honourable member further information.

TROUBRIDGE

Mr. CARNIE: Recently the Minister of Roads and Transport announced that the Government intended to introduce a ferry service between the mainland and Kangaroo Island. Can the Minister say what the Government intends to do in relation to M.V. *Troubridge*?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question raised by the honourable member is scarcely one for the Government to answer: we cannot have any intention about M.V. *Troubridge*, which is the property of Adelaide Steamship Company Limited. Although we pay that company a subsidy of \$200,000 a year to continue running the *Troubridge*, this subsidy will expire on, I think, June 30, 1972. Other than commenting in that regard, it would not be proper for me to say that the Government had any intention with regard to the vessel; rather, it will be a matter for the company to say what it intends for the future of the vessel.

MINISTER'S VISITS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether he has any immediate plans to visit council areas in the District of Rocky River? If he has not, I invite him

to make the visit, on which I should like to accompany him.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At this stage, I have no specific plans to visit the District of Rocky River. I have received numerous invitations from councils throughout South Australia, including councils in the honourable member's district. I have said that I desire and intend as soon as it is physically possible to visit all sections of the State, particularly in regard to local government. However, it is a question of priorities: first things must come first. At this stage, I cannot embark on a tour of the type referred to by the honourable member.

TRANSPORT CONTROL

Mr. MATHWIN: Certain activities at present controlled by the South Australian Railways and the Municipal Tramways Trust are to be examined preparatory to bringing all forms of transport directly under Ministerial control in a transport department in which all activity will be properly co-ordinated. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether this means that small transport operators will eventually be taken over and that all transport will be more or less nationalized?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure whether this is a serious question; I can only hope it is not.

Mr. Mathwin: It is.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should have hoped the honourable member would not ask such a question. The answer is definitely "No". The policy of my Party is to provide for the activities of the South Australian Railways and the Municipal Tramways Trust to be co-ordinated in a transport department under the direct control of a Minister. However, within this concept, obviously other forms of transport will be operating. Without being able at this stage to spell out the details associated with this plan, I can say that it is reasonable to expect that licensed services will continue to operate in much the same way as they do at present. I hope the honourable member will not put a false construction on my reply, as the Leader did with respect to a reply I gave to a question he asked. I refer to a comment the Leader made last evening on the radio that was a completely false representation of the answer I gave him yesterday in relation to another matter. However, I assure the member for Glenelg that the fear he apparently has lacks foundation completely.

DENTAL TREATMENT

Mr. McANANEY: Prior to the erection of the new dental hospital at Frome Road there was a long waiting list of poor people requiring attention. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether this problem has been solved and, if it has not, whether private dentists can be used, particularly in the country, to deal with such cases?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report.

MARREE SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: When I was recently in the Marree area in the Far North of the State, I visited the Marree school, which is attended by about 75 children and which is classed as a special school, as 70 per cent of the children are part-Aboriginal. I can well remember that, after visiting the school, the former Minister of Education (Mrs. Steele) said in the House that she was surprised at the conditions there. After visiting the school, I agree with what she said. The building, being made of galvanized iron, is extremely hot in summer. As I understand a new Samcon building has been approved to replace the present building, can the Minister of Education give a firm date for the opening of the new building?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is correct in saying that a Samcon building will be provided for the Marree school, the design work on that building having commenced. We hope that the documents will be ready shortly, with work getting under way soon. Provided the work commences fairly soon, the new building should be ready early next year. However, the Samcon programme being subject from time to time to some variation in planning, I do not want to be caught out in promising that the new school building at Marree will be completed before the beginning of the school year. However, I hope that that will be the opening date.

SMALL BOATS

Mr. WARDLE: The Minister of Marine will remember that the matter of the registration of power boats and the licensing of power boat drivers was discussed in the previous Parliament. Also, he will know that many councils, speed boat clubs and private individuals have made certain submissions about the matter. As I understand that a former Minister of Marine (Mr. Coumbe) intended to introduce legislation before last summer, but that this

was not practicable, can the Minister of Marine say whether such legislation is likely to be introduced before the coming summer?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Legislation was not prepared previously. However, the matter is at present under active consideration.

Mr. Millhouse: What is "active consideration"?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am always active when I am considering something.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The former Government did nothing, but our Government is considering it, and that's different.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is every possibility that legislation will be introduced during the present session.

PRE-SCHOOL KINDERGARTENS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that the Minister of Education can now tell me something of the Government's plans, announced in His Excellency's Speech, about the establishment of Aboriginal pre-school kindergartens. Last week, when I asked the question, the Minister could not give the information.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am tempted to tell the honourable member that the matter is under active consideration, but I have already told him that I have a reply.

Mr. Millhouse: That's why I asked the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Schools at present classed as Aboriginal schools are those at Amata, Yalata, Koonibba, Nepabunna, Point McLeay, Point Pearce, Winkie, Coober Pedy, Oodnadatta and Marree. The first of the pre-school centres has been set up at Amata. A trained infants teacher was given a special course of training to enable her to take charge of the school and the pre-school was opened at the beginning of 1970. The Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs is now asking for Commonwealth funds for the establishment of pre-school buildings and staff quarters at Indulkana, Yalata and Marree. A pre-school under the supervision of the Education Department operates at Koonibba, where a trained teacher is in charge. At Nepabunna and Point McLeay, pre-school children are admitted to a special class at the primary schools. Because numbers are few, the establishment of a separate pre-school is not warranted. The Education Department accepted the responsibility for the Point Pearce kindergarten from the Kindergarten Union on July 1, 1970. This is now being operated by two untrained Aboriginal women under the direction of the head teacher, but a trained teacher

will be appointed as soon as possible. A female welfare officer employed by the Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs conducts a small pre-school at Gerard Aboriginal settlement on five afternoons each week. The equipment has been supplied by the Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs and the people of the district. At the beginning of Term II, 1970, a Van Leer Foundation Project pre-school was established in a temporary building at Marree. The Education Department will accept the responsibility for this school from the beginning of 1972. Arrangements with the Australian Presbyterian Board of Missions are well in hand for the take-over of schools at Ernabella and Fregon, but the board has asked that it retain control for the present of the pre-school. The Aboriginal teacher-aides are in these three categories:

- (a) Aides who have been appointed to Aboriginal schools on the basis of one aide for every two white teachers. The head teachers are expected to give the aides "on the spot" training. The aides are not expected to accept the responsibilities of a teacher. They will, in effect, be teachers' assistants. Head teachers speak highly of the work being done by the aides.
- (b) At the beginning of 1970, the Commonwealth Government provided money for the training of ten adults as teacher-aides at Amata. These adults had a very limited education prior to the introduction of the scheme. Their attitude towards the training has been commendable and through their liaison work the attitude of the Aborigines in the camp towards the school has changed considerably, particularly with regard to the school attendance of children.
- (c) A proposal for the training in Adelaide of up to 50 Aborigines as aides is currently being examined by the Education Department.

Other matters on which I am not able to report directly at present are being considered.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am just not able to do so now.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't know!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do know, but I do not intend to tell the honourable member.

WATER RATING

Mr. COUMBE: Last year, I announced the appointment of a committee to inquire into the water rating system that has applied in South Australia since the foundation of the colony, to try to find a more equitable system of water rating with greater emphasis on payment for water actually used, somewhat similar to the basis on which electricity accounts and gas accounts are rendered. As I understand that the committee has taken some evidence, can the Minister of Works say when the committee is likely to submit its report and, as the report is likely to be far reaching, will he, after considering the report, table it, in the same way as the Ligertwood report, which dealt with a somewhat similar but not so detailed inquiry, was tabled a few years ago?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The committee is continuing its work at present. A slight delay in the submission of the report is likely because the Chairman of the committee (Mr. Sangster, Q.C.) is going to Japan for a short time. His absence will probably delay the committee's visit to country areas. I will not say, on the spur of the moment, whether I will table the report but, after examining it, I shall be pleased to consider that aspect. The committee is proceeding with its work but I cannot give the honourable member, off the cuff, any idea of when it will complete its report.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: A section of the South-Eastern Freeway between Crafers and Stirling is illuminated by golden lights and local residents call this section the golden mile. There is no guarantee that the lights improve driving conditions, and there is no evidence that they make conditions worse, except that in drizzling rain or other wet conditions drivers cannot see the dividing line between the two lanes on the up and down sides of the freeway. Before a serious accident occurs, will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask his officers to investigate this dangerous position, because motorists do not know in what lane they are travelling and many drivers tend to straddle the line when it is rendered indistinguishable in drizzling rain or in other damp conditions?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am surprised at what the honourable member has said, because I understood the section of freeway that has just been completed to have been built to the latest standards. I should be surprised if, when the officers submit their report, the member's claim is substantiated.

However, I will certainly have the matter investigated and bring down a report.

FERTILIZERS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: From time to time agricultural scientists, the Agriculture Department, and the fertilizer companies have been criticized as a result of their attitude regarding the use of materials other than superphosphate. Various organizations, advocating the use of dolomite, ground rock, phosphate and so on, have gone beyond the ordinary bounds in their argument and have impugned the good faith of the scientists concerned. I noticed in the farmers' march this morning that amongst the many sincere expressions of farmers' problems were placards dealing with the use of fertilizers, other than superphosphate, to which I have already referred. Although I did not see it, I believe that one placard criticized the Agriculture Department's attitude on the matter. In the best interests of the farmers themselves, this matter should be cleared up by the Minister. I should not like advantage to be taken of the marchers, who were sincerely expressing their problems, by organizations trying to use the march for their own purposes.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is debating the question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I therefore ask the Minister of Lands to take up this question with the Minister of Agriculture so that a statement can be made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to pass on the honourable member's comments to my colleague. It seems to be consistent with past practice that demonstrators are used, sometimes unconsciously, for the promotion of matters other than those about which they are demonstrating, and this seemed to be the case today.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 21. Page 178.)

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I rise to support the motion and, in concert with earlier speakers, congratulate you, Sir, on your elevation to the high office of Speaker of this House. I also congratulate the member for Adelaide on his election as Chairman of Committees, as well as the Premier and the various Ministers on their appointments to

their respective portfolios. I wish them well for their term of office.

I am conscious of the honour bestowed upon me by the Australian Labor Party in preselecting me for the seat of Mitchell, and I am proud that the electors of my district confirmed its selection. I also thank other members for their courteous manner and the help they have freely offered in assisting a new member to settle in. Also, I thank the efficient and helpful staff of the House, whose good service has greatly assisted a new member to settle in and find his way about and to ease his worries and fears.

The Mitchell District, which exists as a result of last year's redistribution of boundaries, is named after an eminent scholar, the late Sir William Mitchell, the Chancellor of the University of Adelaide from 1942 to 1948. At the time of the election the district comprised about 15,700 electors, who, I am proud to say, voted the A.L.P. a handsome majority. Older members will know the vagaries and whims of electors better than I do as a new member, but I feel bound to report that at least one elector informed me that he was glad to be able to vote a Payne into Parliament as Parliament had given him many a pain in years gone by.

The area comprising the new Mitchell District was formerly in the seat of Edwardstown, and has been represented in the past by some able Labor members. I call to mind the late Frank Walsh, the former Labor Premier of South Australia and the man who beat the gerrymander; he represented the area well for many years. Prior to the redistribution of boundaries, the present Minister of Local Government (Hon. G. T. Virgo) represented the area. Members can therefore see that I have a hard task in front of me, as I have some excellent shoes to try to fill when serving my district.

The recent campaign in Mitchell was fought by two candidates, and I have but one complaint against my opponent, a complaint that has been made before in other elections: some of my opponent's advertising material failed to mention the Party he represented. I realize that this dodge has been tried before. Indeed, it was used by Alan Hickinbotham in a Commonwealth contest, and I suppose it will be used again. I am glad that on May 30 it was not used successfully.

Before the recent election I spent many weekends and the last month knocking on doors and meeting the people of my district.

I was tutored in this activity by a master, the member for Unley. To the owners of those houses I have not yet visited, I have this message: I am continuing to door knock and will use this means of communication throughout my Parliamentary career to keep a close contact with the people in my district.

I should like to make another comment about the recent election. I believe the respective slogans used by the respective Parties show why the electors chose the A.L.P. to govern them. The Liberal slogan "Vote for your life" is a selfish one and the contrast with the Labor Party's slogan of "Vote for South Australia's sake" (in other words, think of someone else and not yourself), which appealed to the people, highlights the difference between the two Parties. The Liberal and Country League stands for narrow, sectional interests, whereas the A.L.P. aims to help the majority of the people: those who need help in our society.

Before entering Parliament I was employed for some years at the South Australian Institute of Technology as a senior electronics technician. I am glad of the chance to be able to pay a tribute to the work of this institution in training South Australian technologists, a field in which it has no par. As members know, the institute was formerly the School of Mines and Industries. I do not intend to speak of the full history of this establishment, but I want members to realize fully the tremendous effort that has been made by the people employed at the institute in the last several years. The population explosion that has occurred in our schools has been every bit as devastating to the institute, yet through it all the entire staffs of the departments have absorbed such other things as the largely expanded classes which have been able to be absorbed by moving from one building to another between terms, or, as in the last two years, the maintaining of classes and the setting up of operations in two locations simultaneously. I refer to bringing into use the completed buildings at The Levels site for classes commencing in February this year and also to the use of the Reid building, which was situated across the road about 200 yards away.

Classes were not interrupted and large installations of machinery were unhooked and shifted successfully. All this work had to be done by the combined ancillary and academic staff with little extra help and I stress that it was done under constant financial difficulty.

For example, State funds for capital expenditure have been so meagre recently that classes in electronics are using 10-year-old oscilloscopes, which are hopelessly outdated: the position can be likened to teaching automobile principles with a horse and cart. Some principles are the same, but the action is much slower. This refers to the needs of the department with which I have been connected but I assure members that other departments are in the same plight. Therefore, the staff cannot be too highly commended, as it deserves great credit for carrying on under these difficulties as well as for coping with the enlarged classes to which I have referred.

In electronic engineering the final year class in 1969 consisted of 25 pupils, but there will be 49 pupils in the 1970 class. This increase will severely tax accommodation, as anyone familiar with education or teaching would know. I believe that it is fair to mention that during this period the academic staff at the institute had to submit to an 18-months' delaying campaign from the Commonwealth and State Liberal Governments regarding their proper status and salaries. I am not an academic, but I am pleased that the present Minister of Education has taken prompt action in this regard, and I believe and hope that his actions will be sufficient at this late date to stop a threatened drift of highly qualified staff to tertiary institutions in other States.

One aspect of the Commonwealth Government's failure to provide sufficient money for education disturbs me greatly. What is extremely important to the technological future of this State (and I do not raise this, as the member for Alexandra would have it, for political purposes) is the need for quotas. This matter affects the youth of this State who desire to become skilled technologists. I have said that the Commonwealth's failure to provide enough money for education is not only wrong but tragic. I will give an example: in 1970 the institute had available for the first year medical technicians certificate course (a three-year course, full-time) about 30 places. Offering for entry were more than 120 applicants, most of whom had the prerequisite academic attainments required for entry. However, as a result of the quota the institute accepted 36 and managed to squeeze them in. What happens to the remainder, who would number at least 70 if we assume that some of them were not sincere in wishing to continue and others had just reached the required educational attainments? They must wait for next year or later—who knows?

I received letters from two disappointed applicants: both were already working in the medical laboratory field when they applied. They were anxious to obtain higher qualifications, and they have been frustrated, as have others. It is no wonder that youth demonstrates against a Government that can find money for destruction in Vietnam on a colossal scale but cannot find it for education in Australia. Money is not the only answer, but without it or the promise of it even the necessary planning cannot get far. The Commonwealth Government is allocating somewhere near the amount required for building construction at The Levels for each triennium, but grants for the needed equipment are not so readily available. However, the buildings are nice after the North Terrace experience.

The Attorney-General referred to the disparity in present-day bargains and showed how John Citizen could get the wrong end of the stick, so to speak, when he came up against big business. This is true, and I have had an example of it in my district. Price Street, Edwardstown, is rather a nice street situated in a pleasant area, and it contains a mixture of new and older houses: many residents have been there for more than 20 years. They are mostly working people like many of us who have made the big purchase of their life: they bought their house. Last week an older house in disrepair was auctioned and sold to the Graham James group of companies. The house was in Price Street.

Subsequently, residents on either side of the block, which is on a corner, were approached by representatives of this group. The firm wanted to build five single-storey flats on the site, the residents were told by a representative of this company, but, unfortunately, the area was too small to comply with the Building Act by about 400 square feet. The representative said that if either of the neighbours would sell part of his land then the group would not need to build the four double-storey flat units it was thinking of building. In other words, he was saying that the group intended to put up eight flats on a four-unit base, in order to recoup its investment. Presumably, the block was not measured before it was purchased. There used to be another word for this sort of thing, but I call it "pressure".

The representative of this firm asked one resident to sell 10ft. across the bottom of his block or 6ft. down the side from a line level with the water tank. To the other resident the request was for 3ft. down the adjoining side of the block. I do not object to the request

made to either resident for the purchase of his land or part of it, but I do question the statement about the intention to build a two-storey structure. The residents in this area do not mind if single-storey flats are built, but they are perturbed at the loss of privacy inherent in the building of two-storey structures. The representative of the group said that to comply with the Building Act the company would have to build close to the fences if double-storey units were built.

I inquired of the Mitcham council and was told that the firm was legally able to build two-storey flats if the requirements of the Act and council by-laws were complied with, because the area is zoned as residential. Two-storey flats will destroy the character of the area and interfere with the privacy of the surrounding residents. I believe that additional protection is needed for the ordinary citizen in these circumstances. Perhaps the new Community Values Committee could assist in this regard.

In the last few days there has been much comment in the House about an aged citizens organization, and the Attorney-General has spoken about an organization with which he has had some dealings. Since I have become a member I have received requests for assistance from citizens in my district who live in cottage flats controlled by Elderly Citizens Homes of South Australia Incorporated. Their request is related to a projected maintenance charge increase (a charge which, incidentally, used to be called rent only a couple of years ago but which, for certain reasons, is now referred to as a maintenance charge). This organization is managed by a board of reputable and well-qualified citizens who are not paid for their services. Although I do not intend to read out their names, I have several items of paperwork here relating to the organization, and I have no doubt about the *bona fides* of its board.

One comment that I make about the board is that it contains two tenants' representatives who have been selected by the other members of the board and, if I may say so, that is an interesting way to have tenants represented. I have had discussions, on behalf of my constituents, with the manager (Mr. Howard Flaherty), who I believe is a dedicated and capable man. I am not attacking this organization: I am questioning it. I consider that the board would benefit from having a few elected members to represent the tenants' viewpoint. I believe that people who have made donations in order to obtain accommodation should gain certain rights.

I think it is only fair to equate this position with that of people in a co-operative and with the position where people ought to have at least some moral rights. Some of the people concerned have made donations of up to \$2,500 and now, with the projected increase that has already been listed for September, they will be paying a maintenance charge that is only 5c less than the equivalent Housing Trust cottage flat rent, and no donation would be required for the latter. A widow who remains after the death of her husband would be paying 20c more than she would pay in an equivalent Housing Trust flat. I have contacted the Housing Trust for the purpose of working out the equivalent scales.

In order to implement this rent-cum-maintenance charge increase, the organization concerned issued a newsletter, a commendable idea. The aim of the newsletter is commendable, namely, to keep the tenants in touch with what is happening. This newsletter consists of four pages, the last page containing a table of the old and new charges, and there is much explanation about why it is necessary to introduce the new charges. The second main paragraph of the newsletter, headed "Going through the proper channels", states in part:

There are a few tenants who have complained to their members of Parliament about proposed increases. To these few I have this to say: "Have a little more trust and a little more faith in us." I want to sound a note of warning, before irreparable harm is done to this wonderful cause—care of the aged: it will be a damnable thing if the scheme is wrecked by a few tenants "airing their problems" in the wrong places. Again I say, please tell us!

Looking around the Chamber, I see the member for Albert Park and the member for Florey, both of whom have been in union circles for many years, and I am sure they have heard that type of statement made before: "Don't take it to the union; take it to the boss." Although I do not know the full solution to this problem, I have had several discussions with the people connected with the organization, and I am impressed with what has been achieved: in five years, the organization has built 1,067 units, and that takes some doing. At the same time, it has implemented a planned programme of providing aid for those who are no longer able to live on their own and also domiciliary care units, in order to cater for people who need some assistance but who can stay on their own or with their spouse. This organization is fulfilling a vital need in the community. The waiting time for South Australian Housing Trust cottage flats

is at present about two to three years; in fact, I have been informed by the trust that some people who have applied for trust accommodation have passed on before that accommodation becomes available.

The Elderly Citizens Homes organization is operating the balanced plan to which I have referred, which provides for people who are on the periphery of being able to live on their own. This is an important factor to be considered. In the newsletter circulated, the reason given for the maintenance charge increase relates to a loss being made, under the present charge, on appliance replacement and the repainting of units. I believe, following my discussions with representatives of the organization, that the Commonwealth Government is in error in relation to its administration of the Commonwealth Aged Persons Homes Act, which governs the operation of schemes, such as that to which I have been referring, established with a subsidy provided by the Commonwealth Government. In my opinion, something needs to be done. A proportion of second donor funds could be allocated to allow the charges to remain in keeping with the published objects of this organization.

Clause 3 of an agreement in writing between the organization (in fact, any similar organization) and the Director-General of Social Services prohibits the use of donation and other capital-type funds for maintenance purposes. The operative wording in the Act is that such funds shall not be used "without the consent in writing of the Director-General". I believe that something should be done, and if it could be done maintenance charges would not need to increase. I think that at least some members of the organization would agree with me on this matter, which I have spoken about so that at least it will be aired.

I refer now to remarks made by some of the earlier speakers. The member for Bragg (Dr. Tonkin) tried to make the point that social welfare was not only the prerogative of the Australian Labor Party: if the Liberals are so keen on social welfare, it is a pity they did not practise accordingly. When the Workmen's Compensation Act was being considered in the previous Parliament, the workers of South Australia would have been glad if the Liberals had increased compensation payments to a decent level. Last week, and again yesterday, the member for Victoria said that he hoped that the Premier's stand on National Service and Vietnam would not embarrass Government exservicemen. I am a Government exserviceman, and the honourable mem-

ber may rest assured that I am not in the least embarrassed. One of the things for which I fought was the right of the individual to enjoy free thought and speech.

However, I was embarrassed a few years ago when a Liberal Leader in this country said, "All the way with L.B.J. and hang the consequences!" I am more than embarrassed (I am horrified) at the thought, for example, that more bombs than were dropped in the Second World War over Germany have been rained down on North Vietnam, mainly on defenceless people: the industry there could be accommodated in an area no larger than North Terrace. I have been more than embarrassed to see pictures in the *Advertiser* of the napalm-charred lumps that used to be people.

In conclusion, I believe many members, as in my case, will have received a questionnaire from the publishers of *On Dit*, seeking answers to various questions. Question 1 is as follows:

In the formation of your political beliefs, which authors, theoreticians and/or philosophies have most influenced you?

My answer to that would be that it was the philosophy of a fair go. I believe, as indeed the Labor Party believes, that the worker who produces the services and goods that create the wealth should get a fair go and that he is entitled to a proper share of what he produces. As the member for Mawson has said, we as a Party (and this certainly applies to me as a member) are devoted to creating the changes necessary to give the worker that share. I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I join with other members in expressing my regret at the illness of His Excellency the Governor and my hope that he will have a speedy recovery. I express my congratulations to the member for Semaphore on his election as Speaker, and I hope that you, Mr. Acting Speaker, will convey those congratulations to him. I congratulate the new members on both sides of the House upon their election to it.

I particularly welcome the member for Mitchell (Mr. Payne), who has just spoken. That reminds me to say that, in naming the 47 seats, the electoral commission has made two mistakes. The first mistake was to name a seat Bragg; that mistake is, happily, mitigated by the modesty of the member for Bragg. Consequently, it will never be appropriate to rib him on the name of his seat, and long may he continue to hold it. The other mistake that the electoral commission made was to name one seat Mitcham: that was not a mistake at all,

but it was a mistake not only to go on and name another seat Mitchell but also to compound the mistake by putting these two districts side by side. I hope, however, that the difference in political outlook between the member for Mitchell and me will be sufficient to differentiate between us on all occasions. After what the honourable member has just said, I think that this will be the case.

Mr. Clark: I can tell you a third mistake.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will let the honourable member make his own speech on that point. For the second time in the 15 years during which I have been a member of this House I am sitting on the left-hand side of the Chair.

Mr. Clark: It is final.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not, but I shall say something about that in a moment. I must admit that this is a matter of personal regret for me and also a matter of anxiety for the future welfare of South Australia. However, it is the essence of Parliamentary democracy that political Parties should alternate in Government, depending on the support they receive from the electors. I enjoyed the two years of office that I experienced between 1968 and 1970. I hope, indeed, that my actions contributed in some measure to the well-being of the State. I realize that that is perhaps controversial, and I will allow members opposite to say what they like about it.

Mr. Clark: Nobody said anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But the honourable member looked. That is my hope. Finally, I am looking forward very much to returning to office after the next election. There has been much speculation about how long the present Government will last. Naturally, in the first flush of its success it thinks that it will go on forever, but it will not. Many of the problems that we, as a Government, faced remain to be solved, and their solution will be no easier because of the change of Government. One example that comes immediately to mind is the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. We saw yesterday during Question Time the Minister primarily or directly responsible for that study getting further into a web of difficulty.

Mr. Hall: It is not only the Minister who is in difficulty: it is the citizens.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is the citizens who will suffer because of what he is saying and doing. The Minister of Labour and Industry, one of my successors in the present Government, has his own difficulties, and we notice that since the election he has been pretty silent

about them. When the time of reckoning comes he will find that it is not easy to resolve some of the problems that he inherited from me. There are other problems that the Government has created for itself; the outstanding one is the question of the so-called renegotiation of the agreement to build the Dartmouth dam. It was on this issue that the previous Government fell and the election was precipitated. Before the election (in fact, before the House met to decide the issue) we heard that the present Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, would renegotiate the agreement within a few months. He was confident at the time, but he has been strangely silent since on the question of renegotiation; indeed, he has been most reticent when questioned in this House. The fact is that the Government will soon face a day of reckoning on this issue, because it will become clear to the people of South Australia (as it has been and is clear to us) that it will not be possible to renegotiate that agreement to get a more advantageous deal for South Australia than we, as a Government, were able to get. The Government is making its honeymoon last as long as it can.

Mr. McKee: Sour grapes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No; it is not. For the most part His Excellency's Speech contained broad generalities and statements of intention. We have seen very little either in that Speech or in what has been said so far by Ministers of precisely how the Government plans to turn those statements of intention into fact. The Government has been questioned on several matters during the last week or so. I have done my best to elicit certain matters from the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the Minister of Education. Today, a week after I asked him a question about a matter that was set out in the policy speech, I received from the Minister of Education a reply about Aboriginal education. It was obvious when I asked him the question last week that he did not have the faintest idea what he planned to do.

The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs today had no idea about training programmes, about which I asked. That was obvious from the way he replied. This period of honeymoon will end in due course, and the Government will have to account for the promises it has made and try to put its intentions into effect. Then will come the time of disenchantment for it and for the people of South Australia.

Members opposite are still very confident after their victory of their ability to carry on for a very long time. I remind them of the

situation in this House in a comparable period, between 1930 and 1933. At that time there were 46 members of the House of Assembly (there are 47 now). At the 1930 election 30 Labor Party members were returned to this House, 13 Liberal Party members, two Country Party members, and one member who advocated single tax. That was a majority far bigger than the majority the present Government enjoys, yet at the following election in 1933 the Labor Party was swept from office. I am the last to hope that South Australia will experience the same conditions in the next three years as were experienced during those three years. I point to that period merely to temper the self-confidence of members opposite and to point out to them what can happen in a short period of three years.

For the time being, though, we are in Opposition and we have to exercise the functions of an Opposition in the interests of the State, even though I must admit frankly that those functions are perhaps less pleasant and have a less direct influence upon the course of affairs than the functions of the Government. I take the role of the Opposition to be to point out the weaknesses in actions and policies of the Government, to criticize the Government constructively, and to present alternative points of view.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You've changed your attitude since the last time you were in Opposition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have not changed my attitude at all, and I am confident that, in this Parliament, as in the Parliament from 1965 to 1968, we shall carry out that role with vigour and application, keeping steadily in mind the aim of every Party in Opposition, and that aim is consistent with the principle that our members stand for which is to increase our public support sufficiently to win at the next election. Members on this side of the House are Liberals, and we are members of a Party that espouses the principles of Liberalism. It is perhaps not appropriate to expand those principles at length now.

Mr. Clark: It would not take too long.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It will not take long to sum them up, and I can do that by quoting from Objectives Nos. 1 and 4 of the Liberal Party of Australia. I believe that those two objectives sum up fairly well our fundamental principles. Objective No. 1 states:

An Australian nation dedicated to political liberty and the freedom and dignity of man.

Objective No. 4 states:

An Australian nation in which an intelligent, free and liberal Australian democracy shall be maintained by Parliament controlling the Executive and the law controlling all—

I emphasize that last phrase, as it is something which the Premier and other members opposite should know—

independence of the judiciary; freedom of speech, religion and association; freedom of citizens to choose their own way of living and life, subject to the rights of others; protecting the people against exploitation; looking primarily to the encouragement of individual initiative and enterprise as the dynamic force of progress; developing to the fullest extent a national spirit in Australia.

I think that sums up fairly well our fundamental principles. Edmund Burke defined a political Party as a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest upon some particular principles in which they are all agreed. I refer to that particularly, because the deep differences in principle between the two sides of politics in this country have, in recent years, tended to be ignored and forgotten. Some members of political Parties have been attracted to the political Party to which they belong not necessarily because of their attachment to the principles for which it stands but for more expedient reasons. Some have changed their Party for the same sort of reason.

Mr. Clark: It could be by conviction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The point I make is that frequently, I am afraid, it is not by conviction. Recently there has been a greater concentration on personalities, especially those of leaders, and on matters of short-term policy rather than on the fundamental differences between the two sides in politics. I have no doubt that this has been a deliberate tactic on the part of the Australian Labor Party, because that Party is a Socialist Party. It has a Socialist objective, and Socialism is politically unpopular.

Mr. Ryan: What: 54 per cent! Do you call that unpopular?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has been tried and found wanting; therefore, the A.L.P. plays it down as much as it can. Yet Socialism is undoubtedly the particular principle on which all members of that Party are agreed. The Socialism in which they believe and the personal freedom which we support are, of course, contradictory, and finally they cannot exist together. I shall quote from what I think is the best epitome of the difference between Socialism and the socialistic outlook of the Labor Party and the outlook of members on

this side of the House. This is contained in the policy speech delivered by R. G. Menzies before the 1949 general election in Australia. I hope that the member for Price (Mr. Ryan) will not suggest that the Liberal and Country Parties on that occasion received less than an absolute majority of the votes.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're still living in the past.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not living in the past at all. This is what Menzies said—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What year was it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was 1949, when the Minister was getting out of short pants. Menzies said:

Socialism is, in Australia, an alien and deadly growth and we must destroy its political power and its mental and spiritual infection while there is yet time. Socialism must mean the reduction of human freedom. You cannot have a controlled economy without controlling human beings, who are still the greatest of all economic factors. You cannot socialize the means of production without socializing men and women. There may be some people who think that the only freedom that counts is to have a roof to sleep under, clothes to wear, food to eat. These are very necessary; Governments must be pledged to do all in their power to assist people to secure them, but they are not freedoms at all. Each can be obtained in a state of utter slavery. The real freedoms are to worship, to think, to speak, to choose, to be ambitious, to be independent, to be industrious, to acquire skill, to seek reward. These are the real freedoms, for these are of the essence of the nature of man. But Socialism will have none of them.

Mr. Coumbe: Who won that election?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have said already who won that election, and I have quoted that deliberately today because of the maiden speech made in this House last week by the Attorney-General, in which he set out what he termed to be the basic principles by which he is guided. He referred to the intrinsic value of each human life and the essential equality of all human beings. I respectfully agree with him so far as he went, but he did not expound those principles and, in particular, he totally failed to answer the question in my mind, which is why those two principles lead to an adherence to the Australian Labor Party because, in my view (and this has always been my view), those two principles lead the other way, towards the Liberalism in which I have believed all my life. If any member opposite wants to pursue this matter further, he can see those two principles expounded very well but in a short compass in the introduction to Eggleston's *Reflections of an Australian Liberal*. Those

two principles are set out there as the principles that influenced Eggleston during his political life. I believe it is quite common to rely on those two principles as an introduction and as a foundation for Liberalism. However, in some way that he did not explain, the Attorney-General regarded them as being an indication of his support for Socialism.

So far, little reference has been made in the debate to His Excellency's Speech, and there are two reasons for this: first, there was nothing in it that the new Government, with its penchant for publicity had not already announced. Secondly, as I have mentioned, most of the proposals are worded so vaguely and are in such broad terms as to make it impossible to comment on them.

Mr. Coumbe: There were no surprises in the Speech!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There were certainly no surprises and, as I have said, I and other members on this side have tried to get more detail by asking questions of Ministers but so far, as a rule, we have failed to get any detail of what the Government intends. I have listened, as I have implied, to the Attorney-General's speech, hoping to get some elucidation, at least on those matters that are his prime responsibility, but I have not been able to do that. However, in all fairness to the honourable gentleman, it seems that, for the most part, he is merely carrying on, in the fields of law, Aboriginal affairs, and social welfare, the policies initiated by the previous Government.

The only exception to that is the one matter on which the Attorney-General has seen fit to commit himself in detail, and that is the matter of the controversy about Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated. This has been dealt with already in this debate by the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) and there is no need for me to canvass it again at length. However, I may say that, when I was Attorney-General, Mr. Pearce and other people came to see me and I, unlike my successor, discussed the matter not only with them but also with the organization. I talked to both sides and, as I told the House when replying to a question in April last, I concluded that this was not a matter in which I could or should interfere. So far as I could see, the Government had no power whatever to force a solution upon the parties to the dispute, even if it were just to do so. I venture to think that the Attorney-General will, in due course, reach the same conclusion.

I have no doubt that this matter was stirred up for political purposes only. I cannot believe that it is a coincidence that the first time this matter came under public notice was a few weeks before the Commonwealth election in October, I think, of 1969 and that it again came to public notice a few weeks before the State election at the end of May last. That is no coincidence. Yesterday, when the member for Alexandra was speaking, the Attorney-General said by interjection that the Government had some control and power over Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated because of the licence that the organization has pursuant to the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act. Sir, that is the most arrant nonsense, as I made clear in April last, and as the Attorney-General must know. He must have read the file and seen the information on which I based my statement.

Let me give the House the facts of this matter again. Apparently, the Attorney-General is saying that, because of the Government's power to withdraw the licence under the Act I have mentioned, Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated can be brought to heel, to use the Premier's expression. In fact, an extremely small portion indeed of the total income of the organization is collected pursuant to the licence held under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act. I shall give again the figures I have given previously. In 1966-67, the total income of Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated was \$43,069, of which \$537 was collected pursuant to the licence; in 1967-68, the total income was \$53,955, of which \$596 was collected pursuant to the licence; and, in 1968-69, of the organization's total income of \$64,240, an amount of \$938 was collected pursuant to the licence. In other words, the collections for the three years, expressed as a percentage of total income, were 1.25 per cent, 1.1 per cent and 1.46 per cent respectively. If the Attorney-General considers that, by withdrawing from Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated the power to collect moneys of that proportion, he will bring the organization to heel and force it to some compromise, then I think he has a surprise coming to him.

There was another curious matter in the way in which the Attorney dealt with this matter in his maiden speech. I noticed that the pull of *Hansard*, which I studied over the weekend, contained references to a monthly tenancy in lieu of the life interest that the Attorney said had previously been given to the tenants. However, when the weekly volume

of *Hansard* came out, that had been altered to this phrase:

... expression of intention carrying no legal obligation with it.

All members of this House would have seen that the Attorney used the most copious notes in making his speech, and I assume that those notes carried the sentences and references to a monthly tenancy which appeared in the pull of *Hansard*. The pull stated:

The legal right to an occupation of a unit for life gave place to a mere right to occupy as tenant on a tenancy which was terminable on one month's notice.

That has now been changed to:

The legal right to occupation of a unit for life gave place to a mere expression of intention carrying no legal obligation with it.

Later the phrase "a monthly tenancy" has been replaced by the phrase "an unenforceable privilege". I have no quarrel with the Attorney's altering the *Hansard* pull. Frankly, although I listened to his speech, I do not remember what phrase he used, but it is extraordinary that, as late as at the time of preparing the final draft of his speech, he believed that the tenants had been given a monthly tenancy, and it was, apparently, only when he was on his feet that he realized and said (and I am now accepting that he said what appears in the corrected *Hansard* weekly volume) that it was an expression of intention carrying no legal obligation with it.

If he had gone into this matter as closely as he said he had, this was a most extraordinary mistake for him to make, a most extraordinary misunderstanding of the real position, and that is the best construction one can put on the alteration. I do put that construction on it. I certainly give the Attorney the benefit of that doubt and accept the explanation that he gives, but the matter makes one suspicious about the real examination that the honourable gentleman has made.

I shall leave the Attorney for the time being. I said earlier that the time of disenchantment with the present Government will certainly come and, as the Leader said in his speech, in many respects it has already begun. The Government has made several errors and miscalculations, and I should like to deal with two of them. The first concerns the attitude that has been expressed in this House by the Minister of Education to the textbook *Within a Community*. I do not necessarily endorse (as I said when asking a question last week) all the criticisms that were made of that book at the meeting at Cummins, a meeting which, incidentally, as the Minister

has now admitted, was called by parents of students at the school and not, as he implied quite obviously in the carefully prepared answer to the question by the member for Elizabeth on the first day of the session, by the League of Rights and the Eyre Bible Fellowship. He could just as easily have said that he meant that the meeting was called by members of the Church of England or by members of the Roman Catholic Church or by members of the United Farmers and Graziers. If that had no relevance to the fact that the meeting had been called, why did he mention the League of Rights or the Eyre Bible Fellowship at all? He was embarrassed today and his supporters on the other side of the House were also embarrassed when they heard the lame explanation he tried to give; but, leaving that on one side and leaving aside the broad criticisms of this book that have been made, I should like for a moment to go through it and point out what I consider to be the objections to it.

The objection that I see to this book is that it gives a great deal of space (not an undue amount but a great deal of space) to a description of the history and policies of the Australian Labor Party. I would not complain about that at all if equal space was given to the history and principles of the other political Parties in this country, and particularly the Liberal and Country League, of which I am a member. In saying that, I rely upon something the Minister said in the answer he gave to the member for Elizabeth (Mr. Clark). He said:

The social studies courses are undertaken to foster by means of thorough discussion of relevant issues a fuller understanding of the kind of society we live in.

It is perfectly all right by me for the book to use the A.L.P. as an example of the way in which labour has improved its situation in this country; but, if those students who read the book are to be given a balanced view of the politics of this State and country, then obviously there is a countervailing consideration—that other political Parties, and particularly the Party of which I am a member, which is the other main political Party in this State, should have approximately equal treatment in the book. But what do we find? Let us go through the book and see what the references are to the Labor Party. On page 68 there is, almost by way of illustration, an extract from the Rules of the A.L.P. (S.A. Branch) including rules 2, 3, 4, 5, 19 and 22.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They are good rules.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They may be good rules. For the benefit of the Minister, who has just entered the Chamber, I say I am not complaining about that. That is the first direct reference to the Labor Party. Then between pages 78 and 80 we find a subheading "The Australian Labor Party" under which there is a short history of it, but with this note:

A much fuller account is found in Appendix 1, and you should consult this.

The authors are aware of the fact and admit the fact that they have dealt more fully with the Labor Party than with other Parties, because on page 79 questions for discussion are set out, including:

Why has more time been spent on the A.L.P. in this chapter than the other Australian political Parties?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Because it is the greatest Party—that is the answer to that. It gets more support than any other Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That would be the obvious reaction and the answer which a student who had no information at all about other political Parties would give. I agree with the Minister on that. The next question is:

Does this indicate that the A.L.P. is a more important Party?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Of course it is.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Obviously, to a student who knew nothing but what he had read in this book the answer would be "Yes", because that is the Party which is set out. I am glad the Minister of Roads and Transport agrees with me and, as he agrees with me thus far, I am sure he will agree with me that this means that the book has a bias in favour of one Party rather than another, and that is the matter on which we are complaining. But then, when we go on a little further to page 96, we see "Appendix 1: The A.L.P." Again we find that the Labor Party is dealt with in great detail: "A.L.P.—Principles; A.L.P.—White Australia and the Roman Catholic Element; Conflict—A.L.P. and Unions; Labor in power in Federal Parliament; Conscription Issue", and so on. That goes over as far as page 103, so there are five pages—

Mr. Ryan: Not enough.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —devoted to the A.L.P. The only reference we have to other political Parties is on pages 250 and 251, where we read about the Liberal Party. I note that it has about the same number of lines as the Australia Party has. It states:

The Liberal Party—Originally made up mainly of landowners and employers who,

because of their investments in the country, wanted laws to protect their money. They wanted to hasten Australia's development by encouraging businessmen and industrialists with lower taxes and only a few restrictions placed on free enterprise.

Mr. Clark: But they did say "originally".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The paragraph continues:

They also favoured close relations with the U.K. and later with the U.S.A., both for trade and defence.

I appreciate the interjection of the member for Elizabeth. I am sorry he did not make it from his seat.

Mr. Clark: I did it by mistake.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Most of the honourable member's interjections are by mistake.

Mr. Clark: It would be a mistake to bother to answer you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me use the interjection, because it was a helpful one on this occasion. The whole of that reference to the Liberal Party is couched in the past.

Mr. Clark: And every bit still applies.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is nothing about the present situation of the Party, its electoral successes or failures, its principles or anything else for those who read the book: that is the only reference. That is all I can find in this book about the Liberal Party: about seven lines. We find the Country Party is mentioned in one line less; the A.L.P. gets an extra line, and the other Labor Party, the Democratic Labor Party, gets only four lines. (The Minister will be glad to know that.) The Independents (we are all glad of this) get only two and a half lines, and then we come to the Australia Party, which, as I said, has about the same number of lines as has the Liberal Party.

My complaint about this book is not about what is in here. That would be perfectly all right if it was balanced with about an equal treatment of the other Parties because, if we are to have a book which carries out and fulfils the aim which the Minister himself propounded in answer to the member for Elizabeth, students must have all the information about both the Parties, and this book, whatever its virtues might be, simply does not give that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What do you call "both Parties"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When I asked the Minister a mild question about this (not whether he would direct the curriculum committee to alter the book but merely whether he would discuss it with the committee) he

said straightout "No". If the position had been reversed and this space given to the Liberal Party or to the Country Party, one could imagine the alacrity with which the honourable Minister would have jumped at the opportunity to have discussions with the curriculum committee, and one cannot help feeling that it is because his Party is given this undoubted advantage in the book—

Mr. Hall: An unfair advantage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader could call it "unfair", but for the purposes of my argument I use the expression "undoubted advantage". It is only because of this that the Minister is not prepared to take any action. I believe that we on this side and other members of my Party are not the only ones to complain about the book, and the Minister will hear more of it in due course.

I turn now to a matter that I consider of the greatest importance, even of greater moment than those with which I have already dealt. It is a matter that has been referred to by members on both sides in this debate, and it has been raised by questions and speeches from members on this side. It is the attitude of the Premier, other Ministers, and members of the Labor Party to the National Service Act. I say here and now that I disagree entirely with the view that the Premier and some of his colleagues have expressed about the conflict in South Vietnam, and those views have been expressed by more than one member in this debate. That is why I seek your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to deal with it. The conflict in South Vietnam is a horrible one in which lives are being lost and in which a country is being laid waste. In what war do these things not occur? What has been said about the conflict in South Vietnam is true of every war that has been fought throughout history. War is always tragedy, but we fight wars because we believe that if we do not there will be greater tragedy still.

Mr. Ryan: The war has not been declared: it is not a war.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member can say that it is not a war, but that flatly contradicts most of the things said by the Premier, other Ministers, and members of his Party. It may be a war in which there has been no declaration, but this makes it no less a war than if there had been a declaration of war, and the honourable member and all members opposite know that.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish: why not be dinkum?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Our Communist opponents in South Vietnam use terror, torture and assassination as deliberate methods of carrying on that war, and that will not stop if the forces of the United States of America and Australia and the other forces that are in South Vietnam withdraw. Rather do I believe that the slaughter and destruction will take place on an even greater scale than they have up to the present. I do not accept that this is merely a civil war between North and South Vietnam, as I saw it described by Dr. Richie Gun the other day in one of the local newspapers and as it has been described by other members of the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are a stirrer, a reactionary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister would like me to desist from this line of argument.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are a reactionary: that is just what you are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have never concealed my views on this matter, nor will I do so.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have never come out with them before.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes I have, many times, but this is the first time the issue has been debated in this Chamber. It was raised first in this debate by Government members, and that is why I intended to deal with the question now.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You and Posa would make a good pair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have said that I do not believe that this is a civil war between the North and South Vietnam: it is part of the Communist plan for domination of this area of the world and finally for domination of the whole of the world by Communism. I do not believe that if we withdraw from South Vietnam the Communists will stop there: they will not. After South Vietnam they will attempt, as they are attempting now, to take over Laos, Cambodia, Thailand and Malaysia. We will not get any respite by withdrawing from Vietnam nor will we avoid any bloody conflict: it will simply take place nearer Australian shores. On these matters there is a fundamental difference of opinion between the view of Government members and the view that I take. I was delighted last week to see for the first time one glimmer of hope that some members of the Australian Labor Party may be coming to their senses on this matter. That glimmer of hope was the telegram sent by Mr. Gordon Bryant, a member of the House of Representatives from Victoria, to his colleagues after his visit to Cambodia. Frankly, I know

Gordon Bryant and I have never had much regard for his views on foreign affairs.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That would be reciprocated: there is no risk about that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That does not matter for the purposes of this argument. Mr. Bryant, having been to Cambodia as a member of a delegation—

Mr. Coumbe: What Party does he belong to?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is a member of the Australian Labor Party, or at least he was, but I do not know about now. Obviously, he has seen the merits and demerits of the struggle in that country, and I pray that what he has realized he will be able to convey to other members of his Party. Let us consider the matter from the point of view of the Communists. They have a creed in which they believe and which they aim to impose on everyone, and I think all members would accept that statement as being correct. They seize every opportunity to further their aim, and they do that in two ways: first, by armed conflict, when they go into such countries as Vietnam and the others I have mentioned in Indo-China and, secondly, by reducing the will to fight in countries in which they are not able to engage in armed conflict.

In other words, they use the two methods of force and subversion, and that process is going on in Australia as surely as it is in South Vietnam. Here (and this is the difference) the emphasis is on subversion, but in South Vietnam it is both subversion and force. A measure of their success in weakening our will to fight is shown by the opposition to the war and especially by the number and magnitude of demonstrations against it. That is the background against which the Premier has made his statement on National Service. He claimed, when the Leader of the Opposition questioned him, that he had been misreported, and he set out again what he said he had said on television and later when he returned to South Australia, as follows:

I said that, if my son were to ask me whether he should register for National Service, my reply to him would be that that was something about which he would have to make up his own mind. I also said that, if he thought it was wrong to be involved in National Service in support of an undeclared war of the kind in which he would now be required to be involved, he should make up his mind whether he would take the consequences of his failure to register. I told him that if I were in his position I would have to say that I would not register.

Mr. Langley: And take the consequences.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I assure the member for Unley that that does not alter one iota the gravity of what the Premier said.

Mr. Langley: You have been doing more than 35 miles an hour in a car: have you taken the consequences?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member equates defiance of the National Service Act with the breaking of a speed limit, I pity him, and I pity his electors even more. The Premier made that statement in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, who had clearly implied in his question the contradiction between the publicly expressed views of the Premier and his oath as a member of this House. But the gravity of the Premier's remarks goes beyond this, and it goes beyond the issue of the war in Vietnam: and it involves the whole question of our duty as citizens to obey the law (and, by that, I mean the whole body of law, both common and Statute). It is through the law that our community is held together.

If respect for the law is lost and if it is to be disobeyed, then the whole community is weakened, and we shall have taken a long step towards the breakdown of our community and towards a condition of chaos and anarchy, and this is just the situation welcomed by the Communists, because it gives them the opportunity they are seeking to take over. Anyone who has read any of the writings of Communists knows that this is part of their plan, and the Premier knows it better than do most members of this House. He knows it, both as one who is concerned with public affairs and as a lawyer trained in the doctrine of the rule of law; yet he has publicly and repeatedly advocated defiance of the law, and there can be no excuse whatever for this.

Australia is fortunate to be a nation in which elections are free and in which there is the greatest degree of freedom of speech. Liability for National Service, as well as our involvement in South Vietnam, has been a major issue in every election in the last five years, and repeatedly the Government, which initiated those policies and which continues to defend them, has been returned to office.

Mr. Hopgood: Add up the votes last year!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that is as good as the member for Mawson can do in his maiden interjection, it is not very good, and I only hope that he improves as time goes on. It is a convention in our community (indeed, it is indispensable to the functioning of our Parliamentary democracy) that we accept the

authority of a law properly made, above all when it has been made on the policy which it embodies, even if we do not agree with it ourselves. If we do not accept that convention, then the basis of Parliamentary democracy is at an end, and I point out to honourable members opposite, and particularly to the Minister of Works who is now in charge of the House, that there are plenty of ways in which the National Service Act can be amended constitutionally if the electors of Australia want it to be amended.

There is no need at all to go outside the recognized constitutional methods to try to have it altered; otherwise, where will that process end? That question demonstrates the logical weakness of the Premier's position and of the position supported by the Attorney-General and other Ministers. In fact, there can be no end to the process. If it applies to one law, then it applies to all laws. The member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman), in questioning the Premier, hit on this very point, because he asked:

Will the Premier say what distinction he can see between this law and any other?

The Premier had to say:

The distinction between this law and other laws, as far as I am concerned (and I emphasize here that this is a personal attitude of mine: I do not seek to bind anybody else to it)—

why he puts that in, or why that should excuse him, I do not know—

is that I believe that this country is utterly wrong in being involved in the war in Vietnam and that I could not involve myself in support of our continued presence there.

That followed a question which I had asked the Premier and which he answered very effectively in the atmosphere of this Chamber; but his success in doing so does not alter the logical weakness of his position. The Premier would not draw a line; he would not make a distinction between defiance of the National Service Act and defiance of any other law. He said that he would prosecute people who did not vote, even though they said they had a conscientious objection to voting, but he would not say where the line was drawn between a law which he would defy and one which he would not allow others to defy. He cannot draw it, because one cannot draw a line between the two. But apart altogether from these considerations, which some members of the House may say are theoretical or lawyer's talk, there are other more practical considerations of which I should like to remind the House.

Mr. Langley: There are moral considerations,

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the member for Unley says, there are moral considerations. In the first place, there is no doubt in my mind that what the Premier has said in this place and elsewhere amounts to incitement, which is an offence under section 7a of the Crimes Act, for which he could be prosecuted by any private citizen who cared to initiate a prosecution. But I shall leave that aside. Has the Premier ever stopped to consider (and I am sure the Minister of Works will appreciate this) what effect statements such as these have on those who are actually serving in the Australian forces in Vietnam? Whether they be national servicemen or volunteers does not matter: as any one who has been up there knows, there is no distinction whatever in the armed forces between national servicemen and volunteers in Vietnam.

Has the Premier stopped to think of the effect on those people when they hear of the protests and the statements made, inciting people to break the law, by those in authority such as the Premier and others? Those who are in Vietnam hear these things; they get the newspapers within about a week, or a shorter time, of their publication in Australia, and they receive letters from their relatives and friends. What sort of support are we giving them, when things such as this are said? I wonder whether the honourable gentleman has ever given a moment's thought to that aspect of the matter. Perhaps the Minister of Works, who would understand it as well as would any member in this House, would be kind enough to take up the matter with the Premier. That is a very serious consideration that has not been given the public airing it deserves. Every time there is criticism of this nature and incitement to defiance of the law, we are letting down those of our servicemen who are actually fighting in South Vietnam, and I hope the Premier will realize that in future.

He knows, as we know, that under the National Service Act a genuine conscientious objector may be excused from service. He knows, in any case, that not every national serviceman serves in Vietnam. Australia is and will continue to have commitments in other parts of the world (in Malaysia, and in Australia itself). Does the Premier believe that these commitments, too, should be abandoned? He knows that a young man who wants to avoid oversea service has the alternative of five years' service in the Citizen Military Forces. He knows these things, but he chooses to ignore them.

What he has said on this matter in this place and elsewhere is altogether wrong in every way, and the more so because it comes from a man in his position, namely, from the first Minister of the Crown in this State. In my view, this casts grave doubt on the Premier's fitness to lead the Government of South Australia. That is all I intend to say on that matter, but I hope that it is enough to bring the Premier and others on his side of the House to their senses and to give them a respect for the law of this State. I support the motion.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Before embarking on the remarks that I have in mind, I think that, as a lawyer, I should say something to the member for Mitcham, who is a lawyer, concerning his remarks on the observance of the National Service Act. The honourable member may remember back a little further in our history (though not all that far back) to the time when the Nuremburg trials were held. At those trials it was a common defence of almost every war criminal that he had committed his offences under the duress of the law. All the judges who were appointed from England and America unanimously rejected that defence, cut it to pieces, and sent men to be hanged purely on the basis that there was a natural law that stated there was no right at all to obey a law that was obviously immoral. I ask the member for Mitcham to think back that little distance in time when he criticizes the Premier. He criticizes the Premier because the Premier will not draw a line. However, obviously, one cannot draw a line, because it is a matter of conscience.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am most conscious of the honour of being a member of the House of Assembly of the State of South Australia and of the privilege of speaking in the same Assembly that has been graced by so many outstanding men and women. In this my first speech, I wish to record my thanks to the Australian Labor Party sub-branch in the Playford District which was so generous in its efforts to gain the seat for me. I hope that I can honestly assure that branch and the electors of the Playford District of my thanks for the privilege that they have given me and of my endeavour (God willing) to offer them assistance and to play some role, however minor, in helping the development of the State of South Australia and its people.

May I mention, Sir, the real evidence of the democratic process that was shown in the election campaign in the Playford District.

An intelligent and honourable campaign by all involved helped to remove the personal smearing and bitterness often involved in political endeavour. My opponents, Mr. Duffield of the Liberal and Country League, then (and now) the Mayor of the city of Elizabeth, and Mr. Lawrence of the Social Credit Party were both tough and worthy opponents in every respect.

I should like to echo the remarks of other new members and offer my thanks to Mr. Dodd, the Acting Clerk, and his staff for their courtesy and assistance. Finally I would conclude this preliminary part of my address by publicly expressing my gratitude to my mother and father for the sacrifices they made to give me the education which is today the key to success in any occupation.

In making this address in this place I am conscious that Parliament at State level is the closest to the people and thereby permits the greatest contact by the people with their representatives, the closest scrutiny of their behaviour, and the closest influence and control over what they do. I am conscious that in this decade the Federation of Australia is at the crossroads of its history. The fathers of our Federation clearly envisaged a true federation in which the Commonwealth Government would deal with national and international issues for the benefit of the nation as a whole and of the States who made up the nation.

Nowhere was it ever intended that the States should become an ever-declining force in the affairs of the Commonwealth or second-grade administrative bodies for the policies of the Commonwealth Parliament or, indeed, of the policies of its Executive. In fact, in the 70 years since Federation there can be little doubt that the State Parliaments have declined in public power and importance. That there should be some decline was inevitable with the tremendous and rapid changes in economic theory and financial practice and the upheavals of war in the twentieth century. The same process has occurred with the Provinces of Canada, the Cantons of Switzerland and the States of the United States of America.

In the early history of the Federation the State Legislatures were powerful and influential instruments of government in the nation. It was to them that the average citizen looked primarily for initiative and wisdom on the formulation of domestic issues. That, I am sure, is still the wish of the people, subject to the realistic ascendance of the national Parliament in matters suited to it. However, unless

action is taken now the grave risk is present that the State Legislatures of Australia will face the same fate as the State Legislatures of the United States of America.

Of all the major Federations of the world our system most resembles that of the United States of America, and I am afraid that it is in this Federation that the Legislatures of the States have suffered the greatest relative decline. A study of the State Constitutions suggests that, generally speaking, the citizens of the States apparently do not trust their Legislatures or, at any rate, do not trust them very far. For one thing they do not seem to feel the need for them.

In Britain and in other Commonwealth countries, and in European countries, though citizens may not positively love their legislators, they think they ought to meet at least once a year, and for a fairly substantial period too, so that they may act as a standing committee of grievances (to put it no higher). But only 18 out of 50 American States require their Legislatures to meet annually; in the others Legislatures meet every second year. True, in some cases a State Governor can call his Legislature into extraordinary session, and this power is exercised, but it seems odd that annual sessions are not the usual thing.

Then, when the Legislatures do meet, they are restricted in what they can do. They are forbidden by the Constitution from passing laws on some matters; on other matters the State Constitution itself contains the law in some detail, which the Legislature cannot alter. In a number of States the Constitution earmarks so high a proportion of the tax revenues that the Legislature has the power to deal with less than one half of the State's expenditure. In some States the Legislatures are not only prevented from making the law on certain matters; when they do exercise law-making powers, they are required to submit the Bill for the approval of the electors at a referendum.

In Australia it would be a tragedy if the States were ever to be reduced to the ineffectiveness of the so-called States of America. It is not just that this was never in the contemplation of those who founded the Constitution—for all Constitutions must and will change in the process of time. It is because those who founded the Constitution were fundamentally right in seeing the necessity for true power being retained in the States, provided that the Commonwealth had vested in it sufficient power to co-ordinate the differences of its

States and the economic and social progress of its States.

It can be seen that the very nature of the land mass of Australia lends itself to a division of law-making power so that those most expert in the problems of widely separated areas and therefore most familiar with the problems requiring to be dealt with, are appointed to deal with domestic issues. Whereas it can be fairly said that America has too many States, probably Australia does not have enough. Could it be that the decline in power of the States in each country is because the one has too many State authorities and the other not enough?

The Senate in essence showed the concern of the Constitution-makers to see that States so unequal in population would be fairly represented at the national level. However, this system has not worked either. I, together with so many others educated in the Labor and industrial movement system of thinking, was thoroughly convinced that for true social progress centralism was the theory best suited to this country. I, together with so many like me (and better educated than I), took a long time to see the dangers inherent in it. However, recent events have pointed to the urgent necessity of stopping the States of Australia becoming the ineffectual puppet States of America. The centralist tendencies of a conservative Prime Minister like Gorton (and who would have ever thought a conservative like him would have pointed out the danger in this theory) have shown the danger and highlighted it only too strongly.

It was not politics in the sense of Party politics which influenced the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth against South Australia so often in the last few years, for he met Liberal and Labor Governments alike. But for some unknown reason he has contempt for this State and lack of care for its people. Unless the States can be assured of the proper finance to maintain their proper fields of endeavour they will be gradually strangled into the puppet States of America or, indeed, even into the corpses that some of them have become. Unless there is a balance of co-operation between the Commonwealth and the States there will inevitably be pockets of affluence and relative poverty spread across the country.

In America the time of crisis has passed and the result cannot be undone. In Australia the time of crisis is coming; indeed it is here, and the people of the States and the Party branches of the States alike must combine together to

ensure that the most effective system of State Government as originally envisaged but as modified by economic and financial reality will remain. We have before us the Governor's Deputy's Speech, which shows what a great area of power is left vested in the States of Australia, but the power of law making is nothing unless the finance is present to allow its effective use. The tragedy is that in the fields of housing, building, industrial development, education, law courts and justice, law reform, tourism, health and many other spheres, the expertise and knowledge is with the State, and the State can best adapt its resources to deal with each problem but, unless recognition is financially given to this fact, it is all to no avail.

Constitutions and laws can never persuade people. The reverse is true and, if people generally understand the crisis now at hand, it can and will be overcome. I for one then am confident that in Australia a realistic settlement can be achieved. However, in discussing the constitutional process in Australia there is another crisis that must be dealt with and that is the bicameral system of Parliament at State level. I for one was never so influenced towards the Labor Party than by its policy of the abolition of the Upper House. It can be seen by what I have already said that I am not so blinded in my thinking not to know that there must be a balance in all things. It is precisely because of this balance that the Senate representing as it is supposed to do a fair and equal representation of each of the States can be easily distinguished from the Upper House in five of the six States.

It can also be seen by what I have said before and what I have said now that where there is the need for further review I am not driven by any blindly undertaken philosophy to reject the need for review. I can see also the reality, as instanced by the unfairness shown towards our State recently, of the dangers of Government at a distance. Although it is true that the founders of the Commonwealth saw from the beginning that the complications of Cabinet Government were strong enough to create great difficulties in guarding State rights and although these thoughts have largely been true, there has been sufficient thought-provoking analysis in the Senate in recent times to demonstrate the wisdom of the system. The use of the Senate, therefore, is that it provides for a second opinion. It provides for a second opinion in a country like Australia where the very distance makes the central Government in Canberra far removed from the people.

Members of this House would agree that in the districts of this State many people, if not most people, know their local member or just about everyone can find him, but how few know their Commonwealth member. We can therefore see how strong is the need for scrutiny by the people of their representatives and the constant criticism of what they are doing. There must be the opportunity to criticize and be heard. This is why I see a great necessity for real power in the hands of the State at fundamental levels on issues affecting everyone. However, I cannot see any use at State level for a second House. It seems that the people of this State, including both Parties, agree that there ought to be adult franchise for the Upper House. How extraordinary that it should take so long for everyone to agree on so elementary a principle.

This is obviously amazing when one considers that the Legislative Council is only a vestige of the Council that the British Governor once used to make sure that, under the guise of some democracy, his wishes were fulfilled. Furthermore, it is becoming quite apparent that not only do the people of this State want adult franchise and compulsory voting for the Upper House but that they also want the principle of one vote one value written into the Constitution for the Upper House as well as the Lower House. If that is so, we will gradually achieve a system where the same people will elect from time to time the same Party to each of the Houses and so create an ineffective House of review or rather House of obstruction. I am well aware that all kinds of theories can be advanced based on terms of office and different forms of representation to prove the need for some form of House of Review. However, in South Australia in the 1970's the Upper House is in my view an expensive luxury at its very best. As it now stands, it is an expensive luxury at its very worst.

The seating in this House shows that 30 years ago, when the population was 50 per cent of what it is today, there were seven more members than there are now. We need a truly representative House, capable of effectively doing its work. In addition, I would add finally on this aspect that, since the official recognition of Her Majesty's Opposition in the Lower House to which Cabinet is responsible, it is an insult to see at times that in the name of blatant conservatism not only the view of the popular Government but even the views

of Her Majesty's Opposition are overruled in the Upper House.

I now turn to consider some major issues which I feel will be decisive for the Government and the people of South Australia in the coming years and in which I hope that this State can show a lead to the rest of the Commonwealth. One of the major decisions in the last few years has been the proposed reduction of the age of majority from 21 years to 18 years. I applaud this. Today we have the most well-educated youth of any country on earth. The percentage of the voters between 18 years and 25 years grows ever greater. This is a generation that has rejected and will go on rejecting any attempt to stuff their heads with rigid philosophies, old "isms", dogmas, and superstitions. This is the pragmatic generation that wants to be convinced, not told, to be persuaded by logic, not by dogma, and places no value on who says something but every value on why it is said. Both Parties will have to be on their guard to satisfy the demands of a generation like this and the standard they rightly require. The Parties will have to change with time, or perhaps the change in the times will wipe them out. It is an exciting, if somewhat nerve-racking situation, ahead for all members in all districts as the impact of this vote is felt.

There are so many fields on which I could speak with some excitement after references in His Excellency's Speech outlining the legislation to be put forward by this Government. However, I, like other speakers, intend to restrict myself to one or two topics which I consider of particular importance to the people of this State. The first of these matters is the whole question of law reform in our community. The fact is that in so many ways it often happens that, whilst the remedies are there, the difficulty of enforcing the remedies causes heartbreak and misery. Delays created by outdated and formalistic laws of evidence and procedure are every bit as bad and harsh as are insufficient and inadequate remedial systems.

The law of evidence and procedure is the great God and myth of the legal profession, so enshrined in the mists of the past that while it slowly strangles them, they all bow down to it as their master. Indeed, some people rub their hands with glee because they are able to state that they have just enacted rule 2150 to regulation 5380 of the sub-legislation of an obscure Act. To get to court one is literally enveloped by a mountain of paper, an orgy of

words, a mint of money and a feeling of desperation, frustration and humiliation. Yet all this is done in the fond belief that the evidence and procedure laid down is the safeguard of justice: it is not. The forms of action still rule us from their grave.

There is, of course, an easy remedy at hand to help us to solve the problems of long trial lists, and that is not necessarily the appointment of further judges (although that in itself is a help). It is the simplification of procedures, the introduction of pre-trial procedures, and, above all, the introduction of fundamental laws that do away with the rules of evidence and procedure dating from feudal times. I rather like to think of the judge in England who once punished a lawyer, who was so prolix in his verbiage that his documents became a mountain of paper, by having a sheriff punch a hole through the lot of it and put it over the lawyer's head, and sent him through the market place to be liberally pelted with tomatoes and eggs by his past and future clients.

All this accumulation of rules can be prevented by the introduction of discretions for the judges that will enable them to dispense with the ancient rules of evidence and to act on good conscience, equity, and the substantial merits of the case. Then, again, we can learn from our American cousins by introducing not just interim judgments, which have gained little, but pre-trial procedures, which can get one through a mass of documentation and get to the guts of the issue and solve the problem. Our people have great trust in their judges and there can be no possible harm in vesting such powers in them. They will not abuse it. The time has come for lawyers and judges alike to put off their wigs, gowns and buckle shoes, roll up their sleeves, and get into the job of providing justice.

If anybody thinks I am exaggerating in the slightest, just let him speak to the wives and families of hundreds of men who have been neurotic for a time or forever in the seemingly never-ending rigmarole of the law. Enough said on evidence and procedure: I now refer, like others on this side of the House, to the state of affairs in this country where, in what is supposed to be the most equally balanced and affluent nation on earth, 1,000,000 of our people live under the breadline. If we pause to think, we realize that means that one person in every 12 has not enough money to live on. Putting it another way, it would mean that a group of people almost equal to the population of South Australia is in poverty, and that state

of affairs exists while the rate of unemployment is never higher than 2 per cent, if that.

What is the answer? For a significant group of the people in this category (the old, the sick, the deserted) there can only be one answer, and that is money from the Commonwealth. For the remainder, about 50 per cent, it is not charity they want, not handouts they demand, and not jobs they want (for they already have them): they want a proper wage level. Is it generally known that about 15 per cent of all wage earners in this country are on the minimum wage of \$41.90? How in God's name can one raise a family on that? How was this \$41.90 determined? It was determined as an exercise to set something like a living wage while setting up a system of total wage that would make a mockery of it. The living wage should be and must be, the cornerstone of our wage fixation principle. Basic wage is only another term for the same concept. The living wage is that which common decency requires to be paid to all wage earners, regardless of skill, to ensure a decent standard of living.

If there has been a failure of the arbitration system, this highlights it. It is reminiscent of the situation in America, where collective bargaining has achieved little better. While millions are on magnificent wages, millions more are also condemned, by their fellow employees and the system, to utter poverty. The vehicle builder/fitter of Detroit on \$300 a week drives past a lot of slums where there are some of America's 6,000,000 unemployed and 12,000,000 low-paid workers. This increasing disregard under both systems for the lowest paid worker is most alarming. Of course, it must be said that the whole area of collective bargaining favours this result. The stronger and more skilled the unions, the better their results, but God help the unskilled men who are without the power and demand that skill creates!

The same trend is present in the arbitration system, and, unfortunately, there is, even in the trade union movement, a large body of opinion that would abandon the low-paid worker to the mercy of collective bargaining by abandoning the system. That will achieve nothing. What must happen is that within the system the low paid unskilled worker receives a fair go. He can do this only if the whole trade union movement, as a body, stops dismembering itself by endless disputes against each other and within itself and puts the money and the effort lost in this turmoil into ensuring the benefits so rightly demanded by the

unskilled worker. It is no good telling the 1,000,000 on the breadline and the 250,000 unskilled workers among them that they are lucky to be blessed by the freedom of the most lucky and affluent country on earth. It is results that count, and the unskilled worker wants his share of the fantastic riches of the country he lives in.

While children go without proper clothes, his whole family without proper housing and medical care, and his wife, who will take the hardest part of the bargain, without a new dress for years, we have before us a scandal of ghastly dimension. Mr. Speaker, you can see that I have confidence that continued support for the arbitration system is an attitude that can gain results. But, at the same time, I know the system will be destroyed unless employers are prepared to enter into meaningful discussions in areas where real agreement is no problem.

I have seen all of this process at close hand in every part of the country, and the trade union movement and its representatives are quite right in pointing out the arrogance, stubbornness and insults, which all originated from the greed of the employer groups, which will frustrate the obvious and delay the inevitable with reckless disregard for industrial peace and then like knights of purity demand economic sanctions of the worst kind provided for in the penal clauses. They have forgotten, as others have forgotten, that it is not just an arbitration system; it is a conciliation and arbitration system. They have forgotten entirely the philosophy of those who created the system in the hope that eventually all need for arbitration would go and the parties would achieve justice between themselves. That day is still far off.

While it is, I would urge the trade union movement, for the sake of those most in need, to support the system they themselves created. Remedy and rectify it, point out its weaknesses, attack those who use it wrongly but still fundamentally support it. But the Conciliation and Arbitration Acts supply only part of the answer to the 1,000,000 people of whom I have spoken. If for other members 1 in 12 is the answer, among those in my district, a district sandwiched between Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully, it could be more like 2 in 12; so we have a duty to these people to point out, whether we are liked by either side or not, the remedies available. This we can try to do. Part of the remedy lies, I believe, in the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, but it is not only this Act that can provide the remedy.

To the Governments, State and Commonwealth, I would say only one thing: have a good look at an obvious historical process. I cite as an example that 40 years ago there were four major income groups in Australia, and there still are today. They are (1) the top earners—I call them the interest off capital earners; (2) the professional groups; (3) the tradesmen; and (4) the semi-skilled and unskilled people. I make this comparison. In rank order of priority, if \$400 a week was taken as a continuing fixed maximum, the order of income 40 years ago went something like: group 1, \$400; group 2, \$200; group 3, \$60; and group 4, \$40. Today, group 1 still stands at \$400, group 2 has actually declined and would rank at \$150, group 3 has been elevated to \$125, and group 4 has progressed only a fraction to \$60. In other words, because of lack of price control, an unrealistic income tax and death tax system and continual inflation, the earner off capital is still as well off as ever, the middle two groups are in the process of merging and the bottom group is still left to fend for itself.

Group 2 is not heard to loudly condemn the rise of group 3 but group 1 is continually heard to condemn the rise of group 2 and to ignore the plight of group 4. In order to adjust this process there must be a shift in the tax and duty burdens from the middle groups to the top group, where it rightly belongs; and then a redistribution to the bottom group, which so badly needs it. But there must also be price control measures so that inflation will not once again erode the balance.

I am appalled at the continuing arrogance and greed of companies which, having sought an annual review of capacity to pay tax and wages on this line with little regard to prices, then refuse to absorb what the wage-fixing tribunals find they can adequately do. If the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of all the other States will not do so, then let this State show the lead at the next nation wage inquiry by submitting that the plight of the low wage-earner not be ignored again but thoroughly investigated and the concept of the living wage reinstalled.

It can be seen from what I have said that I believe our system of conciliation and arbitration can be made to work provided the employers put more emphasis on conciliation, and realistic conciliation at that. They ought to remember that a breakdown of figures over the last 40 years has shown that the number of strikes and the number of working days

lost through strikes are far less in this country than in other countries that do not have our system. And then, from the position of the employee, I can only stress again that, although I do not think the minimum wage is adequate, nevertheless it is true that the uniformity of the minimum wage throughout the country has prevented the development of such low wage areas as one finds in the United States and, to a lesser extent, in the United Kingdom. Again, from the employees' point of view, where the bargaining strength of the employees is weak (for example, among shop assistants) or they are under disabilities in bargaining, as are public servants, arbitration saves the employees from their weakness.

In my opinion, first, there must be an overall blue-print for the future. It seems to me that the arbitration system ought to be maintained, but that industrial relations must be seen in the broader context of which I have spoken, so that the purchasing power of money will be in the forefront rather than the nominal rates written into the award. Secondly, the arbitration system, provided it supplies the basic minimum that I have stressed, can be related to collective bargaining on an industrial basis. The aim would be co-operation to increase productivity and to share the benefits. Thirdly, it seems to me that, in order to introduce stability, contracts should be entered into for two years, during which wages would be over the award, but stable.

Fourthly, there ought to be partnership between unions and the employers to develop provisions for welfare and the conduct of the necessary funds. For example, long service leave could be administered by such a central fund, and the leave be based on years of employment rather than service to an individual employer. This centralized scheme would encourage a healthy mobility of labour. It would deal with the difficulties experienced in the building industry and other casual industries, and annual leave credits could be paid into the fund rather than lost after each engagement.

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

Mr. McRAE: Before the adjournment I was about to deal with the question of industrial relations, particularly in this State. On the last available figure it seems that for males and females about 40 per cent to 50 per cent of the working force has its wages and conditions governed by the Industrial Code or by the Public Service Arbitration Act. Therefore, I am pleased to see that the Minister intends

to introduce legislation to update the Industrial Code. I point to two important areas where something ought to be done. The first relates to what I have already referred to—the question of the total wage.

With the introduction of the total wage and the system of national wage cases, difficulties have been introduced into our system. I maintain that the percentage-increase system can only further erode the position of the low wage-earner, and it is most urgent that legislation be introduced to permit the South Australian Industrial Commission to pass on national wage increases in divisions payable on living wage and margins. The current position has resulted in a ridiculous situation. Concerning the system used by the previous Minister of Labour and Industry (although it was a system that he had to use in the circumstances, I grant that) it is highly dubious whether it would stand up to a searching inquiry, and that makes the whole matter more urgent.

In this State we have a four-tier wage system starting with the living wage, then tacked on is a margin, somewhere in the middle is a minimum wage, and on top of that an economic loading. As time goes on, unless we do something about it, we will go from a four-tier system to a five-tier system in about November of this year, and then we will add another component to it each year. This is so blatantly ridiculous that something must be done to eradicate these difficulties. It is so serious that it would need only one group to challenge the present position and the whole thing could be upset.

One of the other matters relates to equal pay and is a procedural question. Under our present system the judge or presidential member on the bench, together with the two commissioners making up the Full Commission, must all together make their review. This leads to the most ridiculous circumstances, one example of which was the case involving window dressers, where a judge and two commissioners squeezed into a window case somewhere at John Martins or Myers in order to look at the work being done by window dressers. How easy it would be to have a situation where one commissioner could report about the industry usually belonging to his jurisdiction to the Full Commission and then let it proceed on that basis.

The second essential question involved in equal pay is the overall position in the drafting of the section. The current provision of our code is complex and difficult, and while it is true that it has already been used to benefit

female employees doing work of equal value to male employees, it can only be used where there are male employees in the same industry. What is to happen to the important groups of occupations covered by our code, such as stenographers, female clerks and nurses—to name just a few? The principle of equal pay was agreed to as long ago as 1951 by the countries that are parties to the International Labor Organization Convention. It was never intended that there would be this patchwork quilt type of arrangement.

What justification is there for granting equal pay, for example, to a female cook because there is a male counterpart, but for refusing an adequate recompense to a nurse because there is no male counterpart? What ought to be done is to give the commission discretion in the cases I have mentioned in fixing the wages of these groups of female employees by letting the commission have regard to industry as a whole. Then common sense can prevail. What I suggest is dictated by common sense, and the commission can be relied on to look at the overall position of the industry and to equate those groups of employees, who have no male counterparts, with other employees who do have male counterparts, thus enabling an overall rate to be set.

I was also pleased to find that His Excellency referred to the Workmen's Compensation Act, which was developed as long ago as 1890. This Act is designed to do nothing else than to compensate employees for injuries to which they must be liable in the course of their employment. Every employer realizes that, while our ultimate objective must be to eliminate industrial accidents, it is just not feasible to eliminate them completely. Every employer is therefore paying a rate of premium which, at the moment, I understand, is about \$3.75 for every \$1,000 of his pay roll, to guard his employees against the direct results of their employment. One may think, therefore, that, since everybody is in agreement in principle, we have a Workmen's Compensation Act that is simple, easy to follow, and just but, unfortunately, the reverse is the case. If honourable members read the Act, it appears reasonably simple. However, they may have forgotten that it is not only the Act that must be read: one must look at the cases, and there are whole libraries of books on some sections alone. What is deceptively simple on the face of it, has been a greater cause of litigation than has section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

Honourable members will agree, I am sure, that this is a ludicrous state of affairs that cannot be tolerated. To quote just one example: we cannot even set forth a reasonable system to deal with industrial disease, even though as long ago as 1926 the International Labor Organization had reached a simple convention on this matter, by which certain diseases were to be promulgated as commonly occurring in various industries, and if workers in those industries suffered from the diseases they would be automatically compensated. Instead, however, there is a most complex procedure by which medical referees must issue a certificate; appeals can be lodged against the original certificates, and, in case of disagreement, further applications must be made to courts. Further appeals can then follow the applications to the courts and all of this is necessary because there is no adequate definition in the Act of "injury" or "disease".

The procedure by which the Act is administered leaves everything to be desired. If the employee is in dispute with the insurance company, he can only await the decision of the court. While he awaits this decision, he will be on unemployment benefits or sickness benefits, and so a man with a wife and family to support, whose only sin is that he has contracted a disease or suffered an injury, which is disputable within the meaning of the Act, in the course of his employment and which is disputed by the insurance company, must worry and suffer along with his family for months to get a hearing.

Honourable members would probably be staggered to know that the Act is so legalistic that only a handful of legal practitioners would dare say that they were competent to express opinions on it; and, furthermore, those who can claim to be experienced in this field are the first to admit that the whole Act is so complicated that they would far rather conduct a jury trial or a civil case in the Supreme Court than handle a workmen's compensation application in the Local Court. I am being completely honest in saying this; indeed, anybody who has had anything to do with the Act will know that what I am saying is true. What then is the answer to it? The answer to it lies in what I have stressed before; what we need is a simplification of procedures. Surely it is not beyond our intelligence to lay down a simple series of practices which will enable disputed cases to be heard quickly by a competent judge, who can dispense justice according to truth and the evidence before him. He does not need to be weighed down with a mass of documents

and particulars and legal forms and procedures. He can get to the heart of the matter on the basis of reasonable conferences between the parties.

What I am saying, then, is that in place of the present workmen's compensation arbitration system, what we need is not only provision for arbitration but provision for conciliation. This, in itself, would overcome so much needless heartbreak and worry, at no added cost to anyone and at no added premium to the employer. But in addition to the evidence and procedure, something must be done about the current rates of compensation. The fact of the matter is that, on any investigation, the average family wage in South Australia is about \$60 a week. If that is so, then members will realise that even at \$60 a week, a family man is in extreme difficulties, on current prices, to look after his family. What on earth can he do when, after being injured, he is further reduced to a weekly rate of \$41? He is having a hard enough time to balance his budget on \$60. He is forced to the verge of bankruptcy, and sometimes even to bankruptcy, by trying to live on \$40 a week. Furthermore, the weekly payment rate of \$40 can be used. I know of many cases, and legal practitioners can verify them. The weekly payment of \$40 is used because it is so low and has put many people in difficulties; it is used by unscrupulous insurance companies as a lever to win their case, not on the truth but by a sheer process of trial by exhaustion and bankruptcy.

Because of the numerous instances of injustice that are encountered in private practice in the field of workmen's compensation, industrial accidents and running down cases, I am pleased, too, to support wholeheartedly the proposal to establish a Government insurance office. Certain insurance companies are the first to scream at this proposal, but they and their supporters claim to be great supporters of free enterprise! All that is suggested is that a Government insurance office will provide an organization that can compete in the whole field of insurance with private insurance companies. I hope that, by competing with them, the Government insurance office can elevate the standard of some companies that verge on the unscrupulous and some companies that are openly and blatantly unscrupulous.

I conclude by stressing that in my opinion the best features of the Government's policy arise because it is directed towards employees. I am attracted towards the policies of the

Labor Party for this very reason. When we say "Labor Party", we are distinguishing the Party from Communist Parties, Social Democratic Parties and Socialist Parties. If the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) would like to describe me as a Socialist, I do not mind in the least, but I point out that "Socialist" is a meaningless word. If he describes me as a member of a Party that has a definable policy, unlike his Party, I can agree with him. My Party is one of the few Parties on earth that receives its guidance not from an abstract philosophy but from the wishes of employees. My Party's policy is updated from time to time and is not bound by any rigid platform that is unchallengeable for all time. So long as we can remember that our mandate is from the employees, who accept from us a reasonable and prudent guide and leadership in all areas of State legislation, then we can provide a new deal for people in all the areas mentioned by the Governor's Deputy.

The member for Mitcham mentioned the current controversy concerning books dealing with political Parties that are read by students in some schools. He was most concerned, too, that very little was said about the Liberal Party in contrast to the Labor Party. One reason, it became clear as he quoted from the book, was that much material that was supposedly directed towards the Labor Party in fact dealt with the history of the Labor movement. I intend to ask the Minister of Education whether further material can be supplied to balance the issue. I am well aware that, in the same way as the Labor Party is guided by employees and their organizations, the Liberal and Country League is guided by employers and their organizations. I should like this book to contain information about how the L.C.L. is related to the Establishment, the Adelaide Club, the Employers Federation, the Chamber of Manufactures, the Chamber of Commerce, and similar organizations, and I hope that the member for Mitcham will set this information out in detail for the Education Department so that the book may be expanded to cover all this material, and so give the L.C.L. a fair go for which it has asked. Tomorrow I will ask the Minister of Education whether he will arrange for this.

I conclude, Sir, by congratulating you on your appointment to your high office and I thank you for the help you have given me in the first few weeks that I was a member of this Parliament and shared an office with you.

I hope that I can be guided by the principles of human dignity to which the Attorney-General has referred and expressed so adequately in his speech, and I also hope that I may be guided by honesty in whatever I do, whatever the consequences.

Mr. EASTICK (Light): In making my first speech in this House, I congratulate you, Sir, on your elevation to the office of Speaker. I have been extremely pleased with the direction you have given us already and I congratulate you on your impartial approach. I make this speech with considerable pride and pleasure at being the first member of my profession to sit in either Chamber of this Parliament. Because I am the first such member, I should like to comment briefly on veterinary science.

Only a few years ago it was regarded as being a profession that was responsible for the treatment of sick or injured animals. However, now, members of my profession, like our medical colleagues, have advanced to the stage where we spend much time on disease prevention, and in this field more and more people employed by Government instrumentalities and engaged in private practice are exercising an influence.

When I commenced practice in this State in 1952, the number of qualified veterinary surgeons on the roll in South Australia was only 22. The first time I came to this House was in November, 1952, when I listened in the public gallery to the debate on the Act that had first been enacted in 1935. A rather unusual event occurred then, as the relevant motion was carried by a combination of the votes of the Ministers and of the members of the Labor Opposition. Perhaps such a situation has occurred on another occasion but, if it has, I do not know of it.

Disease prevention has been mentioned as being a major part of the work of the veterinarian. Quite apart from involvement in the everyday practice of veterinary science, whether it be associated with small or large animals, is the fact that many vaccination programmes and procedures are now in force. One of these has received the attention of this House recently in respect of the Commonwealth requirement, brought about particularly by the Canadian, United States of America and other overseas Governments, that our meat must be processed in a specific manner.

More than the processing of it, we have now advanced to the point where the production of meat goes right back to the animal on the hoof, and legislation in recent years has made it possible, through the Cattle Compensation

Fund in particular, to allow for the removal of particularly tuberculosis and more recently brucellosis from the herds. One other area that engages the attention of many members of my profession is looking for and preventing exotic diseases entering Australia. As we have a quarantine programme associated with human health, so too we have a major programme of quarantine undertaken to prevent the entry into Australia of diseases that not only would cause difficulty with the animal population but some of which would also be responsible for injury to or disease in man.

The Commonwealth Government, acting through the Department of Primary Industry, is numerically the greatest employer of veterinarians in the Commonwealth. It has about 12 per cent of the veterinary force, this number representing about 126 to 130 members of the profession. The human diseases I mentioned, which fortunately we do not have, are probably highlighted or are best known to us in the field of rabies, or the so-called mad dog disease; there are others, too. In the animal field, all of them would create a problem. Today, we saw a rural march by farmers worried about prices and returns. Tomorrow morning, if we were to wake and be told that one of these exotic animal diseases had been found in Australia, there would be an immediate cancellation of all contracts relative to the disposal overseas of animal products. All products that were on the water or in store overseas would be immediately channelled back to Australia or otherwise disposed of. A figure two years ago indicated that our national income would be reduced by \$1,250,000,000 overnight. The fact that we have been able for so long to prevent the entry of these exotic diseases into Australia is a great credit to the members of the various professions responsible for maintaining this vigilance, which is exercised by State authorities and by members of State Agriculture Departments working under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Government and under powers granted them by the Commonwealth.

I mentioned the mad dog disease, or rabies. This is only one of the zoonoses or diseases that are transmissible from animal to man. There are about 138 listed, including bubonic plague, tuberculosis, brucellosis, and various other diseases, such as the common everyday ring worm, which creates a problem. The area of public health is one in which members of the profession are playing a significant part.

With regard to paragraph 12 of His Excellency's Speech in relation to the triennium

arranged by the Australian Universities Commission, I am sorry that I am not able to say that in the forthcoming triennium we will be establishing a faculty of veterinary science in South Australia. Unfortunately, although the Leader of the Opposition, when Premier a few months ago, and his Cabinet were able to indicate to the Commission that they were in agreement with the establishment of a faculty of veterinary science, which faculty would have been the fourth in Australia, the Commission by-passed this State and gave the allotment to the University of Western Australia. In fact, the faculty will be set up in the existing university in that State and, after the first two to three years of academic training, it will be passed over to the second Western Australian university. It is a great pity that the scholars of this State will still need to go to a university in another State to undertake a course in veterinary science. The figure of 22 veterinarians in 1952 has grown to the present total of 102 in South Australia. More significant than this, I think, is the fact that, whereas in 1952 there were only three qualified veterinarians established in the rural areas of South Australia, there are 44 today, and this represents considerable progress over that period.

I now wish to say a few words about Colonel William Light, whose name is given to the district I represent. Much has been said and written about Colonel William Light and his activities in the early years of this colony. Colonel Light, it would appear, was not as popular as he would have hoped to be, and he had many enemies, one of whom was Governor Gawler. In speaking of Governor Gawler at one time, Colonel Light said, "Governor Gawler wants his name attached to everything; we have a river, we have a hill, we have mountain ranges, and we have an area." However, when I looked about me and started to do research on Colonel Light, I found that his name was probably prominent in respect of more hills and more rivers and more areas than was the name of the person he had castigated in this regard.

As many members would know, the new district of Light is a composite one, embracing parts of three former electoral districts. The name "Light" goes back many years in the history of this Parliament. Since the redistribution of 1955, that district has been represented by only three persons. They were the late George Hambour, Mr. Nicholson and, more recently, Mr. Freebairn. Although Mr. Freebairn was my immediate predecessor in this House and although it was my fortune

and his misfortune that I now address the House as the member for Light, I pay a tribute to him for the way he has helped me, and I am sure he will continue to help me, to represent the District of Light.

Another major area that the new District of Light encompasses is Barossa, which also was brought into existence in the 1955 redistribution. In that redistribution Barossa, a name which had been used for a multiple district previously, was represented by Mr. Condor Laucke (now Senator Laucke) and more recently by the only (as far as I am able to determine) female representative the district has had in its existence, the present member for Tea Tree Gully. I pay a tribute to those persons for their representation while they were members for this area. A large part of the original Gawler seat before the 1955 electoral redistribution included a large area that was until recently a part of Barossa.

For those members who are punters on omens, the fact that Gawler was represented by Mr. Les Duncan from 1938 until his death in 1952 and that I now live in his house might have caused them to punt on me to win this seat. The name of Mr. Les Duncan, who was at the time of his election the editor of the *Bunyip*, is still associated by the presence of his son with the *Bunyip*, the oldest existing provincial newspaper in this State. The seat was represented by the present member for Elizabeth, who was elected at a by-election, and it would be no discourtesy to him if I referred to him by name for the work that he put into what is the present Light District from 1952 to 1970 as Jack "Sewerage" Clark. He will be affectionately known by, and he revels to some degree in, this title.

I wonder whether he finds his position just a little awkward today, as in his maiden speech on July 29, 1952, he told the House that one of the major reasons for his being able to enter the House was that he had fought and talked against the creation of a satellite town, (which was to be called Elizabeth) and he now represents that area. Speaking again about Light and the fact that areas I have mentioned are still known as Light, I find that the three areas that are now contained in the district all had the influence of Colonel Light in their creation. The Lyndoch Valley, which forms a major part of the Barossa area, was partly surveyed by Light. That gentleman gave his name to the area in the vicinity of the river, which was in the old district; he was associated with Finnis in about 1839 in

the development or subdivision of a large part of Gawler.

I now turn to one aspect of the recent opening of Parliament that I shall always remember and cherish. I was not at all happy about the circumstances preventing the Governor (Sir James Harrison) from opening Parliament, but I am pleased to see from a local report that his return to health is progressing satisfactorily. I am happy, however, that on my entry into this Parliament I was able to stand before a person who has had such a distinguished career in this State over a long period as has Sir Mellis Napier. Several days before Sir Mellis opened Parliament, he was the subject of an editorial in the *Advertiser* that followed the unveiling of a bust in his memory on North Terrace, near Government House. For the sake of posterity I will read that editorial article, which is as follows:

John Dowie's bust of Sir Mellis Napier now stands on North Terrace, just outside Government House as a tribute to a grand old man who, as the Governor-General said at yesterday's unveiling, has run the whole gamut of achievement in all his fields. Sir Mellis is the student who became his university's Chancellor, the articled clerk who rose to be Chief Justice, and the young school-boy from Scotland who so often has passed the spot where his bust now stands on his way to Government House as the State's Acting Governor. Adelaide now has a charming reminder that few men have served the State more wisely or yet with greater modesty.

I fully concur in those sentiments. At the unveiling, Sir Mellis said:

Who is the best choice of what is right for a nation? Not the individual, surely. Had we been prepared at the outbreak of the last two wars, there would be many thousands of young Australians still alive today.

This situation applies at present just as truthfully to other matters that have come before this House. Sir Mellis's acknowledgment of and part in the "Call to the Nation" some years ago was a distinct indication of his interest in the moral welfare and future of this State.

In the Opening Speech we heard of many areas in which the Government would undertake action. In relation to local government, which interests me considerably, we received an indication also of the areas in which the Government would act. I believe that many areas of the local government system require urgent attention, possibly more urgent attention than that which has been foreshadowed. At present, many corporations and district councils are handicapped by a serious financial problem, as is rural industry generally. Increasing costs

of undertaking the services that people require are placing councils in more and more financial difficulty. Some areas that were capable in the days of horse drays of maintaining a council staff are now not nearly large enough. I hope that the Government will urgently consider joining or redistributing some council boundaries to the benefit of all parties.

The Minister of Agriculture recently announced in the press that additions would be made to the Roseworthy Agricultural College. Because I am a former student of the college and because it is in my electoral district, I am very pleased at this acknowledgment of the worth of this college to the community and to agriculture generally, and its work will be assisted by these additions. The additions, costing \$670,000, will be made during the years 1970-71 and 1971-72. Much of this money will come from Commonwealth sources, because the college has been accepted as a college of advanced education. At June 30, 1970, the Public Buildings Department placed a capital valuation of \$1,489,651 on the college buildings. When this further expenditure is added and when we remember that the college now extends over 2,963 acres (valued at \$40 an acre, a very conservative figure, compared with the price that land in the area is bringing), we find that the district council in whose area Roseworthy Agricultural College is situated is unable to claim \$12,061 in rate revenue. This sum is equivalent to 34 per cent of the total revenue of the district.

I am not denying, and never will deny, that the college should be improved. The adjacent Barossa district council area contains three reservoirs, a large area of forests, railway lines and other Government facilities that represent 20 per cent of the total area. Therefore, this council, as is the case with the Mudla Wirra council, in whose area the agricultural college is situated, is losing money, and it does not have access to a large amount of revenue. As a result, the other ratepayers in these council areas are, in effect, subsidizing the existence of these Government facilities in the area and, although I appreciate that the position has always been that the State Government does not pay rates, there is no answer in the claim that the councils are helped because of the grant-in-aid funds. In fact, the grant-in-aid to the Mudla Wirra council for the present year totals \$367. This amount compares unfavourably with the \$12,061 that the council loses by having this college in its area. The Government will have to examine the position

and consider making *ex gratia* payments, similar to those the Commonwealth Government makes in many cases, or make some other rationalized approach to the subject.

During this debate much comment has been made about the drug problem and I do not suggest that I do not consider that we must act urgently in this matter. I am fully in accord with the sentiments that have been expressed on this matter by members on both sides, but I draw attention to the fact that we have in the community a drug problem of a different character that is exercising the minds of members of the professional staff of the Minister of Agriculture particularly and also of the Minister of Health. This problem relates to antibiotic supplementation of foodstuffs for animal feeding. The joint Food and Agricultural Organization and World Health Organization has published the book *Specifications for Identity and Purity of Food Additives and their Toxicological Evaluation*. This book, which is recognized throughout the world, is just as damning of the present situation as it is of the problem that can exist through the use of other types of drug. On page 18 of this publication the four antibiotic drugs, known as erythromycin, leucomycin, oleandomycin and spiramycin are listed as a group. These are so listed because, if an organism responsible for disease (and human disease equally as well as animal disease) is resistant or becomes resistant to one of those drugs, invariably it becomes resistant to all four. The result is that our medical colleagues can commence with a particular drug in treating a human disease not knowing that the person has had access to that drug in the chicken or pork he has eaten, or in whatever other way an animal product has been contaminated by the use of these drugs in its production. We have the situation that several disease conditions of man are masked by the residual effects that these drugs have on the person. This is only one area—and I mention this in particular because with the introduction of one, and one only, of these drugs we get the likelihood of damage by or involvement of the other three.

Another product that is commonly used or has been used for human medication, particularly in relation to tuberculosis, is streptomycin. This drug has the unfortunate attribute that it can have resistance developed against it in a short period. In my profession, I have had the experience of a person who was given this drug to use on an animal; he mishandled it, though not greatly so, by spilling some on his fingers; he did not immediately wash it off.

When treated some two weeks later with this particular drug for an infection, he was non-receptive to the drug and, as well as medical investigation could discover, the problem was directly associated with that small quantity with which he had had contact in treating his animal. This area of drug involvement may come into the field of drug involvement; it could equally as well be discussed or looked into under the heading of pollution. It is an environmental pollution; it is causing difficulty and concern to health representatives, both medical and veterinary, throughout the world. It is a problem we must face. I ask that the Government in formulating its policy, either under drugs or under pollution, when this comes before the House, will make it embracing so that it will involve this area.

I have the greatest regard for the officers of the various Government departments. Particularly, I have had close association with members of the Agriculture Department and, more recently, in another sphere with officers of the departments under the control of the Minister of Roads and Transport, particularly in his jurisdiction as Minister of Local Government. We hear much about the difficulty of maintaining staff or the fact that many professional staff members are lost from Government employ to industry. The figures the Minister of Roads and Transport was kind enough to provide for me yesterday indicate that the Highways Department has lost more than 40 people in the last four years. From a starting point of 102 persons in 1966, there were 93 appointments up to June 30 this year. However, the loss of staff that has occurred in that period has reduced the staff to 153 at the present time.

Not all of this loss has resulted from the staff not being well looked after; I do not suggest that. However, there is considerable import in job satisfaction. In the Agriculture Department, where there have also been losses, many members of the professional staff are lost because they are not happy about having to "watch the ladder". By this I mean that they have to move up the ladder through seniority, as, if they are by-passed by somebody with less seniority, they lose the opportunity of later advancement. Also, they are taken out of the area in which they have been exercising influence and perhaps undertaking research and sent into a different field, albeit that it might be partly associated with the work that they have been doing. However, they then have to leave behind the research

they have been doing or the type of work for which they are well prepared.

The Director of the Division of Animal Health of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, in an article that he presented to a conference in Melbourne in 1967, indicated that he was particularly aware of the problem that existed because people had to "watch the ladder" and because, to progress, they had to move up the ladder. He also pointed out that much of the work, particularly research work, that individuals were doing in Commonwealth and in State circles would be enhanced if those people were able to cross for a period from one department to another, if not exactly from one employment to another. The greatest difficulty that he saw or that was encountered related to the fact that we did not have a complementary superannuation system between the Commonwealth Government and State Governments. As a result, it was impossible for people to undertake research work to the advantage of the work that they had been doing for the State or for the Commonwealth, because they could not be seconded satisfactorily from State to Commonwealth, or *vice versa*. I suggest that to maintain the job satisfaction of many professional people, not only in the Agriculture Department but in other areas, the Government should think about making an arrangement whereby the seconding of professional staff can be done without difficulty. Other aspects of this flexible system is the fact that, because many professional staff have to watch the ladder of progress, they are taken from work in which they are fulfilling a real purpose.

I recall an officer who was in charge of the Turretfield Experimental Station in the District of Light being taken from the management of this organization to become a barley agronomist, although he had a real interest in the work he was doing at Turretfield. I do not suggest that the officer who took over from him was any less capable or necessarily more capable. Because they had to move up that ladder, both officers were taken from a service that was to the advantage of the State. I ask whether there is not the opportunity of using a scheme, or of evolving a scheme, whereby professional officers in particular can make progress in their salary scale but are able to maintain their interest, purpose, and use to the State in the area in which they are undoubtedly expert.

I now refer to statements made in this House by members concerning a situation of

war, whether declared or not. I have never met a person who glorifies war or who by choice has involved himself in war, but I know many people, and no doubt some of them are opposite, whose fervent wish is that we never need to fight a war in our community or in our country, more particularly if such involvement results from our failure to meet our commitments to nations to the north of us.

In the session ahead it could well be that the member for Ross Smith and I may find that we have a real interest in one subject, and that we may be the mover and seconder of motions supporting the consideration of the welfare of animals. In the discussions that we have had little has been said about the welfare of animals. Much has been said about the need for social reform for humans, at the child stage, in adolescence and beyond, and also for members of our Aboriginal community. My interest in this matter is not specifically on the cruelty aspect referred to by the member for Elizabeth. Certainly I have a real interest in this subject but much work and consideration is required in respect of the welfare of animals that are kept under intensive livestock husbandry systems.

I could take members into a poultry establishment in my district where under one roof they could see 25,000 chickens. I could take them into another shed in my district where they could see as many as 7,000 pigs under one roof. We may well need to consider soon the peculiar circumstances relating to the increased activity of intensive livestock husbandry.

In conclusion, I point out that my entry to this House, apart from the personal pleasure it has given me and the recognition it has brought to my profession, is for the purpose of representing every constituent in the District of Light. I hope that, when the time finally comes for me to relinquish representation of the district, I shall be able to do so with the personal knowledge that, apart from having made a contribution to this State, of which I am proud to be a son, I have been able to give voice to the wishes of my constituents, whether or not I have personally believed in their wishes. The man whose name my district bears, Colonel William Light, and to whom I referred earlier, said, when referring to the problems he had had with the hierarchy of the day, in defence of placing Adelaide where it now stands:

My enemies have done me the good service of fixing the whole of the responsibility upon me.

I am perfectly willing to bear it, and I leave it to posterity, and not to them, to decide whether I am entitled to praise or blame.

As in the case of Colonel Light, time will be my judge. I support the motion.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I have pleasure in supporting the motion. I also have great pleasure in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the high office of Speaker, and believe that for many years to come you will maintain a high standard of fairness, integrity and efficiency in that office. It gives me a great sense of honour to address the House as the first member for the new District of Peake. Perhaps, with this current re-arrangement of districts it might be as well to inform honourable members just where Peake is situated. Many of my old friends whom I may not have seen for some time have asked me whether I had moved to the bush. However, I have assured them that the township of Peake is represented by the member for Mallee (Mr. Nankivell). My district is, in fact, far from the Mallee, and it comprises the suburbs of Hindmarsh, West Hindmarsh and Flinders Park (so ably represented for many years by the former member for Hindmarsh, the Hon. C. D. Hutchens), Torrensville (formerly in Adelaide and represented by the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Lawn), and Brooklyn Park, West Richmond, Underdale and Lockleys from the old District of West Torrens, previously held with such distinction by the Minister of Labour and Industry.

It is an indication of the gross gerrymander from which South Australia previously suffered that half of the new District of Peake was formerly but one-fifth of the area represented by the Minister. It is indeed to be regretted that the gerrymander operated for so long to deprive the State of the benefit of Labor Governments. One consequence is that there have been very few Labor Premiers to give their names to the new districts. However, the first Labor Premier of South Australia, Thomas Price, came into office just 65 years ago this week as the Leader of a coalition between the Labor and Liberal Parties, the latter being led by Archibald Henry Peake, after whom my district was named.

A reading of the history of those times indicates that the Liberals, at the turn of the century at least, were true to their name. Mr. Peake had a distinguished political career extending from 1897 to his death in 1920, with only one brief interruption in 1915; at that time he was defeated in an election in

which, as recently, there was a pronounced swing to Labor, this Party winning 26 out of 46 seats. However, the Clerk of this House in his book *Responsible Government in South Australia*, states:

So that former Premier Peake might be afforded an immediate opportunity to re-enter Parliament, Alexander McDonald, who had been a member of the House of Assembly continuously for 28 years, resigned of his own volition as member for Alexandra. As a result of this strikingly generous action, Peake was enabled through success at the subsequent by-election to resume his Parliamentary career practically without interruption.

During his career Mr. Peake was three times Premier and at various times held the portfolios of Treasurer, Chief Secretary, Minister of Education, and Attorney-General. He has been described as follows:

Cool, calculating and cautious, he was an astute leader and a wise far-seeing administrator with a remarkable analytical faculty, unflinching fairness and singular restraint under criticism. One of the ablest Premiers and Treasurers South Australia has had, he was distinguished for his masterly grip of financial problems and for his statesmanship.

I am glad to be able to pay this tribute to the person whose services to the State have been recognised by the name of my district. Honourable members will appreciate that I have a considerable responsibility to emulate the distinguished record of my predecessors in this district and the honourable gentleman after whom it was named. It is appropriate that his portrait should be hung immediately behind me on the Government side of the House. I believe he will be able to look over the shoulder of a Labor member for Peake for many years to come.

At this stage in the debate I may cover ground already traversed by earlier speakers. However, if I do, I make no apology for raising again matters that I believe are of paramount importance to the welfare of the people of South Australia. The present state of affairs surely indicates that they have been inadequately stressed in the past. We now have a new Government, and 40 per cent of the total membership of this House consists of newly elected members. The electors of South Australia may well hope that so many new brooms will sweep away the dust that has settled on much of our social structure during 40 years of almost uninterrupted Liberal rule. I hope to contribute to this House-cleaning by pointing out new lines of thinking on many matters.

There is a crisis in education. This country is one of the most affluent in the world, and

it is also one of the most vulnerable. In the circumstances we have what is at best a third-rate education system. Most of the blame for this must, of course, rest on the Liberal Government in Canberra which has for years refused to face up to its national responsibilities in this field. Without massive injections of Commonwealth funds the most we can hope for in South Australia is a second-rate system. Even that, however, would be a great improvement on the present position.

The first necessity is to realise that the crisis does exist. The previous Minister was in office for too short a time to recover much of the ground lost by his predecessor. He did in fact ask for a special capital grant of \$4,500,000, which request, I am pleased to see, the present Minister has raised to \$7,000,000. However, last year, as President of the High and Technical High Schools Councils Association of South Australia, I was invited to the official opening of the annual conference of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. There I was stunned to hear the then Liberal Minister of Education say that our education system was much better than that in undeveloped countries! When this remark got the reception it deserved from most of the large gathering of teachers present, she thought the comparison sufficiently relevant to repeat it. Reference was also made to our discarded school desks being gratefully received by schools in the southern Pacific.

It is easy to understand how the existence of a crisis in education can be denied by a person who is quite happy to compare our position with that obtaining in the South Sea islands or, say, in India, where the annual income per head is something like \$US75, compared with Australia's \$US1,785. For too long there was a conspiracy of silence on this matter. Ministers of Education, departmental officials, and members of the teaching profession at all levels joined in covering up the position so that the public, until recently, was unaware of the gravity of the situation. Members must realise that today's children in most cases stay at school longer than their parents, they know more, and in many respects have better facilities. Parents get the impression from this that the present education system is satisfactory because it is better than the one they knew. However, in relation to present-day needs and potentialities, it is in fact much worse. One might as well say that anything better than an A model Ford motor car represents suitable personal transportation for 1970. In fact, in many respects in education we are still

using A models, considerably older and the worse for wear. This attitude of parents has been strengthened by the refusal of education administrators and headmasters to admit parent bodies to a meaningful role in education or to say anything publicly which is critical of the system. I do not know whether this is due to fear of departmental superiors, from the Minister and the Director-General down, or to an understandable reluctance to accept criticism which they mistakenly believe is directed at them personally. I here go on record as praising the tremendous personal efforts made by many of those engaged in education, officials and teachers alike. Only their devoted efforts have prevented the system from becoming an open scandal. To put it another way, however, they have prevented the creation of a public awareness that alone can force the blinkers from the eyes of politicians in Canberra.

I have always maintained, Mr. Speaker, that if teachers wish to be regarded as a professional body (and I believe they should be) they have a responsibility to insist on professional standards in all aspects of their employment. When one points to their toleration of disgraceful conditions, they justify it in the name of professionalism by saying that their first responsibility is to the children. I agree with this, but I believe they serve the children ill by agreeing passively to carry on under such conditions.

There are encouraging signs that these attitudes are changing. In recent years the Institute of Teachers has begun to complain much more energetically and publicly about shortcomings in education. As a result of a recommendation from the institute, most honourable members recently have received from school staffs long lists of deficiencies in schools within their districts. I have received such lists and I welcome them, not, of course, because I like the existence of these inadequacies, but because I believe many honourable members in the past have not been aware of their existence. We can no longer say that we do not know there is a crisis in education nor, if we accept our responsibility, can we fail to take whatever action is possible to meet it. The Minister of Education has made many welcome announcements since he took office, but I consider his statement reported in the *Advertiser* of Friday last, July 17, to be the most important:

Teachers should speak out and tell the community what they saw wrong with the Education system. Teachers have a responsibility

to draw attention to the deficiencies of the system. This should be done in such a way that the needs of education in South Australia were recognized but not to create antagonism towards the teaching profession.

This clears the way for a frank appraisal of our education system. The deficiencies are so great that it will take years to remove them, but all parties (politicians, administrators, teachers and parents) now have the opportunity to face up to the problem and overcome it.

So far I have been talking about a crisis in education. What evidence is there of such a crisis? Mr. Speaker, there is a limit of one hour on this speech and I certainly do not wish to go to the limit but had I five hours I could easily fill them with facts and statistics to prove that a crisis does exist. First, let me refer to the result of a recent survey of education needs, carried out by the South Australian Education Department. This shows that over the next five years, if expenditure on education increases only at the present rate, there will be a gap in South Australia alone of \$200,000,000 between what is needed and what will be available. The Minister has already informed this House that one of the first pieces of information he was given by officers of his department was that the total cost of replacing all the unsatisfactory school accommodation would be \$216,000,000 and that the current rate of replacement expenditure was just over \$1,000,000 a year. If members believe that this does not indicate a crisis, I suggest their senses have been dulled by the hopelessness of it all.

What this sum represents in terms of unsatisfactory buildings may be seen at practically any school more than a few years old. Most have unattractive "temporary" wooden classrooms, which are difficult to maintain, poorly insulated, subject to temperature extremes, and situated poorly so that the school's efficiency is impaired and very noisy. I am indebted to the South Australian Institute of Teachers for that description as a summary of the first 100 replies to a survey received from schools only last month. A similar survey conducted in 1969 produced 521 replies from 611 schools, which indicated that only 56 per cent of classrooms were of solid construction in reasonable or good condition. Other buildings are just as bad in many cases. The Tintinara Area School staff reported this year:

The toilets in the school have been condemned by the Public Health Department but, although plans have been formulated for the last 18 months, no further step has been taken. Flies,

mosquitoes, spiders are abundant in this area, the toilets overflow frequently making this an unsanitary area which the children have to use daily. There are no facilities nearby the toilets for the washing of hands. The school sick room is a small room alongside the grade 7 room. This is extremely unpleasant for grade 7 students, especially on summer days.

Staff facilities are, if anything, worse in many places. On the opening day of this session, the member for Florey (Mr. Wells) commented on the lack of suitable modern amenities, in respect of toilet blocks, rest rooms and weather shelters, for waterside workers at Port Adelaide, who, he said, "should not and cannot be expected to tolerate them very much longer". I am sure his remarks will be supported. However, several letters from school staffs last month made the point quite correctly that school staff rooms were often below the standards accepted by employees in industry and commerce. Moreover, teachers were expected to use these rooms, not only for eating but also for lesson preparation, marking, storage of personal books and equipment, and consultation with other teachers.

Some schools, particularly those in the inner suburban areas, lack adequate school grounds. Hindmarsh Primary School does not have a square inch of grass in the main school, which is crammed into an area of 1½ acres. There is some grass in the form of weeds on a small building block across the road which contains two special classes and toilets, while at the back of that block is an area formerly occupied by a house. This could serve as a playing area provided funds were available to convert it but, with a total subsidy provision of \$330 a year and poor contributions from parents, most of them migrants, this is impossible. I can give other examples from schools within my district.

Serious shortages exist also in the provision of equipment. In many schools we are still in the "chalk and talk" era. Much of what is now essential equipment is paid for by parents, either in full or through a subsidy system that operates in favour of more affluent areas. Several years ago the Education Department introduced television lessons at several levels and the privileged schools chosen to receive these telecasts were asked to buy one of the television sets especially manufactured for the department. However, when the time came no subsidy was available. The Australian Broadcasting Commission provided the production facilities and staff training, the staff from their schools covered the gap caused by the secondment of those producing

the telecasts, and the parents paid for the receiving facilities. What a magnificent leap forward by the Education Department into this modern age! Even where modern equipment, for example, projectors, is being made available through parents' efforts or Commonwealth Government grants, it is often unused because of lack of training by teachers or the shortage of ancillary staff to control and maintain it.

This shortage of ancillary staff prevents the inadequate teaching staff from being used to best advantage. There is a need for more clerical staff, bursars (some big secondary schools have a turnover of more than \$200,000 a year, excluding teachers' salaries), laboratory assistants, technicians, groundsmen, teaching aides, etc.

Undoubtedly, the biggest deficiency in our schools is a lack of adequate numbers of trained teachers. The South Australian Institute of Teachers holds the firm belief that in secondary schools the maximum size of classes should be as follows: first, second and third years, 30; fourth year 25; fifth year 20. It claims that these limits are based on the practical experience of teachers in South Australia, and that they coincide with limits set by teachers and educationists in other States and with levels set by governments in countries such as Sweden, Norway, Denmark and the United Kingdom. The 1969 survey disclosed that in metropolitan high schools these desirable maxima were exceeded by at least five in 73 per cent of the schools in the first three years; in 77 per cent of schools in fourth year; and in 68 per cent of schools in the main matriculation subjects. The position is just as bad in primary schools. There is an urgent need for relieving staff in both primary and secondary branches. In the first six months of 1969, 25,894 teacher days were lost through personal or official reasons, of which 4,228 were covered by relieving teachers. In metropolitan high schools the respective figures were 4,715 days lost and nine covered.

There is a serious lack of specialist teachers. I am told that there is only one speech therapist for the whole of the State, and there are no training facilities in South Australia for persons wishing to enter this field. No training courses for the professional training of librarians exist at the university or the South Australian Institute of Technology although almost, if not all, other States have such classes. This is at a time when even the Commonwealth Government has recognized the value of school libraries and is making available considerable sums to both Government and independent schools for the setting up of

modern libraries or resource centres. Incidentally, I believe that only one of the four secondary schools chosen to enjoy the first of these libraries has it in operation, although all four were listed to be completed last August, that is, 11 months ago. Primary schools particularly suffer from inadequate numbers of library books, a lack felt most severely where large migrant populations have to be catered for.

The Psychology Branch is greatly understaffed, so many children with deep-rooted problems are denied expert help. Typical comments from schools on counselling services are, "Long delays and insufficient assistance from Psychology Branch, when children are referred for special attention; great need for follow-up visits", and the following:

- (a) they are grossly inadequate because the waiting list is at least six months;
- (b) time spent at each school is insufficient to test all the children who require testing; and
- (c) the follow-up is non-existent.

The Institute of Teachers (and who can refute the statement of the institute) concludes:

The Psychology Branch should be dramatically expanded and there should be social workers, counsellors, and/or vocational guidance officers in schools.

The booklet *The Needs of Education in South Australia*, compiled by the Institute of Teachers in 1969, also states:

No courses in South Australia give adequate specific training for particular types of special education teaching.

- (a) Many, not all, teachers of the deaf take one year at Glendonald, Victoria.
- (b) A course for teachers of mentally retarded children is of approximately 50 hours only, plus practical work.
- (c) Teachers of children who are retarded, spastic, chronically ill, emotionally disturbed, delinquent, autistic, aphasic or brain damaged, have no special courses available to them.

The lack of training for teachers results in a lack of treatment or a lack of classes for those suffering these handicaps.

Special problems are associated with migrant children. In one school in my district, 60 per cent of the children are of Greek parentage and 10 per cent come from other European countries. In another, Thebarton, which serves part of the district, about 50 per cent are Greek and 30 per cent Italian. This school is big enough to provide two special classes where these children, who often come without any knowledge of English, can be given a start. In most cases, however, they have to be put into the regular classes and largely, because of class sizes, are left to sink or swim.

Often, inadequate school funds have to be used to buy special books for these children. I understand that the Commonwealth Government has belatedly accepted some responsibility for those children whom it has brought to this country but, as yet, no relief has been possible from these sources.

Teacher training generally is inadequate. The new Minister of Education is to be congratulated on his recent announcement that primary teachers would all take a three-year course in the training colleges. However, this overdue move to raise teaching standards will, in the short term, accentuate the teacher shortage in the schools. An inadequate number of teachers is in training to cope with losses from the profession, the natural increase of the population, and the continuing tendency of students to remain longer at school. In 1969, more than 1,400 teachers, representing about 13 per cent of the total teaching staff, left the service, but about 1,000 graduated from the training colleges. Two more colleges are urgently needed: only Adelaide and Bedford Park have adequate buildings.

Western Teachers College, a crowded collection of wooden huts on the edge of a pughole or at the side of a brewery, has been the subject of outcries for several years, but I understand that not even the purchase of a new site has been finalized yet. Wattle Park is disgracefully overcrowded. Library facilities in terms of seating, book stocks, and professional and ancillary staff are well below British standards in all five colleges.

All of these considerations overlook the need to upgrade the existing staff, a proportion of whom are unqualified or unsuitable for teaching. One headmaster of a major high school, not serving my district, told me five years ago that, at the beginning of the year, he and his deputy head were at their wits end "trying to place some teachers where they would do the least harm," and the position has not improved much since then.

I have spent some time on our primary and secondary school system, because it is extremely important and because it is the area of education most directly under the control of this Parliament. I have presented some, but far from all, of the unsatisfactory aspects of our State education system. I realize that it is a one-sided presentation. For the other side, I refer members to the rather expensive propaganda effort put out by the previous administration entitled *What Our Schools Are Doing*. I shall be happy when the favourable

activities depicted therein become sufficiently widespread to show a representative picture. To those who may criticize me for dwelling on the deficiencies, may I say that a man who suffers from, say, high blood pressure, duodenal ulcer, lung cancer, and nervous exhaustion is still rather sick even though the rest of his body is in reasonable shape. His life is certainly not very pleasant: he could easily die from his complaints, and they are the things with which his doctor has to concern himself.

One of the many satisfactory features of His Excellency's Speech was the indication that the Education Department would establish and operate pre-school kindergartens at Aboriginal schools and that it would train Aboriginal teacher aides for employment in Aboriginal schools. I believe this indicates the willingness of my Party to make special provision to ensure a fair go for those who are in an under-privileged position. At the same time, it highlights other inequities, and I hope that sufficient funds will be available soon to remove those inequities. I refer here to the unequal provision of pre-school education through kindergartens. Although the operations of the Kindergarten Union are largely financed by Government grant, which last year amounted to \$616,869 out of a total income of \$802,627, individual kindergartens are largely dependent on contributions made by parents in regard to building and running costs.

This will be apparent from the statement of receipts and payments by branch kindergartens for 1969. Contributions by parents and donations amounted to \$274,441 and net proceeds from fund raising to \$96,879, totalling \$371,320 out of \$425,784, or about 87 per cent. A consequence of this reliance on local contributions may be seen in the distribution of kindergartens in the metropolitan area. Kindergartens are noticeably scarce in the less wealthy areas or in those new districts where parents are fully extended in meeting the costs of new homes and of raising young families. As a result, only about 14 per cent of eligible children in South Australia enjoy the benefits that kindergartens offer. I understand that about twice this proportion is enrolled in Victoria. Latest research indicates that kindergarten training provides a valuable head-start in educating the young child. Taken in conjunction with the restricted availability of kindergartens to which I have just referred, this results in yet another educational bias in favour of the well-to-do.

I hope that it will soon be possible for special grants to be made in order to build kindergartens in the poorer areas of our State.

I turn briefly to tertiary education, in which we again see many disturbing features. In 1968 the State Government contributed about \$8,850,000, in addition to Commonwealth funds of \$7,950,000, to the two universities and the Institute of Technology. Despite this, however, these institutions are chronically short of funds, with a resultant curtailment of necessary courses, restriction of intakes and the imposition of higher fees, to the detriment of students. In addition, student unrest, which is endemic in many parts of the world and which we have fortunately been largely spared, is on the increase. Some of this unrest may be attributable to the attitude displayed by university authorities towards students. Much more is due, however, to the way tertiary institutions have been starved of funds by the Commonwealth Government, the only institution with the capacity to provide them. In brief, the position in tertiary education, too, is rapidly becoming critical.

The inequalities at the pre-school level that I have just described apply throughout our education system. Leaving aside the ability of the well-to-do to opt out of the State school system into expensive private schools, we see a deplorable inequality in the education offered within departmental schools. In some cases this is because of historical reasons: many of the older schools in the inner-suburban area are crammed into small areas and surrounded by industries. As a consequence, these schools suffer the disabilities of inadequate space and of being in noisy and unpleasant neighbourhoods; in addition, they consist of old and unsatisfactory buildings.

It is often difficult to remedy this situation, but there is all the more reason to make special provision to ensure that these schools are well treated in other respects. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be the case. Another inequality is that existing between country and metropolitan high schools because of the difficulty of providing a full range of courses in the smaller schools usually to be found in the country. Perhaps the worst inequities are due to the operation of the subsidy system. This system provides that grants from the Government for certain purposes are made only on the basis of a \$1 for \$1 subsidy on amounts raised by parent organizations. As a result, the more affluent areas have been able to get better equipment and facilities than have the poorer areas. During the term of

office of the previous Labor Government some steps were taken to reduce this tendency, but some subsidies seem to have been maintained at levels that were fixed in bygone days.

I recommend to the Minister of Education that he consider replacing the subsidy system for current expenditure by a system of grants that schools can spend irrespective of the parent contributions. This is done quite successfully in Victoria with no diminution of parent contributions and, as a result, with a considerable reduction in the paper work associated with the subsidy scheme. Any step in this direction would be most desirable in a department already cluttered up with forms.

Most of this speech has been devoted to education. For this I make no apology. As I have said earlier, this country is one of the most vulnerable. I believe it is far more important to Australia's defence for us to develop our human and natural resources to the utmost than it is to squander them in overseas military adventures. We are also in grave danger of being conquered economically by foreign countries that are supplying the know-how and capital that we could find if we recognized that education was by far our soundest form of investment.

One of the most critical reasons for providing the best possible education for our children is the ever-increasing rate of technological advance. In the first half of this century it was still possible for many boys to learn a trade in the expectation of working at that trade throughout their lives. Those days have already gone. It is now generally recognized that most people will be required to change their jobs, not just their employers, several times during their working lives. This throws a still heavier burden on our education system. Not only must it supply basic knowledge and skills: it must also train the child to be adaptable and receptive to new ideas and circumstances so that 15, 25 or even 35 years after leaving school he or she is able to learn a new way of life.

It has been said that you cannot teach an old dog new tricks. Unfortunately, this will become ever more necessary in future. Incidentally, there is an urgent need already for Government-sponsored retraining schemes to cope with the displacement of labour from traditional fields, and this applies not only in industry. Today we witnessed a march through the city by farmers who had been affected by changing economic circumstances, and today's *Advertiser* dealt with their plight. The article says that the message is "Get big or get out".

There is an unfortunate degree of truth in this slogan, and many of those without the capacity to get big must get out. To where and to what? What contributions can the Government provide toward retraining persons forced out of a way of life they had confidently expected to last forever?

The most important task of education, however, is not to make the child a more effective producer of goods and services but to develop his personality and capabilities to ensure that he enjoys life as a human being to the fullest possible extent. Material goods undoubtedly contribute much to the enjoyment of life, and this Party aims to ensure that all citizens get a reasonable share of the wealth of the nation. This in itself, however, is not enough. Unless a person has the internal resources to appreciate, select and use them wisely, those material goods can bring unhappiness and degradation.

We see in the United States a growing dissatisfaction with the most affluent society in the world; that dissatisfaction has led many young people to turn their backs on that society and in many cases take refuge in drugs as a substitute for a sense of purpose or a joy in living. Education and other civilizing agencies could well be fighting a losing battle with the anti-social and anti-human forces so characteristic of a society based on exploitation for personal gain. I hope that I have convinced honourable members that there is a crisis in education. The situation is so bad that it is most fortunate that the Minister of Education is so capable, young and husky. He will need all those qualities to carry the burden of his department.

I now wish to make a few observations on traffic and pollution. The latter can occur independently of traffic but, doubtless, one of the worst and most insidious causes of pollution is the internal combustion engine. For that reason, I commend the Government on its decision to withdraw and revise the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. The former Government intended to adopt a plan that would not only have destroyed Adelaide as a pleasant and gracious city but also would have contributed nothing to the long-term solution of our traffic problems.

In 1966-67 I spent six months in the United States of America, travelling some 13,500 miles by Greyhound bus, so I have seen many freeways, and I am convinced that they are not the solution. Freeways are an efficient way for motor vehicles to go from point A to point B with a minimum of delay but, unfortunately, in doing so tremendous cost is added. When point B is in an inner-city area, parking

vehicles when they get to that point is a major problem. By encouraging private motorists, through the provision of freeways, we cause tremendous pollution in several forms. We have tended to get used to visual pollution, but I think most citizens would be shocked at the eyesores that freeways constitute in terms of concrete, as opposed to graceful, sweeping lines on a map.

Another particularly objectionable form of pollution is noise. We already know the effects of noise near airports, as any honourable member who has an airport near him will realize. People do not recognize that major freeways cause, in total, much more noise than does our existing airport. At least there is some hope that the aeroplanes will be kept quiet for a few hours at night, but in the case of a freeway this is impossible. There is a constant roar for the 24 hours of the day and the only escape from it for those who are within several hundred yards of the monster is to live in an insulated noise-proof house with air-conditioning. The latter may be necessary in any case because the worst form of pollution attributed to the internal combustion engine is pollution of the atmosphere. Three months ago, when I was flying into Tokyo, I could just see the snow-capped top of Mount Fuji above what I regarded as being cloud, and when we came in to land we came through a brown haze. For the rest of the day, it was not possible to see the sun in Tokyo because of this smog. It was not cloud but the typical brown haze associated with decomposition of motor car exhaust fumes. Since coming back I have noticed that a visiting doctor has stated that cases of rickets are beginning to occur in Tokyo owing to the effect of smog in the atmosphere.

If, then, freeways are not the solution to the traffic problem, what is? I believe there is only one answer—the provision of an efficient and cheap public transport service. I know there are all sorts of man-made restrictions on the use of funds and that the M.A.T.S. plan was to be financed largely from road grants that must be used for that purpose, but it is urgently necessary that our Parliaments here and in Canberra somehow find a way to put some of the money that would have been wasted in the M.A.T.S. plan into upgrading our public transport system.

In San Francisco it was planned to build a freeway round the edge of the bay, but the residents of that city were so aghast when they saw the effect that the freeway would

have on the city, of which they were very proud, that they deliberately forwent the Federal Government assistance that would have enabled them to build that freeway and, in place of it, they put in a railway, which does the job much better. In fact, it was almost amusing, if it was not so serious, to see an advertisement by the promoters of freeways showing a Chicago freeway, in the centre strip of which they had put a railway. They made the point that, when one builds a freeway, one is in the fortunate position of being able to use the centre strip for a public transport system, which carries about 40 per cent extra load. So it seems to be a rational idea to use the money on a public transport system rather than get it as a by-product of a freeway.

I should like to see some investigation into the cost to our society of running a public transport system at a uniform fare—say, 10c within the metropolitan area—and providing a good service. I am sure it would show a loss but the loss in terms of social cost would be far less than the cost involved in the M.A.T.S. plan, which envisages the expenditure of some \$574,000,000 in terms of 1968 prices. If any other scheme may be taken as a guide, it will probably be considerably more than that but, even on that basis, the cost of the interest alone, if we were paying interest on that total would be between \$35,000,000 and \$40,000,000 a year.

I realize that the actual cost of the M.A.T.S. plan would not be as high as that, but we are tying up \$574,000,000 worth of public funds. I should like to see what sort of a public transport system we could provide at a loss with that sum of money. I realize I am getting the traditional kindly treatment in making this maiden speech and that what I say is being recorded and no doubt will be used against me later, so I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that we should run at a loss a public transport system irrespective of efficiency—that we should not worry about efficiency. What I am suggesting is that we should be prepared to run an efficient public transport service at a loss in terms of profit and loss account. We do it already with the railways, and I understand that one group of beneficiaries that is subsidized by the railways is the farming community; and I believe that this is quite proper.

I believe also that it should be a charge against the general revenue of the State to provide a public transport system that will not only free us from the menace of the M.A.T.S. plan but will also provide a proper and ade-

quate service to those members of the public who do not enjoy the privilege of owning a motor vehicle. This includes quite a big group; it includes the group that the member for Playford (Mr. McRae) referred to earlier, of pensioners and people on low incomes, and it also includes children, wives whose husbands have taken the car to work, and so on. I believe that it is urgently necessary to provide these people with a much better service than they get at present.

No doubt there will be many opportunities later to talk on the M.A.T.S. plan or the revised version of it. I am pleased to see that the Government has taken the forward step of getting Dr. Breuning to report on the scheme. I hope that the further consideration that will be given to our traffic problems will not be so heavily traffic-engineer orientated as was the original M.A.T.S. plan. I think it is most essential that we call in a bigger percentage of town planners, public transport authorities, geographers, meteorologists, acoustics engineers and so forth because I think that all these people have a valuable part to play in assessing the worth of any transportation scheme. It is not merely a problem of taking a motor car or even a truck load of industrial goods from point A to point B.

I briefly support the remarks of the member for Mitchell regarding the loss of privacy caused by investors seeking the greatest possible return from a small block of land by cramming two-storey flats on to it. I have had some experience of this myself, and I have received several complaints from constituents concerning the application of zoning regulations, particularly with regard to the building of high level flats. I believe that the Minister of Local Government should take a close look at the existing regulations, and in the urgent amendments to the Local Government Act foreshadowed in His Excellency's Speech he might be able to provide greater protection to ratepayers, as well as giving them a greater say in local government.

I have referred earlier to inadequate buildings and staff in our schools. Now may I express the shock that I and many other new members felt regarding the facilities provided within this House. In doing so, I wish to make it clear that I strongly support the references by other new members in this debate to the help and kindness shown by all members of the staff of Parliament, who certainly tremendously eased our transition into a new and formal environment. However, despite their undoubted efficiency and willingness, it is impossible for

four typistes to give the type of service, let alone the secretarial help, needed by 55 or so members. I understand that steps are being taken to improve this position, but I believe that a fair minimum service would require at least one stenographer to four members. The other glaring inadequacy is in accommodation, and this appears to be intractable within the existing building. Office accommodation is disgracefully scarce and in many respects inferior. For a time seven members had to share one room; even now three members may be forced to share a room for an indefinite time, and others have less than 100 square feet in an inaccessible area. For the use of 47 members there are only two interviewing rooms, and this is just not good enough.

The first job I had as a boy was in the Government Reporting Department about 35 years ago and, while I was there, a debate was proceeding (more furiously in the columns of one of our newspapers than in the House) about expenditure by Parliament on what was called "marble halls". This was a reference to the completion of Parliament House building where the other place now is. I am sure that it would be unpopular in some quarters if a similar further expansion of the House were now suggested. However, I believe that the dignity of Parliament and the needs of electors demand that action be taken to extend the present accommodation. One desirable solution would be for this House to take over the eastern wing of this building, and I suggest that the Opposition combine with us in adopting this course, because it would save considerable capital outlay and a considerable recurring annual expenditure.

I thank the Australian Labor Party for conferring on me the honour and giving me the opportunity of representing the District of Peake in this Parliament. Also, I thank the members of the Party within my district for the loyal and efficient work they did during the campaign. I believe that they and all other loyal Party members, who have waited for so long for this Party to be given its rightful chance to govern, will take pleasure from the long list of progressive legislation set out in His Excellency's Speech. I support the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the motion. I congratulate His Excellency the Governor's Deputy on his presentation of the Opening Speech of the Fortieth Parliament. In common with other members I sincerely hope that the Governor is soon restored to good health. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your

election as Speaker and thank you for the tolerance you have shown to me and other new members. I congratulate the member for Gouger (Steele Hall) on his re-election as my party leader. I thank the Acting Clerk of the House of Assembly and the staff of Parliament House for their kindly advice and assistance.

Hanson is named after Sir Richard Davies Hanson, who was born in London on December 6, 1805. Educated at Melbourne in Cambridgeshire, and admitted as Attorney in 1828, he lectured in favour of the Gibbon Wakefield Colonization Scheme for South Australia. In 1835, he was appointed as Assistant Commissioner for an inquiry into Crown Lands and Immigration in Canada. He migrated to Wellington in New Zealand in 1840, where he was Crown Prosecutor and edited *The New Zealand Colonist*.

In 1846 he moved to Adelaide, secured a leading position at the bar, wrote for *The Register* (now *The Advertiser*), and in 1851 entered the Legislative Council, but his election was petitioned against for technical irregularities. He was made Advocate-General, and thus an *ex officio* member of the Council. In the first Ministry formed under responsible government (Finniss's of 1856-1857) he was Attorney-General, and within six weeks of the defeat of that Ministry, formed one of his own, which lasted until May, 1860. From March, 1857, to November, 1861, he was one of the members for Adelaide in the Legislative Assembly. He was knighted by Queen Victoria in 1869. In 1872-1873 he was for six months Administrator of the Government, and in 1874 he was chosen to be Chancellor of the newly founded University of Adelaide, but before he could deliver his inaugural address, died suddenly at Mount Lofty on March 4, 1876.

Hanson was a tireless worker and was responsible for framing many laws and important Acts, one such Act being the 1852 District Councils Act, on which all subsequent South Australian legislation of the kind is based. Hanson was a great pioneer and it is only correct that a district should bear his name, namely, a district which contains the location of the Proclamation of South Australia. The Proclamation is celebrated each year with a public holiday, a holiday, I trust, that will never be dispensed with.

It is with pride that I stand here this evening as the first member of Parliament for Hanson, first manager of my bank (the Bank of Adelaide) and, I believe, of any South Australian bank so elected; and the first member

of Parliament in the Commonwealth holding the position of the immediate past President of the South Australian and Northern Territory Division of the Australian Bank Officials Association. I consider that I will be a unique member of the Liberal and Country League team. With 19½ years of wide and varied banking experience in many country, metropolitan and city areas, including almost three years in the bank's Sydney office, I have been trained to help people in all walks of life, from the "battler" to the managing director; from the person starting a small backyard business to the Australia-wide public company, and I include also exporters, importers, farmers and market gardeners. I have gained the sound practical experience and understanding of my fellow citizens that is so vital in carrying out the duties of a modern politician. I appreciate the value of careful economic planning and development.

I have always been interested in community affairs, and, since the age of 15, I have served the community on numerous sporting, church and social organizations. I was elected President of the Australian Bank Officials Association, South Australian and Northern Territory Division, in 1964, and held that position for five years, serving my fellow bank officers on numerous committees in this State and at the Federal Executive level. Prior to my election as President of this organization, I served as Vice-President for two years. I was able to obtain a valuable background to industrial relations knowledge concerning white-collar workers, and I have had the satisfaction of seeing many of my suggestions implemented, not only in the Bank Officers Award but in other industrial awards. This industrial relations background will, I trust, be beneficial to me and my Party in understanding the many problems facing workers in my district and in South Australia generally, for I am a worker and I pledge to work for all my constituents, my State and my country.

Although I am a member of the Opposition, I pray that I will not be discriminated against in my endeavours to improve the lot of my constituents and to do the many things that need urgent attention in the district and State. Hanson contains the suburbs of West Beach, Glenelg North, that part of Glenelg north of the tramline and, I suppose, half of the jetty, Novar Gardens, Camden Park, Plympton, Plympton North and Netley. Most of the district is the southern portion of the former seat of West Torrens, and for the first time portion of it is now represented by a member of the

Liberal and Country League. With the redistribution of boundaries, with all due respects to the previous member, who now represents the northern portion of the old District of West Torrens, I know that the constituents in my district feel closer to their member of Parliament than ever before. Whilst the redistribution contributed, in part, to the defeat of my Party, it always appeared unfair to me for a State Parliamentarian to represent so many electors in the metropolitan areas, as we have witnessed in the past. I accept the challenge given to me in this Parliament.

I sincerely thank the members of my district committee who worked tirelessly, my district organizer and all those who supported and voted for me. My opponent worked extremely hard and never let up in his determination to win for his Party. I wish I could state that the campaign waged against me personally was fair and clean. To the contrary, cheap smears, standover tactics and attempts to intimidate voters did more harm than good for my opponent's Party. Because Hanson was a new electoral district and the two candidates were of unknown quality, it was only natural that the contest would be close. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and given time I will prove my worth as an effective member of the Parliament.

Many parochial issues requiring attention in my district have been referred to the Ministers concerned, and questions have been asked during Question Time; however, more issues will have to be considered after further research has been undertaken. The western boundary of my electoral district covers the beaches at Glenelg, Glenelg North and West Beach. Pollution and destruction of the natural environment of our beaches is a matter of grave concern. Litter in the form of food scraps, paper, broken beer bottles, etc., is a constant worry to the councils, which endeavour to protect young children from severe injuries. Government aid is essential to beachside councils so that they can cope with erosion and improve public amenities.

Since the declaration of the poll for my district, I have enjoyed the opportunity to assist my constituents and many organizations with the many problems that appear to have been ignored by their previous member of Parliament, now a Minister of the Government. As one who has worked for free enterprise and who has been given authority and responsibility, I find the red tape that a member of Parliament has to go through in attending constituents' inquiries very frustrating and time

consuming. I appeal to all Ministers to exert their influence to streamline our Public Service departments to give their departmental heads and assistants more authority and better working conditions.

There are many charitable and service clubs in this State, and I believe the community owes a large debt of gratitude to the club members and committees. Many such clubs rely on State Government grants, and I hope that the new Government will continue the generous consideration of previous Governments and, if possible, increase such grants to counter rising costs of goods, materials, etc., necessary to carry out their functions.

The new Government has inherited a surplus of about \$3,000,000 in the State Treasury. Not satisfied with this, the Premier grumbled that we did not receive enough from the Commonwealth Government's tax distribution. Now, he has approached the Grants Commission for more aid. It mystifies me how he can justify additional funds from the Commonwealth without being forced to increase State taxes. The only section of the community that will suffer will be the workers, civilian and service widows, superannuated persons and fixed income earners of my district and, no doubt, other districts.

I challenge the Premier and his Party to justify any new tax increases on an already over-taxed community, particularly those they claim to represent. The Government must learn to balance its Budget: every citizen in the country has to balance his budget. This State cannot continue going into debt, and we have no right continually to mortgage our State's future income.

Careful planning and financial management are vital for the new Government to continue and, I hope, improve Government services, successfully maintained and increased by the previous Government. "Airy-fairy" promises made by the Labor Party during the election campaign and the past weeks, have the community at large most concerned as to where the funds will come from. If the Premier, Dapper Don, can and does receive more money from the Commonwealth without raising State taxes, then he will have my support. But the new "Buck Rogers" type of futuristic public transport system outlined in the press is a classic example of irrational thinking and wanton waste of public money. In an effort to recoup the cost of this proposal, maybe the Premier has thoughts of promoting Adelaide as a giant version of Disneyland, incorporating Fantasyland as the main theme.

Tourism is important to me and to the State. I would like to see a modern, progressive air transport system established, linking us with the rest of the Commonwealth and overseas countries. Consideration must be given during the life of this Parliament to offering the Commonwealth Government land on which to build an international airport outside the metropolitan area in the near future. The future of the tourist industry is as vital to my electorate, particularly the West Beach and Glenelg areas, as it is to South Australia.

Much development and expansion worth millions of dollars have taken place through free enterprise. This clearly indicates the faith placed in the future of the tourist needs. Travel facilities and accommodation are being made more attractive and competitive. We in South Australia must encourage and compete with the other States to bring interstate and overseas visitors here. To do this we must provide and encourage development by private individuals in certain areas. There are many areas in our State requiring more promotion. The Barossa Valley, for instance, should receive special attention. The many historic wineries should be encouraged to provide facilities such as museums to induce more tourists. Special passenger trains during the tourist season would be a great advantage. The organisers of the Barossa Valley Vintage Festivals deserve the highest praise for their efforts in encouraging tourists in the past.

Other areas with great tourist potential requiring additional Government assistance include Kangaroo Island, Wilpena Pound, Port Lincoln, parts of Eyre Peninsula, areas of the South-East, and the Murray Valley. World-class accommodation and restaurants should be established in these areas to attract a wide range of tourists.

A healthy nation in body and mind is a strong nation. We suffer badly from the need for more sporting and athletic facilities, both in the country and metropolitan areas. Sporting bodies finances should be subsidized in some cases by the Government. I feel it is wrong that Australia's Commonwealth Games team has to undertake to finance its representation overseas. South Australia can pave the way in this manner by the Government's sharing a greater interest in sport, especially financially.

Cultural activity is another field I feel should receive encouragement, specially financial aid from the government. Adelaide has the Festival of Arts every two years and, as a State, we must do more to promote this

festival. At last, thanks to the Steele Hall Government, we are now well on the way to providing a world class festival hall. I consider that the Government should be prepared to establish a new Ministry, a Ministry of sport and culture. The benefits to future generations, physically and culturally, will be repaid handsomely.

I hope that the Industrial Development Branch, which has been *nothing* but a political football in the past, can commence sending personnel overseas to promote South Australia. Personal contacts and approaches by departmental officers are the only ways this State can expect to receive its fair share of new business. I fail to visualize how independent agents, such as Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Ltd., in Tokyo and other Asian countries will help to promote South Australia. Naturally, as a banker, I recommend the use of overseas banks as agents. After all, international bankers keep their fingers on each country's economic pulse. They travel consistently around the world and personally visit heads of Governments, leading industrialists, etc. I offer my suggestion to the Government, hoping it will not be ignored.

I am concerned that windows in our schools have not been cleaned since this maintenance was cancelled by the previous Labor Government three years ago. I concede that the cleaning of windows in schools, once a term, was costing the Government about \$250,000 a year, a ridiculously high figure in view of the keen competitive nature of the window cleaning business. I hope that this position is rectified soon. One method of attending to this problem would be for the Government to appoint janitors for large schools and one, say, for two or three smaller schools. Such janitors would be of great service in attending to small maintenance jobs at our schools and would reduce the workload of the Public Buildings Department. It seems strange to me that, if a fuse is blown at a school, technically the workmen from the Public Buildings Department must attend and repair the fuse. What a waste of public money!

I think that we, the members of this Fortieth Parliament, face the biggest challenge in the State's history. We must work out and seek out ways and means of continuing the stability introduced by the Steele Hall Government in the past two years. We must attract more industries to and encourage more investment and confidence in South Australia.

When Labor was last in Government in 1965 to 1968, it failed to attract sufficient new

industries and the investment this State so rightly deserved. South Australia and its citizens have a magnificent future. New minerals and oil, even though in minor quantities at this stage, have been discovered. It proves that we have what it takes to keep pace with the 1970's and the rest of the Commonwealth. We must have faith and confidence in our own State. Our State motto is faith and courage: we should not think about it but act upon it. Let us now get on with the job of proving that South Australia is on the go, not stagnating under over-emotional attitudes of some so-called modern-day airy-fairy socialist reformers.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion so ably moved by the Attorney-General (Hon. L. J. King) and seconded by the member for Spence (Mr. Crimes). First, I desire to convey my sincere congratulations to the Speaker upon his election to such a high office and to the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) on his election as Chairman of Committees. Also, I tender my congratulations to all members on their election, and in particular to the new members who have made contributions by way of their maiden speeches. I express my appreciation to the constituents of Gilles for the confidence they have placed in me in electing me the first member for that district. Conscious of the honour and the responsibility, I will endeavour to carry out the duties of Parliamentary representative for that district as assiduously as possible, and with dedication, in the interest of the constituents in particular and of the State as a whole. I should be remiss if I did not mention the many friends and Party supporters who assisted me during the election campaign. I owe them a debt of gratitude and express my appreciation of the part they played in my election as the first member for Gilles.

The pattern set by the new members is that they have referred to the person after whom the new districts were named, so I feel that it is incumbent upon me to refer to the person after whom the District of Gilles is named. Osmond Gilles was the first Colonial Treasurer of this State when it was a colony and one of the original pioneers arriving on H.M.S. *Buffalo* with Governor Hindmarsh in 1836. In 1835 Osmond Gilles joined in England the circle of contenders for office in the projected province of South Australia and, as the first Colonial Treasurer, he was a member of the first Legislative Council. On entering this House I inquired whether he was still in the Legislative Council, but found that he was

not! History records him as being a person of extremely strong views and official independence, a person of tempestuous nature who nevertheless was regarded with high esteem for his philanthropy and his assistance to financial and other organizations at that time. His name has been perpetuated by various street names in and around the city of Adelaide and, I presume, by the Gilles Arms Hotel, and I feel most fittingly now by the State Assembly District of Gilles. I am honoured to be the first member for the Gilles District and, what is more important, the first Labor member for the district.

His Excellency's Speech has set out the Government's legislative programme. The proposals outlined in the Speech are many and varied and, I believe, will be beneficial to all citizens of this State. This legislative programme indicates the progressive and forward thinking of this Government in the interests of the people of the State, and in the course of my remarks I intend to deal with some of the Government's proposals.

During the short time I have been a member of this House I have become increasingly aware of the many and varied problems that beset our community. Indeed, I have been appalled and alarmed on occasions at some matters that have been brought to my attention as a member of Parliament. I refer particularly to matters concerning housing and social welfare, which I believe are inter-related.

The member for Albert Park (Mr. Harrison) in his speech outlined many problems that young couples face in acquiring the most important asset in their lives, namely, a home. One important step that the Government has already taken is to authorize an increase from \$8,000 to \$9,000 as the maximum housing loan that may be made from funds secured under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and no doubt this will assist many young couples seeking homes. Therefore, it is a step in the right direction.

However, the immediate housing problem lies in the fact that many people do not have the necessary deposit to secure a home. Because of adverse circumstances, many people such as widows, deserted wives, pensioners, people with large families and people in the low-income bracket, as referred to by the member for Playford (Mr. McRae) during the course of his remarks, are having difficulty, as I said previously, in raising the deposit necessary to purchase a house. I understand that currently the rental applications outstanding with the South Australian Housing Trust

number about 11,000. This figure is in respect of all types of rental housing in all areas of the State.

I do not wish to criticize the Housing Trust, for I believe that it acts to the best of its ability with the funds available to it. However, I believe that the funds that are available should be diverted particularly to rental houses and flats, for I consider that this is the area in which the greatest need lies. I believe that the trust should build houses and flats and make them available to people at an economic level, in other words, at a rental that they can afford to pay. One would not need to emphasize the stimulus that would thereby be given to the building industry in this State.

I have already said that housing and social welfare are inter-related problems. I believe that many families experience difficulties and frustrations because of unsatisfactory accommodation. Many matrimonial problems associated with an unsatisfactory environment and marriage failures with children from broken homes as a consequence can be attributed to this factor. The member for Bragg dealt at length with juvenile courts and social service matters. Although I substantially agree with him, I believe that he addressed himself to the effect rather than to the cause. It is pleasing to know that the Minister of Social Welfare has announced special therapy sessions for juvenile offenders, and this plan is part of the overhaul in the South Australian system dealing with juvenile offenders.

It is a far cry from the day when the local constable confiscated the bicycle pump belonging to the member for Bragg. I believe society has changed, not for the better unfortunately, since then, because increasing social injustices and pressures are being directed particularly at the younger generation. Almost daily, by the medium of television, we see an emphasis on violence with little regard paid to the dignity of human life. People are gunned down with almost callous indifference. This situation is condoned, aided, and abetted by the interests of big business in its search for increasing profits. Is it any wonder that juvenile delinquency and social problems continue to increase?

Many problems facing society arise from the gradually increasing breakdown in family life because of the lack of suitable housing and the unjust social environment. In many instances the opposition to society occurs at an early age when lack of equality of opportunity is realized by the younger generation,

and they express their disapproval in various ways. The member for Flinders spoke about his belief in equal rights but, under the Liberal philosophy, the capitalistic ethic, some people are more equal than are others. We have many deficiencies in society today. This Government, of which I am proud to be a member, through the policy of the Party to which I adhere will try to implement legislation to improve the real quality of life as stated by the mover of the motion, the Attorney-General, not only for the privileged few but for all citizens.

The member for Alexandra said that he was displeased at the way this Government assumed office. I remind the honourable member and his colleagues, that this Government assumed office by the vote of the people; in other words, the policies of the Australian Labor Party were acceptable to the people and the policies of the Liberal and Country League were not. One section of the legislative programme set out in His Excellency's Speech in which I have a particular interest is the plan to provide adequate recreational facilities. Paragraph 25 of the Speech states:

My Government has plans for the provision of adequate recreation facilities. It will provide moneys to the Development Fund to ensure that open space areas recommended in the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan are acquired without undue burden upon the councils in the areas concerned. These acquisitions, together with recreation area development, will be financed by an additional metropolitan land tax which will cost about \$2 a year on average to each suburban block holder. Special remissions will be given to pensioners and people in real poverty, and the tax acquisitions and development will apply only to the area covered by the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan and not to the rest of the State.

I believe that this is a move in the right direction. The member for Hanson referred to the assistance and subsidy sought for sporting activities and for establishing athletic clubs, and I heartily agree with him, although I do not agree with most of what he said concerning other matters. I strongly believe that the establishment of sporting facilities should be encouraged, and I think that the additional recreation areas developed under the plan will be of great assistance to local and junior sporting bodies.

This measure, like many others, including consumer protection laws, workmen's compensation matters and amendments to the Industrial Code, is long overdue. The member for Playford adequately covered the archaic legal system applying to workmen's compensation.

With those others who have come from the industrial movement, I appreciate the problems and extreme hardship experienced by people who are awaiting workmen's compensation settlements. The latitude allowed in this debate has allowed many subjects to be raised, and I refer here to the National Service Act and to the conflict in Vietnam.

The member for Alexandra said that he believed the Act to be a tolerant measure, but he should speak to the father of the boy from Athelstone who was conscripted under the Act and who, with deficient eyesight and limited vision, was killed in his first action. He should speak to those parents whose sons paid the supreme sacrifice under the Act. I express my disapproval of the National Service Act and of our connection with the conflict in Vietnam. The Australian, as has been proved in the years between 1914 and 1918 and again in the years between 1939 and 1945, has never been found wanting when the cause has been real and justified.

As a humanitarian, I express my complete abhorrence of war. Bearing in mind the nuclear weapons available today and the experiments being made with chemical and biological warfare, one realizes that power is available to destroy the whole of mankind in a nuclear holocaust. The foreign policy that should be pursued by the Commonwealth Government is one of peaceful relationships with all nations of the world and not the kind of intolerance that has been expressed by the Opposition. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I have great pleasure to be the first member for Heysen. In some ways, I regret that I am no longer the member for Stirling, because at times some of the more knowledgeable people have called me a sterling member, and I took some comfort in that. However, it is an honour to be the first member for Heysen, and it is fitting that a district comprising some of the best scenery and gum trees in the world is to be known by this name, as the artistic circles owe so much to Hans Heysen. He was born on October 5, 1877, and came to Australia when very young. He later returned to the Continent for further studies. When he returned to Australia he became the leading landscape artist here, and was knighted in 1959. The following tribute was paid to Sir Hans Heysen:

"I feel," said Lindsay, "that the phrase fits absolutely the art of Hans Heysen, filled as it is with sanity, the grace of good living and thankfulness for the wonder of life." Whatever the truth of this in relation to Heysen's art, it is real truth in relation to the man

himself. He is the sanest of men; an old man who expends his great talent slowly to preserve its bloom, a man who has not left his studio in six years apart from short trips to Adelaide, a man who owns a car but refuses to drive one. He lives with more grace than most of us could ever anticipate in a place that none of us could copy. And he is quite clearly thankful for the wonder of life and has spent a long lifetime in expressing his thanks in paint on canvas in the manner he knows best.

This description typifies the kind of person who lives in the Hills area. Many families have lived there for generations—since the beginning of South Australia. The article I have quoted indicates the kind of life they lead and their approach to other people. The metropolitan area is gradually extending into my electoral district, which is the watershed of the Adelaide reservoirs. Consequently, of course, it must be kept clean. I do not think that anyone has the right to pollute a stream. In the Adelaide Hills, particularly in the catchment areas, dairy farmers will incur much expense in installing equipment to spray their pastures so as to prevent pollution. Anti-pollution measures may be justifiable, but I believe that everyone must be treated fairly. The Government has seen fit to spend money and resources in removing waste from a factory. Therefore, assistance by loans or grants should be given to these dairy farmers. People who go to live in the Blackwood area immediately start polluting that area.

Mr. McKee: How are they doing that?

Mr. McANANEY: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief says that the laying of paths and the keeping of dogs and cats are the greatest causes of pollution in the Hills area. The Government now plans, as it should, to implement a sewerage scheme in the Blackwood area by using large sums of Loan money. The revenue received from this scheme will not match the cost of maintaining it and the interest and depreciation charges. The Government should not treat one section of the community differently from another. It seems to be dangerous to talk about conservation and subdivision in the Hills area, but there must be a commonsense approach to this matter. If the Engineering and Water Supply Department is willing to co-operate with the Public Health Department and the councils, they should come to some fair and reasonable solution to the problem.

I disagree entirely to the arbitrary action of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in saying that people cannot make subdivisions of less than 20 acres. Every case

should be judged on its merits. An area of 20 acres for this purpose is impracticable. If a person who has previously lived in the city buys a 20-acre property, he will neglect it and it will soon be covered with noxious weeds. It will become a fire hazard that is difficult to cope with. I doubt that, under the present Act, the department has the right to make this arbitrary provision about the area of 20 acres.

Members opposite have said much about whether there is a crisis in education and I think the member for Peake (Mr. Simmons) covered well the shortcomings in education, but no Government member has suggested a solution to the problem. They say, "Ask the Commonwealth Government to provide the funds." As a result of the baby boom after the Second World War, the number of primary school students in South Australia increased by 50 per cent in one year, and this increase was greater than that in any other State. Increasing enrolments continued into the 1960's, when the number of secondary school students doubled, and a position such as this is almost impossible to cope with. Children are staying at school longer now, but we have got away from the substantial increases resulting from the baby boom and next decade the increase in the number of students in secondary school will be only 25 per cent.

We must progress in the present decade, but our progress is governed by the priorities that we establish for the money available. Although I concede that the Labor Government acted with the best of intentions in the 1965-68 period, in reality that Government increased education spending by less than that by which such spending was increased in the three years before that period or in the two years after it. The Labor Government reduced expenditure on school buildings.

Members opposite are quiet when I say that, because they know that the Auditor-General's Report sets out what they did. In the six weeks that a Labor Government has been in office on this occasion it has been taking action similar to that which it took between 1965 and 1968. It is all very well to have good intentions, but money must be used to the best possible advantage. Members of the Public Works Committee have seen the good new buildings that are being provided. Deficiencies have been pointed out in comparisons between old and new schools, but progress can be made if money is used correctly.

The matter comes down to relationships between the Commonwealth Government and

the State Governments. The Premier was going to tell the Commonwealth Government what it had to do, and he was going to put up a good case for South Australia. However, he got less for his State than did any other Premier, so he blamed the Commonwealth Government for this. One of the bases of allocations to a State is population growth. Between 1962 and 1965, when South Australia had the biggest State population growth rate (about 3 per cent) in Australia, Sir Thomas Playford got bigger grants than did any other Premier. At one stage between 1965 and 1968 the population growth rate was down to 1.26 per cent. Naturally, when the State demands are less and there is not an increased demand for services to cope with an increasing population, we receive less.

The Commonwealth Government has been blamed for its attitude to the States. The biggest problem confronting the States (and it is common to all of them) is that they are making bigger and bigger losses on their respective Government services. We see that happening with water supply and railways, for instance, and it has been suggested by members opposite that we make these losses bigger. If we cannot afford to pay for these services as a State, we say that somebody else must pay for them, that the Commonwealth Government must provide the money to meet these ever-increasing losses. Where shall we get the money from except from the taxpayers? Already, the taxpayers are beginning to object because in the last 10 years the amount collected in income tax has trebled whereas personal incomes have only doubled.

Mr. McKee: Who's responsible for that?

Mr. McANANEY: Those who service the losses we are making. My point is—

Mr. McKee: You are not making any point; that is the trouble.

Mr. McANANEY: I have been here for seven years and have waited a long time for the member for Pirie to come up with some constructive remarks. I do not think that any one of the new members opposite has made a constructive remark so far. They have pointed out the difficulties in education, and that more money is needed but, until we get together and look at things as South Australians or as Australians to see how we can produce more goods so that everybody can share in them, we shall not achieve a rise in living standards. The member for Playford (Mr. McRae) has said we are an affluent society, that we have the highest living standards in the world. That is a lot of bunk. We should be, for we have the natural advantages and every-

thing else, but we have not pulled together to produce more goods as a State.

Mr. Ryan: The farmers did not say that at the rally.

Mr. McANANEY: In that way, we can get rising living standards. Nobody opposite has suggested how we can achieve this. I think the *Australian* has said that the present Commonwealth Government under Mr. Gorton has been the most generous Government of any when the States have applied for increased grants. There is no doubt that this has happened, and much more money will be available to the States over the next five years than they would have had otherwise. In South Australia it is 4.7 per cent more than we would have got otherwise. The fact that the Commonwealth Government will make Loan moneys available as interest-free loans or straight-out grants will benefit South Australia, because we have spent more Loan money than the other States except Tasmania.

Mr. McKee: Who's responsible for that?

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member has come in again. This was the application and request made by Mr. Hall when he was Premier of this State. The case built up by the State Premiers during the last year has brought this about. The Prime Minister has offered the States a sort of Grants Commission to decide what they should have. South Australia has been told that it should go to the Grants Commission, and perhaps that is the wisest advice anybody has given us. The point that was made in the past, in the days of Sir Thomas Playford, was that we suffered in South Australia because our expenditure on social services was less than that in the other States. However, that is not correct, for more is spent a head of population on education and many other things in this State. There was no increase in the sum spent on social services when the present Premier was the Minister of Social Welfare in the previous Labor Government. I point out that even though South Australia has just over 9 per cent of Australia's population we are receiving well over 11 per cent of all the money distributed by the Commonwealth Government. Therefore, we do reasonably well in this State.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You are satisfied, are you?

Mr. McANANEY: No; all I am saying is that the Labor Party set out with a deliberate campaign before the last Commonwealth election to say that South Australia was getting a raw deal. Its members misquoted figures

and were not prepared to face up to what was actually happening.

Mr. McKee: Weren't you down at the march today?

Mr. McANANEY: Those members convinced the people of South Australia that we were getting a raw deal. Immediately the Labor Party's new members went to Canberra they criticized the deal that South Australia was getting. The Premier said that we were the Cinderella State, or the State with no hope, yet for 30 years before the Labor Government first came into office in 1965 South Australia had a bigger growth than any other State, and provided we have confidence and go about things with the right policy we will get somewhere.

Mr. McKee: You are lost without the gerrymander.

Mr. McANANEY: Members opposite cry "gerrymander", but just how many elections would the Labor Party have won between 1940 and 1965 on the total vote for either Party? Admittedly, the present redistribution was necessary, and it is a very fair one indeed for the country people still have some reasonable chance of a say if the Liberal Party again becomes the Government. I think the redistribution has done the Liberal Party a lot of good, for previously there were far too many farmers representing the people of South Australia. We had 16 farmers here and, although in many ways they are the salt of the earth, we had only three city people. With the present redistribution we have come up with a Party the represents every possible interest. We have a bank manager, a veterinary surgeon, a doctor, and a wide range of other interests, whereas if one looks at the Labor Party one sees that they are predominantly a trade unionist party.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McANANEY: The Liberal Party represents a much wider range of interests. I have nothing against trade unionists.

Mr. Hall: They seem to be ashamed of it.

Mr. McANANEY: In the Heysen District, which I represent, as many working people voted for me as voted for the other candidate. How many members opposite are in the capitalist class? The present Government says that it is going to take money away from the capitalist class and give everyone a rise in living standards. However, I point out that only 2.7 per cent of the national income went in the form of dividends and only 3.5 per cent in rent and interest, and some of this at least would have gone to retired people and

others who are receiving superannuation and various types of pension. How is it possible to distribute the wealth to help everyone? I do not think it is always profitable to own shares. I had to pay a \$1,000 call the other day and I have not received a dividend from these shares for five years. I own shares in Chrysler but I have not had a dividend since I purchased them. The overall profit rate of all companies is not much more than this State pays in interest to its bondholders. Labor members say that they believe in Father Christmas and from somewhere out of the air they will pluck rising living standards by giving this and that group something.

Mr. Clark: You'll give no group nothing!

Mr. McANANEY: We have to understand the basic facts of how living standards are raised. I represent an area in which 99 per cent of the people are workers. They are employees, and for the Commonwealth Liberal Government to be elected it has to win more of the skilled employees' vote than the Labor Party has to win. Gallup poll statistics will show that more employees than employers vote for the Liberal Party. We must consider our policy from a wider viewpoint, because that will have to happen if we are to govern. The member for Playford said that everything could be solved by conciliation, but that the terrible employers were the meanest and lowest types he had seen, although everyone else was lovely.

I may be the oldest member in this House but, perhaps, I am the oldest in terms of wisdom, if the actions of Government members now are any criteria. The honourable member thinks that the position could be solved by those at the top agreeing that the others are entitled to have what they ask for. We are Australians: we are people of the world, and if we want rising living standards we have to create conditions in which we can trade on world markets, and be Christians and share what wealth we have with other people by exchanging goods with them. How can one group of people in an industry get together and agree to an increase in wages which will increase the price of goods to others? This has, for instance, already had a disastrous effect on the wages of nurses. Conditions have to be considered in order to ascertain how the facts fit into the Australian economy. We must get together and talk things out by conciliation, so that we can have a reasonable economy and catch up with the rest of the world.

About 20 years ago we used to consider the Japanese people were imitators, but since then their living standards have become almost as

good as ours, and within five years they will be ahead if we do not get together and create the conditions under which more goods can be produced. Today there was a farmers' march, and they are certainly having a difficult time at present. Obviously, we need a sensible approach to all matters. Five years ago when speaking in the Address in Reply debate I suggested what could be done to overcome the problems that Australia faced at that stage. I said:

Recently, two people with legal training voted for a 10s. rise in the basic wage and two voted for 20s. The casting vote decided in favour of 20s. I do not intend to voice an opinion as to the ability of the Australian economy to meet this rise, or whether a group of people on the Tariff Board, each with different training, err in imposing certain tariffs. I submit, however, that if this rise of £1 a week were justified, industry could afford to pay it and still compete with imports without additional tariffs. Or, equally important, can the exporting industries continue without incurring bigger losses? Surely the scientific, hard bookkeeping fact, in the interests of every person in Australia including the State Premiers with their Budgets, would have been to reduce tariffs instead of increasing nominal wages without any increase in the purchasing power in the long run.

It is not generally realized that most of the total wages paid in Australia is for the services, the distribution of goods, and the activities of government. These increased wages must be passed on, or services reduced. Less than one-third of the population of Australia is engaged in the actual production of goods but improved production methods might make it possible to absorb wage increases at this level, without increasing prices. A reduction in tariffs plus increased competition would lower prices and benefit all sections of the community, whether they be pensioners, farmers, wage-earners or people on fixed incomes. What predicaments some people are in today!

The predicament in which people find themselves today is even worse than it was seven years ago, because we have not accepted the fact that we cannot continue to assume that increasing nominal wages results in a higher standard of living. Even Mr. Hawke, who is now President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, claimed in the Arbitration Court recently that, however much wages increased, a person's share of the gross national product did not alter considerably. If we adopt a policy similar to the one I have been referring to and relate the proceedings of the Arbitration Court to those of the Tariff Board, the situation confronting many people today would not exist. Ministers of the Crown are saying that the small farmer must go but I have never heard such utter bunk. Just recently members received a communication from the Pump

Manufacturers Association stating that a tariff greater than 50 per cent on the production of pumps was desired. However, there are well over 30 pump manufacturers in Australia and, if a gradual reduction in tariffs were effected, this number would be reduced, large-scale production introduced, and production costs would probably be much lower.

Mr. Ryan: Are you talking about beer pumps?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: I always had a certain regard for the Government, but tonight I think its members are carrying on like school-children. Their behaviour is even worse than usual. If the companies concerned were to amalgamate, it would effect a saving in costs. One might say that this would be putting secondary industry out of business, but just as many people would be employed in the large-scale production that would ensue. However, this is not so in regard to farming. The family unit comprising one or two people on a farm is the most economic unit possible: these people like the life and are willing to work long hours, including Saturdays and Sundays, without thinking of earning overtime, etc. The larger companies with three or four employees cannot carry on in competition with the family-size farm. If there is to be any reorganization of farming, the uneconomic farms are the ones that must go out of business. Whether or not this must be done in a way similar to that applying to the dairying industry, and whether we help people to get out of the business or to be trained in some industry, are matters that must be decided. Some people are on farms 300 or 400 miles from a capital city or distribution centre.

In connection with his plan for the wool industry, Sir William Gunn says that the first priority is to pay millions of dollars to Queensland farmers in arid areas. Over the last four years such farmers have received millions of dollars in drought relief, yet they did not make any provision for the dry years. They did not practise hay conservation: they are practically in a hill-billy state of production. However, in the Heyden District some small farmers have received no drought assistance, yet they are leading useful lives. We must assist those farmers who can stand on their own feet rather than those who are in distant areas and cannot farm economically.

A Government member said that most railway subsidies were paid to the farmers, but this is not strictly correct; more than \$3,000,000 was lost on metropolitan passenger services,

and the interest charges would increase that sum. Until now the Commonwealth Government has sought to assist farmers by encouraging development, but rural industries are now producing more than is demanded on world markets. Consequently, Government policy must be changed. The incentive to produce is now working to the disadvantage of the small farmers. Taxation concessions for such things as depreciation allowances do not help the small farmer; perhaps they mean a postponement of taxation. Farmers do receive taxation assistance in respect of capital items such as dams or netting, which can be written off in one year. If a city businessman buys a property and incurs such expenses he saves 65c or 70c in the dollar plus an extra allowance of 20 per cent; he is therefore possibly receiving a concession of 85c for every dollar he spend on improvements, yet the small dairy farmer with a family who does not pay any income tax does not receive any taxation saving. We must change to a more equitable basis.

The Commonwealth Government will make money available for developmental purposes but it is most difficult to get money from any source for carrying on a farm. Twenty or 30 years ago a farmer may have had only a few thousand dollars invested in plant and stock but, as a result of inflation, his investment may now be up to \$120,000 or \$150,000. It is not possible to obtain such sums through income or savings. Therefore, long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest must be made available to provide this capital. Otherwise, the farmers cannot carry on.

For many people it is not possible to have such a big asset as a property worth \$120,000 or \$150,000. At present succession duties and estate duties in South Australia on smaller estates are too severe. The rates on estates of a value up to \$50,000 in South Australia are higher than the rates in other States, but in the top bracket the rates are lower, and I possibly agree with what the Labor Party intends to do in this respect. However, I probably will not support the Government at the third reading stage, because it will be making the rates far too high and this will destroy incentive to people who have to save and people who are in small businesses. Small businesses, whether farms, secondary industries, or shops, must be capable of carrying on.

At present South Australia levies estate duty on estates valued at less than \$20,000, and I think this figure should be the minimum figure on which these duties should commence. That amount is about equivalent to the amount

involved in assessment of eligibility for the age pension and the medical and other benefits that go with that pension. There is no reason why a family should have to pay duty on an estate valued at \$20,000. I disagree with the Labor Party about the concession arising from giving a house to the spouse. I think this results in injustice, because many people who live in rental houses do not get this concession. Government employees who live in rental houses probably save enough money to enable them to buy a house by the time they retire but because they live in a rental house, they are not entitled to the concession. It would be better to increase the \$20,000 minimum, because, having regard to inflation, this would not be a big estate compared with the exemption granted 10 years ago.

Today in Elder Park much was said about how to help the farmer, but the farmer is in difficulty at present because he is producing more goods than can be sold and he is not receiving an adequate price, having regard to his cost of production. A subsidy to a farmer is an incentive to produce more, and control of production becomes necessary. When the wheat stabilization scheme came into operation in the 1940's, a form of quota system should have been introduced so that farmers would know the position. We would have needed quotas 10 or 15 years ago if acreage restrictions had not been introduced in the U.S.A. at that time.

We are now running into that position with wine grapes in South Australia. A few years ago, when the growers were in difficulties, we established a guaranteed minimum price, and that was a good thing, but in the first year of operation of the scheme the supply of grapes exceeded the demand and grapes that should have brought the appropriate price were sold at a lower price. Demand for grapes now exceeds production and more than the minimum price can be obtained, but soon we will have over-production of grapes. Until now we have given the farmers everything they have asked for, such as orderly marketing and the wheat scheme. Many of them are blaming us now for the position they are in. Some are saying, "We want to leave." We should be pointing out these facts of life, which are that there should be some plan now to deal with the surplus grapes with the incentive of the prevailing good prices. This is what secondary industry has to do: it is spoon-fed with tariffs. Adelaide people have the protection of the arbitration courts, but no manufacturer can produce more than he can sell and still get good prices;

he immediately makes a loss if he over-produces. For instance, if General Motors-Holden's makes 100 cars more than it can dispose of, it makes a loss. We have to accept that as a principle that applies to farmers. I do not believe in controls, but this is a basic fact that we must stress everywhere we go.

I return to education, because I omitted to mention this point before. I know it is difficult to plan ahead but we hope the new Labor Government will continue to replace schools where necessary. I think it intends to do so, but often good intentions go astray. Sometimes, a new toilet was installed a year or so ago in a school due to be replaced. Only yesterday we saw a school where a 24ft. extension had been made to the canteen, at considerable cost. This building will be torn down within a year or two. When schools are to be replaced, we must guard against wasting money on installations with which they can get along with some scrimping, until they are replaced.

I went to a college and spent all my years there in wooden buildings. Looking back, I think the only way in which I missed out was when I did not have a good teacher, although I am not criticizing the honourable member on what he said. Much can be done by forward planning and proper supervision of the work to save money. In my district is the Oakbank Area School, which has a drain that runs uphill. A change shed was built there recently. The earth has been built up alongside the wall and the drainage there is not good. There are many ways in which savings can be effected at the schools and we must forward-plan to ensure that we do not too often pull down good things. In Parliament, we must be more constructive in finding solutions to these problems. It is easy for a member opposite to get up and say, "We need more for education; we will do this or that." It must be realized that the Commonwealth Government is issuing credit to possibly more than the limit and the money is being used for Government developments, but the people are already beginning to object to the amount of income tax they pay. Company tax or something else could be increased but that is an indirect tax and it creates inflation. This is the problem. I will finish my speech by repeating what I said in the Address in Reply debate in 1964, as follows:

As mentioned earlier, we spend millions of pounds on research to increase primary production. We have been successful in that respect, but we should spend more time and money to find out how a permanent balanced

economy can be achieved, where there is always a demand for goods equal to our capacity to produce and the wage force available. After 20 years of research I am positive that this happy state of affairs can be achieved without undue interference with individual liberty and with a minimum of Government control.

We are certainly not getting a minimum of Government control from the present Government. The member for Playford spent some time advocating the control of this and the control of that. However, I do not think the young people of today want this: they want to have more say in what is being done. It is expected that within the next 10 years the percentage of the gross national product spent by the Government will increase to 30 per cent; it is 21 per cent already. I do not think the spending of more money by the Government will result in better living standards and happy people, because the people will be demanding a bigger share of what the Government spends. It would be better for the people to obtain a reward for their own labours and to have the right to spend it themselves. My speech continued as follows:

This is not conservatism but progressive liberalism, by bringing science into political management. I am confident that our better-educated younger citizens will expect it and even demand it. After all, democracy—government by the people for the people—can best be achieved by leaving as many decisions as possible in the hands of the people themselves. Progress does not consist of introducing a large number of controls merely because there is ignorance of how to maintain a balanced economy without them. If one does not have this ability or knowledge, one would certainly be incapable of efficiently implementing a controlled economy. Let us go forward and not backwards to the dead hand of bureaucracy. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "If we are to be free we must school our minds to be free; if we content ourselves with timid thinking or halfway goals, or a policy of gradualism, we will fall into evils that boldness will overleap at a bound."

I think this is what we are getting into in Australia today. We are looking more and more to Government to assist us, whereas we should be demanding of the Government that it create the conditions under which private enterprise can exist and thrive. It has been proved throughout world history that this is the way to improve living standards. People do not want too much Government interference. The Premier now says that he will plan everything in South Australia. Just how ridiculous can we get! It is far better to have planning by individual firms which, monthly or even more frequently, call in every member of the staff, analyse the position,

and then decide what the people want. We do not want to go back to price control and what we had to put up with after the Second World War.

I was amazed when the Attorney-General said that a person who went to buy something was at a disadvantage compared with a person selling. I am never at a disadvantage when I go to buy anything; in fact, I think that is the only time that I am the boss. I admit that some protection must be given to people in certain transactions such as the purchase of a motor vehicle. However, a simple agreement setting out the warranty with regard to the quality of materials or some such thing should be ample, and setting out in plain language just what a person had to pay would get over this problem in a better way than interfering in a contract between two people. We cannot look after everybody to this extent, for some people have to learn the hard way. I know that some people who invested money in vending machines expecting to get a 20 per cent dividend were amazed when they lost their money. People can learn only from the hard experience of life. If a person invests money in a company paying 9 per cent interest when the ruling rate is 8 per cent he must realize that he is having a gamble and, if he gets bitten, he should learn.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Have you made mistakes?

Mr. McANANEY: Those who do most and think most make the most mistakes, but they also make the largest contribution to development.

Mr. Coumbe: You must learn by your mistakes.

Mr. McANANEY: Of course. The bears in the Rocky Mountains used to be healthy: they were wise old bears and collected food in the summer and autumn and put it away for the winter. When the tourists came (and I was one of them) they fed the bears bread, and every time the bears came down they were fed. When winter came the rangers of the national parks had to go out and bury the dead bears, because the bears had not prepared for the future. I am sure there is a good moral in this story. It seems that the Labor Party philosophy is that, if someone is not prepared to pull his weight, he must be helped.

No-one believes more in helping the sick and the aged than the Liberal Party does, because we realize that we can give more services than can be given by the Labor Gov-

ernment. We have more to give but, when things are taken from able-bodied people and given to other able-bodied people, those responsible must get into strife, the same as the bears got into strife. I think I have spoken enough words of wisdom for Government members to absorb, because we should not feed them too much common sense at one time: we have to feed it to them gradually. I admit that the Labor Party has good intentions, but I plead with it not to make a mess of South Australia as it did from 1965 to 1968. The Liberal Party was getting the State out of trouble in its 2½ years of office, and we do not want South Australia thrust back into the situation of less money for education and less services available for the people. We should be a vital State, confident of the future, and not, as the Premier said, the Cinderella State. He should be ashamed and disgusted at using the words "milk bar economy". Good Lord!

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): In supporting the motion I join with other members in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on attaining your high office and, like other members, I am confident of your ability to rule the House with fairness and impartiality. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on the able manner in which they performed that task. Also, I join with other members in hoping that the Governor will soon be restored to good health so that at the next official Opening he will be able to read the Opening Speech. His Excellency, the Governor's Deputy, ably delivered the Opening Speech on Tuesday of last week. It is an imposing document which sets out clearly and concisely the legislation that the Government intends to introduce this session. It is also a great pleasure for me once again to be representing in this august Chamber the important District of Chaffey. As members know, I had the misfortune to incur an unfavourable vote at the election held in 1968, but it is pleasing to know that the electors of that good district did not take long to become disillusioned not only with their former member but also with the Government that he was supporting.

Mr. Rodda: When are you going to dig Chowilla?

Mr. CURREN: It is interesting to note that the member for Victoria has brought up this subject. I recall clearly the statements made in 1968 by the Leader of the Opposition which gave people in this State the clear impression that he and his Party would, if elected and if necessary, build the Chowilla

dam with their own little picks and shovels. Not one member on this side has said that we shall build two dams or none, and the member for Victoria is well aware of that fact. Our position has been made clear by the Premier not only in statements made during the election campaign but also in other statements that he has made and in answer recently to questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition, who is in his correct place at last, and who I think will stay there for a long time.

The changing of ground to which the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy have referred recently in Question Time recalls to my mind the fact that two years ago the Leader of the Opposition believed that Chowilla dam should receive No. 1 priority. Within a few short months of taking office as Premier, he met with the Leaders of the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian Governments to discuss the matter and to "sell" the Chowilla dam, but he did not sell it; he just gave it away and then switched to this marvellous dam to be built at Dartmouth. However, the people of Chaffey in rather unmistakable terms (particularly in Renmark, as the member for Victoria knows) expressed their disapproval of the Leader's action.

Mr. McAnaney: Was there any wisdom in their choice of member in 1968?

Mr. CURREN: We have not had any wisdom out of the sterling member for Heysen for quite a few years. This evening I listened intently to his speech, which concluded with a little story about the three bears, and I think that is about the sum total of his speech. The Chowilla dam—

Mr. McAnaney: Do you think it will ever be built?

Mr. CURREN: We do not make silly promises such as those made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Clark: And immediately break them!

Mr. CURREN: Yes. All that was promised by this Government was that we would renegotiate with the other parties this so-called agreement that was considered by the House and rejected by a majority of members, thereby causing the much-needed election that was held on May 30 last. As this matter was made the No. 1 item by the Opposition, the people of this State have given their views on which Party's policy they favour. The Premier told the House what he planned to do in connection with renegotiating the Dartmouth dam agreement to ensure that South Australia's undoubted rights to the Chowilla dam were preserved. The Premier will carry out his

undertaking as soon as the other parties to the agreement give him an opportunity. My views on the Chowilla dam are well known, because I have expressed them both here and in my district.

Mr. Clark: And they have been endorsed in your district.

Mr. CURREN: Yes. Paragraph 8 of His Excellency's Speech states:

My Government will promote tourism in South Australia and the Government Tourist Bureau will carry out research into and promote the State's unique tourist potential.

Because the Murray River flows through my district, I realize it has great tourist potential; so I aim to ensure that the greatest possible financial assistance is given to all tourist organizations that serve my district. In connection with the provision of riverside tourist facilities, there is a great need for control of pollution of the river. A departmental committee has investigated this matter; the committee, appointed by the previous Government, comprised officers of the Public Health Department and Engineering and Water Supply Department. The committee's comprehensive report makes some far-reaching recommendations. The report has been discussed at length by the representatives on that committee and the local boards of health in the Murray River area.

The publicity given to many of the far-reaching recommendations in the report caused concern about whether these recommendations would be introduced, either by regulation or by legislation, without regard being had to local opinions, and last week I sought the Premier's assurance that, before Government policy was formulated and regulations promulgated, councils concerned would be consulted and their views would be considered so that the local scene would be recognized fully and many good projects that might otherwise be excluded could be put into effect.

Today I and several other members and Commonwealth colleagues attended the rural march and many of us received a copy of the manifesto distributed by the marchers. I agree fully with all the points that it contains. Regrettably, it has become necessary for persons in primary industry in this State to demonstrate by marching in Adelaide in order to publicize their economic plight in recent years. Speakers and organizers of the march emphasized that they were stressing their points for the benefit of politicians, and the Premier indicated clearly what this Government had included in its policy and explained that this

would meet many of the farmers' requirements so far as the State Government has power to assist.

The Deputy Premier (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) explained the Government's rural policy before the recent State election, and it is interesting to note that the previous Government referred to only two matters of rural policy. They were promises to reduce land tax by 50 per cent and to reduce succession duties on land used for primary production.

Mr. Gunn: And they're both good?

Mr. CURREN: I agree that they are both good things, but similar proposals that will have a far more beneficial effect are included in the Labor Party's rural policy. To the small landholder, a reduction of 50 per cent in land tax often amounts to exactly 50 per cent of nothing. I took out some figures several years ago on the incidence of land tax on the majority of primary producers in the Chaffey District.

Mr. Hall: Why don't you mention the figures of 70 per cent to 80 per cent mentioned in the policy speech?

Mr. CURREN: The figures I am quoting at the moment were arrived at after a thorough search of areas, acreages and land tax assessments for fruit blocks in the Chaffey District, and it transpired that about 85 per cent of those properties were not subject to land tax, as their assessments were so low that they were eligible for exemption, for which most of the landholders had applied. A flat 50 per cent reduction in land tax will not greatly benefit the small primary producers but will be of great benefit to the larger landholders, who pay considerable sums of money in land tax. I am a small primary producer myself, and the small primary producers are the ones in most trouble in the present period of economic stress: so they are the ones in greatest need of assistance.

Mr. Rodda: You are not paying land tax?

Mr. CURREN: I still pay land tax, but only because I have not applied for exemption. In the policy speech, on rural matters many other proposals that will be of considerable benefit to the primary producers were put forward by the incoming Labor Government. In particular, one was the proposal that a committee be set up to inquire into and make recommendations for a much more balanced and fairer allocation of wheat quotas. The Premier has announced today that that committee is about to be set up and that it will examine the situation as soon as possible. He also announced today to the gathering in Elder Park just how far we as a Government would be going

in the matter I have already referred to—revision of the land tax assessments that were due to go out in July but were held back and re-examined in the light of the general falling off in valuations and values of primary-producing land. I have no doubt that in many cases the assessments will be considerably reduced and the primary producer concerned will receive benefit in that way. Regarding succession duties on primary-producing land, the Premier also announced today that exemptions of varying amounts would take effect up to a valuation of \$200,000, and no doubt this will meet with the general approval of the medium to large landholders who have the responsibility of providing the succession duties when they assume ownership of the land.

I now wish to refer to the troubles now besetting the citrus industry. As many members will recall, it was the previous Labor Government that set up the Citrus Organization Committee by passing the Act in 1965. The legislation was passed by this House as a result of an inquiry conducted into the citrus industry by a committee that had been appointed by the previous Government. It was passed in this Chamber without any dissent from the then Opposition, and it was also passed in the Legislative Council, the House of Review. It was not envisaged that the passing of that Act would be the be-all and end-all of the troubles of the citrus industry: it was merely an attempt to set guidelines for the industry to do something itself to overcome the economic problems besetting it.

Before the Act was passed and also immediately after it was passed a spirit of confidence and co-operation was expressed by many industry leaders, and it is a matter of regret that many of those industry leaders who took office in the organization that was set up, namely, the Citrus Organization Committee and its subsidiary, South Australian Citrus Sales, did not continue with that spirit of wanting to do something for the benefit of the industry as a whole. They rather tended to preserve their own little empires and, in the main, would not go the whole way in the measures that were necessary to bring stability and prosperity to the industry.

Only five or six months ago there was a major upheaval in the C.O.C. Unfortunately, this matter that caused the major upset, the resignation of the chairman and the deputy chairman and also two grower representatives, had been brought to the notice of the previous Minister of Agriculture (Hon. C. R. Story)

some two months previously; for reasons undisclosed but apparently with a desire not to make a decision on any contentious matter; the report that was submitted to the Minister was not acted upon and unfortunately, through that lack of action by the Minister, the major upset occurred. It has had a most harmful effect on the industry as a whole, in that it has destroyed much of the confidence that growers had in the ability of the C.O.C. to put the affairs of the industry on a sound basis.

It took much effort by a group of Berri growers to obtain action by the previous Government for an inquiry into the reasons for the major upset and to accede to the request for recommendations to be made that would put this necessary organization back on a sound basis. I fully support the present inquiry being conducted by the Director of Lands (Mr. Dunsford), and I am sure that, as he was Chairman of the original inquiry committee, with his background knowledge and his usual forthright approach to primary industry problems he will get to the bottom of what caused the trouble and will make sound recommendations, which I know this Government will act upon, to return the citrus industry to a sound economic basis.

The question of education has been dealt with at considerable length by previous speakers who have sound knowledge of the needs and requirements in this State and who have suggested how these can be met and the problems overcome. I speak of two points in my Party's policy that will be of great benefit to parent organizations, particularly to those in country districts. The subsidy policy of the Government will be of considerable benefit to those organizations that desire to provide major amenities, such as assembly halls and swimming pools, at country high schools. The Government intends to legislate to enable parent organizations to borrow, with a Government guarantee, their part of the cost of the project, and later raise their part of the money and pay off the debt rather than wait for many years to have these facilities provided after they had raised their part of the cost of these much-needed facilities. Having again found my feet in this House, I again congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment, and I support the motion.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Although somewhat footsore, I rise to support the motion.

Mr. Clark: You were out of step.

Mr. VENNING: The honourable member would not know. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on being elected to your high office.

I know that you will be impartial in carrying out your duties but, politics being what it is, I cannot offer you a long reign as Speaker. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I offer my good wishes to you and, bearing in mind your impartiality, I know that you will command good conduct in this Chamber, although at times this evening I thought we were getting close to the point of no return. With other members, I, too, express my regret that His Excellency the Governor was unable to open the 40th Parliament, but it is pleasing to note that His Excellency is making satisfactory progress. Sir Mellis Napier, who deputized for the Governor, handled the occasion with dignity and calmness, as though the opening of Parliament were a daily occurrence for him.

Before delving into the matters contained in the Speech, I should like to correct a statement or two made by the member for Chaffey in connection with the policy of my Party enunciated prior to the election. I refer to land tax, which on rural lands in this State amounted to about \$1,100,000 last year. My Leader stated that in the next financial year, if he were elected, we would reduce land tax on rural lands by 50 per cent and that in the following year, which would have been the first year of the quinquennial assessment, we would reduce land tax further to the extent that the income received by the Treasury from this source would amount to about \$300,000.

That represents an overall reduction of 80 per cent compared with what primary producers are paying at present. I hope that when the relevant legislation is introduced, as has been forecast in His Excellency's Speech, the Labor Government will do something about land tax and will follow closely the policy laid down by my Leader. I congratulate the Acting Clerk and his staff.

Mr. McKee: What about Tom Stott?

Mr. VENNING: Live horse and the grass will grow. The Acting Clerk and his staff have had an immense amount of work in preparing for this the 40th session of Parliament, particularly bearing in mind the additional accommodation required for the new members. In the absence of the Clerk, I congratulate the Acting Clerk on the way in which he has carried out his duties. I also congratulate the new members on being elected. To the Leader of the Opposition, I offer my congratulations on winning the enlarged seat of Gouger.

Mr. McKee: He just made it!

Mr. VENNING: I know that the Leader of the Opposition is aware that part of his new district was once represented by a former

member who had the ability to speak for hours and say nothing, and as a result time limits have now been placed on speeches made in this Chamber. As I now occupy the seat in this Chamber that was formerly occupied by the honourable member, I sincerely hope that I do not catch the wog that must have troubled him in the past. I know members opposite appreciate that on this side sits a sound Opposition. Although the Premier has the numbers on his side, when it comes to matters of sound legislation he will be looking for support from the Opposition.

The premature closing of the Thirty-ninth Parliament, with all the uncertainty that surrounded its dying days, occurred very quietly. The then Speaker (Hon. Tom Stott) spoke in appropriate terms about certain members who would not be returning to this Parliament. However, he may not have known of his own future. The Hon. Mr. Stott did not return, and it is of him that I wish to speak. Tom Stott held the seat of Ridley as an Independent for 37 years, although from time to time attempts were made to take it from him. Coming into politics during the depression, Tom Stott was a fighter for the primary producer, and he

deserves the thanks of primary producers for many achievements. I trust that Tom Stott and Mrs. Stott will live to enjoy many happy years in retirement. I know that members who were in office when Mr. Jim Heaslip was the member for Rocky River would have read recently, with regret, of the passing of Mrs. Heaslip. Nell Heaslip had endeared herself to the people of Rocky River, and we know that she was a tower of strength to her husband.

The comments made recently concerning the image of the greatest South Australian of our time (Sir Thomas Playford) were unwarranted and in very bad taste. Be it known to all who hear and read this speech that the member for Rocky River and many others do not condone the making of those comments. I again express my appreciation to the people of Rocky River for re-electing me. I say to both my new and old constituents that I desire to assist them at all times, irrespective of their political views. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 23, at 2 p.m.