

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Thursday, September 17, 1970

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated the Governor's assent to the following Bills:

Australia and New Zealand Banking Group,

Potato Marketing Act Amendment,

Supreme Court Act Amendment (Salaries),

Supreme Court Act Amendment (Valuation),

Wild Dogs Act Amendment.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: VIETNAM MORATORIUM**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement. Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is gravely concerned at the situation which appears to be developing in Adelaide relating to the moratorium demonstration tomorrow. In consequence of the expressions of opinion given by the Government to this House during this week, the Chief Secretary and I interviewed the Commissioner of Police and expressed the view that the utmost effort should be made that confrontation should be avoided in Adelaide and that any action which might lead in any way to a breach of the peace should be carefully avoided or controlled. Specifically, it was put to the Commissioner that, in view of the announced intention of moratorium demonstrators, with whom I have expressed my disagreement, that they would march in the city of Adelaide and at some stage occupy an intersection, plans should be prepared to divert traffic so that no sort of deliberate confrontation should take place, and that the whole matter should pass off peacefully and with the minimum of public inconvenience. This was discussed in detail with the Commissioner. I have received from the Commissioner, through the Chief Secretary, a letter which includes the following paragraph:

It is the earnest desire of the police to avoid a clash with the demonstrators, but I could not ask my officers to neglect their duty and thereby deny the general public the rights to which they are entitled. Therefore, I am unable to agree to the request of the Hon. Premier to permit the moratorium demon-

strators to occupy an intersection. There is agreement on the other matters discussed this morning but the police must be free to handle situations as they arise.

The Government has no power to direct the Commissioner of Police in this matter. The Commissioner has made a decision which, in my view, does not entirely accord with what has happened in relation to other demonstrations which have held up public traffic, including the farmers' demonstration, in which I took part. However, that is the expression of view of the Commissioner of Police, and over him we have no control. So, I hope (and I appeal to everyone involved tomorrow: demonstrators, people opposed to the demonstrators, or the police) that the utmost effort will be made that peace and order be kept. But, unfortunately, the matter is now out of the hands of the Government; we have no power legally or administratively to take further action than we have taken. We have expressed the view that the utmost tolerance and understanding must be shown and prudence and care taken to see to it that the peace is kept, and I hope that that will occur. Unfortunately, the Commissioner of Police has communicated with me in these terms, and he will carry out his duties, as will members of the Police Force, in the terms that he and they believe to be right. In these circumstances, the responsibility will rest there.

**QUESTIONS****VIETNAM MORATORIUM**

Mr. HALL: My question is directed to the Premier. I refer to the police control of the moratorium march and, with your leave, Mr. Speaker, and with the concurrence of the House, I will explain.

Mr. Ryan: You weren't listening yesterday. What's your question?

Mr. HALL: So far there appears to have been no serious disruption of public activities in the city by the moratorium demonstrators.

Mr. Ryan: Question!

The SPEAKER: Will the Leader indicate the question?

Mr. HALL: However, the situation in other States, Mr. Speaker, has not been so placid.

Mr. Ryan: Question!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the Leader making a personal explanation to the House, or is he asking a question? If he is asking a question, on the ruling you gave yesterday and the

decision of the House upholding that ruling the Leader must ask his question and then seek leave to explain it.

The SPEAKER: The question must be asked.

Mr. HALL: I was explaining my question, and I had asked leave to explain it.

The SPEAKER: "Question" has been called, and the Leader must now ask his question.

Mr. HALL: I do not think that "Question" has been called, with due respect, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What is the question?

Mr. HALL: I am explaining it, with the leave of the House.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There is a ruling already on the books on the matter that was debated yesterday.

The SPEAKER: The Leader must ask his question.

Mr. HALL: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, I will ask my question. I ask you on what basis you ask me to ask my question.

The SPEAKER: On the basis of the procedure that this House agreed to yesterday.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday we had a long-ranging debate in this House concerning the matter that you now invoke to require me to ask my question. Following that debate, you allowed (and supported) the member for Unley to ask the following question—

Mr. Ryan: He did not.

Mr. HALL: I am speaking on a point of order. Yesterday, the member for Unley asked:

My question is on the sittings of the House and with the leave of the Speaker and the concurrence of the House I will explain it.

Then the member for Mitcham asked, "What is the question?", and you, Sir, said:

The Speaker is here to administer Standing Orders. Under Standing Orders, members are not permitted to interject. The member for Unley is asking a question concerning the sittings of the House.

I want to tell you, Sir, that I have used exactly the same form of question as you supported the member for Unley in using, except that I have changed the subject of the question (and, obviously, this could be of no interest to you, as Speaker, in impartially administering the affairs of this House). Having therefore, fulfilled the conditions that you supported the member for Unley in, I request that I get

impartial and identical treatment and, if this is to be denied me, I see no basis for that denial. I ask for the same treatment as you not only gave the member for Unley but supported him in.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise also on a point of order. Yesterday the member for Unley was pulled up following the matter that the Leader quoted and then specifically asked me a question about the Government's proposals relating to the sittings of this House, and I answered him on that basis.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have quoted from *Hansard* the exact and relevant words, as reported.

The SPEAKER: The Leader will recall that I did stop the member for Unley and he then asked the Premier about the sittings of the House, to which the Premier replied that it was expected that the House would adjourn at the end of the first week in December and possibly come back in February for six or eight weeks, although that had not been determined. I have not checked that, but that is my recollection of what the member for Unley said.

Mr. HALL: Still on that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the proof of *Hansard* which I have and which would be available to you. According to that proof, you did not prohibit the member for Unley from continuing in terms of the leave that he had obtained from the House. You, Sir, in fact said he was asking a question concerning the sittings of the House. I am asking a question concerning the police control of the moratorium march, which I said was the subject of my question. I must ask for identical treatment.

Mr. Ryan: This is not a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Would the Leader please return to the point of order?

Mr. HALL: This subject was thoroughly debated yesterday, but there was some doubt as to whether you required a full indication of the subject matter or whether you required the question in detail. Following the debate I certainly took your treatment of the member for Unley to indicate what you now required—

Mr. Langley: I got sat down.

Mr. HALL: —and I ask for similar treatment. I will be subject to the Standing Orders of the House in that if someone calls "Question" I will conform. That Standing Order has been in use for many years, although you are ordering me not to do something on

that basis but rather to desist from my course of action modelled on the consequences of the question of the member for Unley subsequent to yesterday's ruling and based on the decision of the House. I cannot accept that, but I submit respectfully that the only thing changed in the form of my seeking leave has been the subject matter of my question.

The Hon HUGH HUDSON: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker. The ruling given yesterday was that the question had to be asked first and then an explanation given, after leave had been sought. That ruling was dissented from and it was the subject of the debate yesterday, but as every member is aware your ruling, Sir, that the question had to be asked first, was upheld. Then there was time for a question, which the member for Unley asked, setting out only the subject matter. He was then pulled up and the honourable member did not proceed with any explanation but asked a question. Therefore, it follows that, if the Leader wants the same treatment as that received by the member for Unley, he would be required to ask his question in detail and then seek leave to explain it, as the member for Unley was required to do yesterday and as would be required by the ruling you gave yesterday.

The SPEAKER: If the Leader can indicate sufficient detail of the question it will assist me considerably. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HALL: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for saying that you would like more detail. As I said in my early statement before I asked leave to explain my question, it concerns the control by police of the moratorium march in Adelaide tomorrow. I was going on to explain that whilst—

Mr. Langley: Question!

The SPEAKER: As an honourable member has called "Question", the Leader must now ask his question.

Mr. HALL: I will abide by Standing Orders and in that case will ask my question. Is the Premier aware that in other States there has been much disturbance associated with supporters of the moratorium and Viet Cong in relation to their public display of support for that cause? This disturbance has centred on the State of Victoria, with which Dr. Cairns, who has expressed himself as being in favour of other forms of government than Parliamentary government, has a close association. Will the Premier assure the House that

he will support the police, and will he reconsider his decision, which he has made known to the House today, that he regrets the Commissioner's decision (which the Opposition fully supports), and not show any bias in favour of those who have demonstrated in support of the moratorium and the Viet Cong by associating himself with the leaders of that group?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have always made it clear that I believe that people have the right publicly and peacefully to demonstrate their opinions. This includes people of all shades of political opinion, and it includes the farmers of South Australia who received the Leader so badly at the time of their march through Adelaide.

Mr. Jennings: Did they rubbish him?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As soon as he opened his mouth, they did.

Mr. Jennings: That's usually when he puts his foot in it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe it is reasonable for people to demonstrate their opinions publicly, that it is advisable for those responsible for the maintenance of law and order to exercise the utmost care to ensure that breaches of the peace do not take place, and that this should be the basis upon which action is taken. Indeed, if action had been taken literally upon the law in relation to the farmers' march, some of the farmers would not have reached Elder Park. I should have thought that it was most ill advised—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: There was no defiance of the law whatever.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: With great respect, the rights of the citizens of Adelaide to free traffic movement were interfered with.

Mr. Mathwin: That wasn't a two-hour sit-in.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not suggesting there should be a two-hour sit-in, either. There was still obstruction of traffic within the provisions of the Road Traffic Act. The question concerns what sort of discretion and sense one must exercise. The Government has expressed its opinion regarding the care that should be taken; I regret that its expression of opinion has been rejected. However, the responsibility for ensuring that no breach of the peace occurs is no longer in the hands of the Government but in those of the Commissioner and his officers. So I can do no more than I have done. The rights in law will be enforced by those upon whom the law places that

responsibility. I can only urge that the utmost prudence, care, tolerance and understanding be exercised in this situation.

Regarding the Leader's political statement, which he made in the course of asking what he called a question, I can only say that it was perhaps unfortunate that Victoria, the State to which he referred, had not seen what occurred in Adelaide on the Friday before the last moratorium. I would hope that the restraints that occurred in Victoria during the long period of occupation of city streets by those involved in a march will be similarly exercised in South Australia, because that is a sensible course.

Mr. HALL: My question concerns the behaviour and personal hygiene of some members of the group stationed in front of this building and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House, I ask leave to explain my question. When I arrived here this morning, I learned that a member or members of the moratorium group occupying the front steps of Parliament House had apparently used one of the light wells in front of members' rooms as a lavatory.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, a decision was made by this House yesterday on the way questions were to be asked and explained, and a vote was taken by the House on the matter. I ask that the Leader be required to comply with your ruling, upheld as it was by a vote of this House.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, I again refer to what happened yesterday. Distasteful though it may be for members opposite to have to listen to this, I point out that it is not the subject matter with which you, Sir, and I are concerned in administering Standing Orders. I again refer you to the question asked yesterday by the member for Unley and to your support of him in that regard. Having given a clear definition of the matter with which my question is concerned, I am proceeding, having obtained the leave of the House, and having defined in precise terms the aspect on which my question has a bearing—

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, I was interrupted.

Mr. HALL: I think I have stated the substance of my question. It concerns hygiene in front of Parliament House.

The SPEAKER: For the benefit of members, I point out that only this morning I spoke to members of the moratorium group. Having

received a complaint yesterday about the noise of the music being played by them, I told them that they would have to tone down the amplification, and this was done. The people concerned expressed their satisfaction in the matter. Other requests were made regarding the removal of a Viet Cong flag, and these requests were complied with. It was reported to me this morning that, as the Leader has said, one of the light wells had been used as a toilet. Right throughout this matter, I have been conferring with the President of another place and, when I had discussions with him this morning, I told him it was my view that the people concerned would have to clean out the light well and also clean and tidy the steps in front of the House.

I was asked whether buckets and some detergent could be made available, and, although I did not stay to supervise, I have been informed by some of our members that certain members of the group proceeded to wash down the steps. In fact, the light well had been cleaned out prior to this. Certain people volunteered to clean out the well and came and informed me that, as they did not consider that the steps were sufficiently clean, they intended to wash them down again. Hitherto, they have co-operated on the matters that were the subject of the requests which the President and I decided we would make.

Mr. HALL: I appreciate your reply prior to my finishing my explanation, but I should like further to ask you—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Has he got the call, Mr. Speaker?

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! One has to be practical, and I point out that I was discussing matters with the Clerk when the Leader of the Opposition was finishing, so that I caught only the former part of his statement. I apologize for this and, as a matter of courtesy, I think I should listen if I have missed part of what he said because, after all, one has many things to watch in this Chamber. As I do not profess to be a superman, I will permit the Leader to proceed to inform me what I may have inadvertently missed.

Mr. HALL: Let me hasten to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not consider that you were doing anything contrary to my interests. I was at that stage finishing my remarks addressed to a point of order, and I was about to ask you another question, which was to follow the conclusion of the explanation for which I had obtained leave. I had said

(and you have referred to this matter in your partial reply to me) that a light well in front of this building had been used as a lavatory, and I was distressed to find that members of the staff of this House had had the most unpleasant task of removing the excreta apparently deposited there by those supporting the moratorium and the Viet Cong. I therefore ask you to express yourself further on the action you will take to prevent a repetition of the fouling of these Parliamentary premises by those people.

The SPEAKER: This situation needs handling with the utmost discretion, and I think every member appreciates this point. Throughout the whole proceedings, I have informed members of this House and others that I will, in consultation with the President of the Upper House, deal with cases as they arise, and when complaints are brought to my notice I intend to continue doing what I have already been doing and to use the utmost discretion. I do not think that we wish to make martyrs of these people: I think the situation requires to be handled with discretion; and I intend to handle it accordingly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier concerning the Ministerial statement he has made this afternoon and the matter of a reconsideration of the decision he announced in that statement. With your concurrence, Mr. Speaker, and the leave of the House, I desire briefly to explain that question.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What's the question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Sir. The member for Mitcham is proceeding to evade what was decided in this House yesterday: he is not asking a question and then seeking leave to explain it. If he does not proceed as was decided—

Mr. Coumbe: You're disagreeing with the Speaker. I thought the Speaker ran this House, not the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member does not ask his question, I must ask him to ask it.

Mr. Ryan: Question!

The SPEAKER: I understood the honourable member for Mitcham to say that his question was whether the Premier would reconsider his decision.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is that what he said?

The SPEAKER: That is what I understood him to say. If I did not hear him correctly, I apologize to the House.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He's asking me to reconsider my statement?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Premier had listened to what I said instead of being so anxious to try to trip me up, he would have heard me give what I considered to be the full substance of the question I desired to ask.

Mr. Ryan: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I then sought your leave, Sir, and the concurrence of the House to give my explanation of the question. I desire now to give that explanation. The decision which was embodied in the Premier's statement indicates a clear difference in thinking between the Government and the Commissioner of Police. This is unprecedented in my experience and knowledge. Because of the likelihood of trouble tomorrow in the streets of Adelaide, which the Premier foreshadowed in his statement, and the difficult situation with which the police will have to deal, I appeal to the Premier and the Government to reconsider the decision they have made to repudiate the Commissioner of Police. Can the Premier say whether he and his Ministerial colleagues will reconsider their decision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is completely without any basis and foundation in saying that the Government has repudiated the Commissioner of Police. If this Government were to repudiate the Commissioner, clear action by this Government would be necessary under the Police Regulation Act, and we have not taken action, because it is not the case.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We can't instruct the Commissioner.

Mr. Millhouse: You just repudiated him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Under the Police Regulation Act, we have no power—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is replying.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is stating that I have repudiated the Commissioner of Police. I have not done so. I was asked, in this House, whether this Government would consult with the police to ensure that there was peace and order in

Adelaide tomorrow, and we did that. We suggested to the police action similar to that taken by the police in Victoria on a similar occasion, that action having resulted in completely peaceful demonstration, without disorder of any kind, and the Commissioner of Police has not accepted that suggestion. Now, he is responsible for maintaining—

Mr. Millhouse: You waited—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What do you think I should do? The Government has expressed its opinion about the proper action that should be taken. Sir, if there is disorder in Adelaide tomorrow as a result of the Government's suggestions not being accepted, we will not take responsibility.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. Burdon: You're a lot of Fascist dictators over there.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Gambier has referred to members on this side as Fascist dictators, and I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I am afraid I did not hear the remark, because everyone was singing out.

Mr. McKee: I didn't hear him.

The SPEAKER: Order! Did the honourable member for Mount Gambier make the remark that is objected to?

Mr. McKee: I was talking to him.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Mount Gambier whether he made the remark that the honourable member for Eyre has claimed he made.

Mr. BURDON: I did say the word. If it is offensive to the gentleman, I withdraw.

Mr. Lawn: What does he want withdrawn? He only wants "dictator" withdrawn.

Mr. BURDON: Does he? Well, I withdraw it.

Mr. GUNN: I mean all words by which he referred to members on this side.

The SPEAKER: What words?

Mr. GUNN: He implied that we were Fascist dictators.

Mr. Millhouse: He said it!

The SPEAKER: What words? If members would keep quiet, the Speaker would have a better opportunity to hear what the honourable member requires to be withdrawn, and I appeal to members to let me hear the honourable member for Eyre. I ask him what are the words that he objects to.

Mr. GUNN: I object to the words "Fascist dictators"

Mr. Ryan: Used by whom?

The SPEAKER: Used by whom?

Mr. GUNN: By the member for Mount Gambier. I ask that he be required to withdraw both words.

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Mount Gambier, if he used those words, kindly withdraw them?

Mr. BURDON: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the duty of the Government of the State to indicate to the Commissioner of Police what it considers to be a sensible course to maintain law, order and peace within the city, but the Commissioner of Police, under the Police Regulation Act, has it entirely within his power to accept or reject the Government's advice in the matter. He has chosen to reject it.

Mr. Coumbe: It means that you don't support him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have stated our views: that we think that a course similar to the one taken in Victoria would be a sensible course to take here. Certainly, that course has been proved in Victoria. I regret that the Commissioner of Police does not agree that that is the course to be taken here. In the circumstances, I can only urge that the utmost prudence, caution and tolerance be exercised by everyone tomorrow, and that includes the prudence, caution and tolerance of members opposite.

Mr. Millhouse: Thereby, you encourage the demonstrators.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not. My disagreement with what has happened regarding this demonstration has been made very obvious in this House. The Labor Party and every member of this Ministry has said that we want no part in the demonstration, because we disagree with the course that it is following. That does not mean that we have no responsibility for peace, order and the protection of citizens, and that is what we are concerned with. The kind of inflammatory statement and political partisanship shown by the member for Mitcham does him little credit.

Mr. McRAE: I wish to ask a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, the question being in four parts. First, is it true that the police have informed members of the press that they must wear identification badges during the coverage of

tomorrow's demonstration? Secondly, if that is true, is it also true that identification badges will be provided by the Police Department? Thirdly, is it true that a police inspector has informed press members that it is "going to be on tomorrow"? Fourthly, is it true that the personnel at the Woodside barracks have been given leave tomorrow?

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. McRAE: With your leave, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House, I should like to make a brief statement. First, I apologize that I do not have the question in written form, the matter having been raised with me urgently, but with your permission I should like to hand the written note that I have to the Attorney-General in order to assist him. In explanation, I point out that there is considerable concern among members of the press about their position, safety and rights during the course of tomorrow's procession. Finally, concerning the leave for personnel at the Woodside barracks, I point out to the Attorney-General, if this is true and if there is some possibility of persons being involved in further incidents, that liaison might take place between the State and Commonwealth authorities on this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As I have no information on the questions asked by the honourable member, I will discuss the matter with the Chief Secretary and see whether any information is available to him. Also, I will see what can be done to deal with the situation.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier say what is his definition of "law and order"? Does he consider it "law and order" for a person to sit down in a street for a quarter of an hour and block the traffic? The Premier earlier said that this was similar to the farmers' march, but the farmers marched straight down the street and made no effort to sit down and thereby interfere with other people's activities.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The length of time taken by the farmers' march would hold up a city intersection for as long as would a smaller group of people sitting down at that intersection. The effect upon the traffic would be substantially similar. I did not consider that the farmers' march was a breach of law and order. In fact, I took part in it, and, if I remember correctly, the honourable member was there too, at some stage of the proceedings. I should have thought he would think it as proper as I did. This

applies to a great many functions in the city of Adelaide. There are numbers of occasions when traffic is held up for some reason or another, sometimes for very long periods indeed. I suggest that in these cases some sort of sense of proportion, tolerance and understanding be exercised. That is necessary for a proper exercise of the function of maintaining law and order.

### POWERLINES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Works raise with the Electricity Trust of South Australia the possibility of placing new powerlines at the rear instead of in front of suburban allotments? With your leave, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House I should like to explain briefly that this system is in use in Canberra, and I believe that it has also been applied in a small area of our eastern suburbs.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No doubt, the honourable member read the same article as the one that I read in a recent newspaper. I draw his attention to the fact that the system of land tenure in the Australian Capital Territory is different from that in this State, and I think this has some bearing on the matter. The system to which the honourable member has referred could be used in Canberra, whereas it might not be usable in this State. However, I shall be happy to have the matter examined and to bring down a report.

### DOCTORS' FEES

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked a few days ago about doctors' fees?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague has indicated that this subject is within the province of the Commonwealth rather than that of the State. However, the following information is provided:

As far as is known, there is no list in existence which shows those doctors who charge the most common fee. The most common fee for a consultation by a general practitioner is \$2.80 of which the Commonwealth meets \$1.10, the medical fund 90c, and the patient 80c. If a doctor charges in excess of the most common fee, he should inform the patient of this prior to the consultation, and if the patient still wishes to consult that doctor the patient must bear all of the additional cost over and above the most common fee. In other words, the patient would pay all of the total charge made by a doctor, less the \$2 combined benefit.

## TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wish to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan has been withdrawn, and I ask leave to make a statement explaining my question. This morning's *Advertiser* reports a statement by the Minister of Roads and Transport to the effect that licence fees for drivers will be increased by \$1 from the present fee of \$2 to yield \$500,000 a year and that the money will be used for a programme to alert drivers to safety needs and to improve railway crossings. As the M.A.T.S. plan sets out in considerable detail the 20 rail crossings that most urgently need attention, I should have thought those crossings would be the first to receive attention as a result of revenue from the increase in drivers' licence fees. As I have said on other occasions, considerable doubt exists as to the Government's policy on the M.A.T.S. plan, as doubt exists about its policy on many other subjects. As I have been led to believe from time to time that the M.A.T.S. plan has been withdrawn, I ask the Minister to say whether or not it has been withdrawn. If it has been, can he say whether the Government intends to refer back to the M.A.T.S. plan when deciding what road and rail crossings most urgently need attention?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope that I have gleaned from the honourable member's statement the fact that he supports the policy of this Government to take positive steps in a genuine endeavour to reduce the shocking road toll in South Australia. I should be disturbed if I believed that Opposition members, particularly the member for Alexandra, had any thought contrary to that. The position regarding the M.A.T.S. plan has been stated in this House often. In our policy speech, the Premier announced that we would withdraw the M.A.T.S. plan, causing a revision to be made to determine what type of transport would be needed in the future. Of course, we were acknowledging the fact that the term "M.A.T.S. plan", as interpreted by the general public, meant the massive concrete freeways and expressways contemplated. At no stage has the Government said that it will not proceed with the utmost haste humanly possible to upgrade the arterial roads system and to provide grade separation both at road and rail intersections. If the honourable member cares to read our policy speech, he will see that that is exactly what the Premier said, and we are following that course. We have had conducted the revision of the M.A.T.S. plan, as the honourable member knows and as I have reported

to the House. I have also reported that we expect the report of that revision to be available soon. I have said that, on receipt of that report, the Government will consider it to determine what will be done in future in relation to the M.A.T.S. proposals for freeways hither and thither in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Coumbe: When do you expect to receive this report?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If I am permitted to reply to that interjection (and I wish to do so), I will say that I hope the report will be in the hands of the Government by the end of this month. Following that, the Government will consider the report. Then, when we are able to say precisely where we stand and what decisions we will make arising out of the report, so that the confusion that was caused in August, 1968, with the release of the M.A.T.S. plan can be ended once and for all, we will do so.

## PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General received from the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the provision of spectacles for pensioners in country areas?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague has supplied me with the following information:

The present situation is that medical practitioners are unwilling to co-operate in any State-assisted scheme until such time as the Commonwealth Government will agree to a request from the Australian Medical Association that the pensioner medical service be extended to cover specialist services at "specialist rates". The Australian Medical Association has approached the Commonwealth asking that the National Health Act be amended to provide for this. Despite the considerable length of time that this matter has been under consideration, there appear to be no immediate prospects of Commonwealth Government action in this regard. Without the co-operation of medical practitioners in country areas, it is not considered that any satisfactory scheme could be commenced for the extension of facilities for pensioners to obtain spectacles in these areas.

## APPRENTICES

Mr. HARRISON: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked on August 18 regarding apprentices?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Generally speaking, industrial awards prescribe the maximum ratio of apprentices to tradesmen in any trade who can be employed by an employer. However, there are factors other than the number of tradesmen employed which influence the intake of apprentices into Government departments. These include the suitability of



youths seeking apprenticeship to ensure that they have appropriate educational qualifications for the trade concerned, the availability of inservice training facilities as well as workshop facilities, and an indication that there is a work programme within the department concerned to enable adequate and appropriate work to be available for the efficient training of apprentices. When selecting and employing apprentices to commence work in 1971, all Government departments will employ the maximum number of first-year apprentices who can be properly trained therein. At the present time about 7 per cent of all apprentices in South Australia are employed in State Government departments. Of the 10,536 apprentices who were in training in this State on June 30 last, 770 were being trained in 32 different trades in various State Government departments. I reiterate what I have said previously, that the continued industrial development of this State requires that the number of skilled tradesmen should be increased significantly. Last week I read with interest that in New South Wales, in the first year of the new apprenticeship system in that State, under which the maximum term of most apprenticeships is four years and the wage rates of apprentices have been increased, the intake of apprentices increased from 8,585 in the year 1968-69 to 14,447 in the year 1969-70. This is an increase of no less than 68 per cent in one year. The alterations made in the New South Wales apprenticeship system are among the matters I am presently considering in connection with amendments to the Apprentices Act that I intend to introduce this year. I realize that it is essential that apprenticeship be made more attractive to young people, and the Government intends to take every step possible to do this. I hope that all employers will examine their needs for skilled workers in

the future and make sure that they train enough young people as apprentices to meet their future demands.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about apprenticeship enrolment?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: There has been a significant increase in the number of indentures of apprenticeship received by the South Australian Apprenticeship Commission during the last financial year. In the year ended June 30, 1970, a total of 2,416 indentures had been lodged with the Apprenticeship Commission of apprentices whose indentures commenced in that year. This compares with a figure of 2,151 at the same time in 1969 and represents an increase of over 12 per cent for the year. Significant increases in the number of indentures lodged occurred in all the major trades, particularly in the building trades, in which the falling intake in previous years was causing concern. Although it was still too early to give final figures of the intake for 1969-70 because up to a three-month probationary period is permitted in most trades before indentures have to be signed, these figures of the actual number of indentures lodged with the Apprenticeship Commission give a reasonably accurate indication of the trend. The revised intake for 1968-69 showed that the actual number of new apprentices in that year was 2,526 (compared with the preliminary figure of 2,151 referred to earlier), which represented an increase of 7 per cent compared with the year 1967-68. I also have a schedule setting out the various occupations of the apprentices to whom I have referred. As I realize many people will be interested in this schedule, I ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### NEW INDENTURES REGISTERED—SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Trade Group	1967-68		1968-69		1969-70
	Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original
Metal . . . . .	961	1,066	1,049	1,174	1,083
Electrical . . . . .	329	385	297	374	340
Building . . . . .	193	208	200	247	273
Furniture . . . . .	81	90	87	100	108
Printing . . . . .	60	72	58	74	64
Vehicle industry . . . . .	54	63	80	102	101
Ship and boat building . . . . .	13	15	14	15	8
Bootmaking . . . . .	8	14	7	11	16
Clothing . . . . .	3	3	1	1	—
Coopering . . . . .	—	1	—	—	1
Food . . . . .	109	145	84	124	99
Hairdressing . . . . .	268	286	263	292	308
Leather and canvas . . . . .	3	3	2	2	5
Miscellaneous . . . . .	9	9	9	10	10
Total . . . . .	2,091	2,360	2,151	2,526	2,416*

\* Subject to revision.

## ADVERTISING

Dr. TONKIN: In view of the promises of improved figure, improved enjoyment of life, new energy and vitality, relief from that terrible tiredness that so many people have at the beginning of middle age, and an increased virility for men who are feeling the strain and exhaustion of a business life, made by an advertisement in the evening paper yesterday, and the questionable aspect of the beneficial properties of the advertised product of flower pollen and royal jelly in these respects, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to obtain a report as to whether or not this can be considered misleading advertising?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall ask my colleague to investigate this matter. If it should prove that the claims in the advertisement are misleading I shall ascertain what action can be taken, but if it is proved that the claims in the advertisement are well-founded I shall apply.

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Attorney-General, when framing the consumer protection legislation, consider the matter of misleading advertising, such as occurred in the advertisement previously referred to by the member for Bragg, and will he ensure that prices are included in such advertisements? With your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House, I wish briefly to explain my question. The advertisement referred to by the member for Bragg does not mention a price: it merely mentions the name of a person and a place at which the material is available. On inquiring, one is told that one can get a month's supply for \$8.40 but that it is better to get three months' supply so that the full benefit of the treatment may be obtained.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The matter of misleading advertising is very much in the forefront of the matters that the Government intends to legislate on. The precise question of insisting that in all advertisements the price should be stated has not been a feature of the recommendations made to the Government; nor have I considered it until now. I should not be disposed, as at present advised, to ask Parliament to insist that in all cases prices should be stated. It seems reasonable, if a price is given, that it should be stated fully and accurately, and in a way that does not create a misleading impression. However, as the honourable member has asked whether the law should require all prices to be stated in all cases, I will certainly further consider the matter.

## RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about installing automatic warning devices at railway crossings?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Funds for the installation of railway crossing automatic warning protection are provided from the Highways Fund with priorities determined by an inter-departmental committee consisting of representatives of the Highways and Railways Departments. Many factors are considered in assessing relative priorities for installation, and although \$200,000 will be expended on this type of work during the current financial year, the remaining unprotected crossings at Mount Gambier are considered to be lower in priority than many others throughout the State and, accordingly, are not listed for installation this financial year. However, the Pick Street and Crouch Street crossings have been retained on the priority list and will receive further consideration when the 1971-72 programme is being prepared.

In the announcement of the upgrading of the safety plans on which the Government intends to embark will be included a provision for the upgrading of the programme of grade separation automatic devices. As a result of that, the information in this reply applies to the current position, but the figures I have quoted will be increased if the House agrees to amend the Act by passing the legislation I shall introduce later.

## NURSES' UNIFORMS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to the question I asked on August 13 about nurses' uniforms?

The Hon. L. J. KING: A report has recently been submitted to the Chief Secretary by the Director-General of Medical Services regarding nurses' uniforms generally, but no decisions have yet been made. At present only the capes worn by nurses are of woollen material, and no change is expected with them as they have proved very satisfactory. Trainee nurses' uniforms are of a cotton material or a cotton mixture, the exact blend of material depending largely upon samples submitted by manufacturers at the time of tendering. All materials submitted are assessed, taking into account price, durability, appearance, laundry economics, and suitability for the bedside nursing situation, etc. Any materials submitted that contained a proportion of woollen fibre would certainly be as carefully considered in the light of the above requirements as any of the other materials submitted.

### PORT PIRIE FENCE

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the erection of a fence in Ellen Street, Port Pirie?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Tenders have closed and approval has been given for a contract for the construction of fencing along Ellen Street at Port Pirie. It is expected that the contractor will start work shortly.

### UNIONISM

Mr. CARNIE: My question to the Minister of Labour and Industry concerns unionism as applied to shearers, but it is difficult to ask an exact question. My question is, "Can the Minister tell me what are the rights of an employer in cases such as this?" Obviously, an explanation of that question is needed, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to proceed with the explanation. A constituent of mine, a farmer, whilst shearing last month had to dismiss one of the shearers for his continued drunkenness. As a result of this action he received a visit from a union organizer, who told him that unless the man was re-employed the organizer would call all the other shearers out on strike and declare his wool black. Can the Minister say what are the rights of an employer in cases such as this?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I understand from what the honourable member has said that an employer dismissed a shearer because of his drunkenness, that, as a result, his action has been resented by the organization representing the employee, and that there is a dispute over the matter. I suggest that the proper way that this matter can be dealt with by the employer is for him to refer it to the Industrial Commission if he considers that some injustice has been promoted towards him.

### HOSPITAL CRECHES

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary when it is expected that creches will be established in certain major Government hospitals in an effort to attract married nurses to the profession?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain that information as soon as possible.

### BURRA SCHOOLS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of September 2 concerning the high school and primary school at Burra?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The inspection to which the honourable member referred in his question was carried out by officers of the Education and Public Buildings Departments as part of an itinerary of inspection of accommodation in Northern secondary schools. The impression gained at first hand of conditions at Burra confirmed the need to provide a new high school. In the light of the evidence, every endeavour will be made to have the new high school ready for occupation at an earlier date than the beginning of 1974 as at present programmed. However, funds available for building are a constant limiting factor, and unless substantial additional sums are received from the Commonwealth Government it will not be possible to provide the school any earlier than the scheduled date. Subsequently, it is intended to upgrade the existing buildings to meet the needs of the Primary Division, and the total accommodation then available on the existing site at Burra will satisfactorily meet the requirements of the primary school.

### TEACHERS' PAY

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say whether the department intends to pay the teaching staff and student teachers their usual wages? I refer to an article in the *News* of September 14, in which it was reported that a motion called for a general strike of staff and students in relation to the moratorium on Friday. I ask my question in case a strike eventuates.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Government's policy applies to teachers the same as it applies to any other public servant: pay would be docked in respect of time taken off.

### SCHOOL SECURITY

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Education say what arrangements are being made by the Education Department to protect school property and equipment? In the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, I noticed that school equipment to the value of \$4,861 had been lost or stolen during the preceding 12 months, and included in the list of missing items were six tape recorders. I believe a similar pattern occurred in the year ended June 30, 1969.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Headmasters in control of schools take every precaution to ensure that equipment is securely locked away. However, some burglaries inevitably occur and equipment is stolen. Indeed, this pattern is:

repeated year after year. Each case is reported to the police and handled by them, and, where a pattern of burglaries occurs in a specific area (for example, I remember that some thefts were committed at the Brighton High School), the police are asked to keep a special watch near the school concerned. The availability of police staff for this work is a limiting factor but, nevertheless, the Education Department makes such requests of the Police Department which, to the best of its ability, tries to keep a watch on any situation where a pattern of thefts has emerged. It is not possible to provide a complete night-watchman service in these circumstances because of the costs involved. However, the honourable member can rest assured that every effort will be made to ensure that the aim of the burglar is thwarted by suitable precautionary measures.

#### NORTH ADELAIDE POLICE STATION

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding the North Adelaide police station?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Reports were received from both the Minister of Works and the Chief Secretary. An inspection has been made of the North Adelaide police station and detailed estimates of costs are currently being prepared to determine the economics of maintaining the premises to meet the future needs of the Police Department. When the estimates of costs are available, every endeavour will be made to resolve the matter and to undertake the work considered necessary as soon as possible.

#### PROFESSIONAL SALARIES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the Government intends to increase the professional salaries of persons employed in his department? In the most recent issue of the *Australian Veterinary Journal* an advertisement appears for a senior veterinary research officer with the Agriculture Department. The same issue contains advertisements calling for applications for positions in the Tasmanian and Northern Territory Agriculture Departments as well as in the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry. The salary being offered by the South Australian Agriculture Department for a senior veterinary research officer is less than the starting salary for veterinary officers in the other three services to which I have referred. The maximum of our range is below that of the others and the

commencing salary offered for a class 2 veterinary officer is below the maximum salaries for all class 1 officers elsewhere. I ask this question merely to ascertain whether this State is going to meet the professional competition from the other States.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer this question to my colleague and bring down a report as soon as possible.

#### INSURANCE ASSESSORS

Mr. McANANEY: I should like to ask the Attorney-General what requirements are necessary regarding insurance assessors. I have a letter stating that a young man, who bought a car in March for \$1,275, had an accident in April. The Motor Marine and General Insurance Company Limited was telephoned four or five times before it finally told me that it would make him an offer of \$700 for the car. However, since then, the company has decided to offer only \$400. As insurance companies rely on assessors, can the Attorney-General say what requirements exist concerning an assessor's integrity?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Insurance assessors are not required by law to be licensed or to have any authority. A person may set up as an insurance assessor without necessarily having any qualifications and without there being any check on his integrity. Also, there is no way in which a person can be prevented from carrying on business as an insurance assessor. A committee, presided over by the Master of the Supreme Court, is at present considering whether or not there should be a licensing system for insurance assessors as well as for certain other classes of people who deal with the public. When that committee's report comes to hand, I will consider whether the law should be altered in this regard. I am not clear from the honourable member's question whether the claim made was rejected on the advice of an assessor who was not an employee of the company or whether it was made at the instance of an employee of the company.

Mr. McAnaney: He was outside the company, I think.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If it was an assessor who was not an employee of the company, my remarks apply. Concerning insurance companies generally, I have previously said in reply to a question (and it is still the case) that I am at present in communication with the Commonwealth Government, as are the Ministers from the other States, on whether

there should be Commonwealth legislation or complementary Commonwealth and State legislation to control insurance companies generally, as distinct from assessors.

#### TRUSTEE COMPANIES

Mr. NANKIVELL: I should like to ask the Attorney-General whether it is correct that yesterday he supported an increase in the charges of proctors concerning probate matters. Did the Attorney-General support this increase on the basis of increased costs of the professional people involved? If he did, will he say whether other people who are also involved in this sort of work have experienced similar increases in regard to their operations? If they have, will he say whether the Government intends to amend the Trustee Act during this session?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Certain submissions from the trustee companies are before the Government and are currently being considered, but a decision has not yet been made by the Government.

#### HORMONE SPRAYING

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to inquire into the possibility of placing hormone spray detectors on the outskirts of the town of Murray Bridge? I asked a similar question about 2½ years ago, when such equipment was not available. However, as I believe that it is now available in other parts of the world, I ask whether the Minister will bring down a report on the availability and possible use of this equipment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report from my colleague.

#### UNLEY INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain a report on when work on the Unley Road and Greenhill Road intersection will be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

#### DOG ATTACK

Mr. RODDA: My question concerns dogs in schoolgrounds. Has the Minister of Education taken any further steps to ensure the safety of students in the many schools in South Australia under his control? I am referring more particularly, of course, to schools in the metropolitan area. I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Klemzig Primary School Committee expressing interest in the matter, bearing in mind that I

have previously asked the Minister a question about it. The Secretary points out that problems concerning stray dogs are still being experienced at this school, and I have been asked to raise the matter again with the Minister. Although I know that in his previous reply the Minister referred to the Minister of Local Government, I should now like to have an assurance from the Minister of Education concerning the steps he may be taking to remove this nuisance from metropolitan schools.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The department has taken the following action: first, it has written to all local councils seeking their co-operation in removing dogs from school premises when a complaint is made by the school to the council. That is the difficulty existing in respect of the Klemzig school. I believe that the procedure that should be followed is straightforward. A school that is experiencing a nuisance as a result of the presence of one or two dogs should contact the local council, asking it to take appropriate action.

Mr. Mathwin: It has to have a dog catcher!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The council would have to have a dog catcher. However, surely if the matter were a local nuisance and problem, it would be the responsibility of the council to undertake that function.

Mr. Mathwin: The unions will not allow it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have also taken up the matter with the Minister of Local Government, asking him to see what weaknesses there are in the current situation. I understand that he has had an investigation made and will be bringing before Cabinet for decision recommendations on what can be done to strengthen further the position of schools in this matter.

#### BUS NOISE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the noise of buses at a terminus. This morning a lady who lives at Clapham close to the terminus of the Westbourne Park bus route telephoned me in some distress to say that today as on other days she had been disturbed by the first bus which reached the terminus at about 5.30 a.m. or a few minutes thereafter, leaving again at 5.48 a.m. During that period of up to 18 minutes the engine was running (to use her distinction, it was not idling but running fast). The noise of this disturbed her sleep and the fumes from the diesel engine invaded

her bedroom, causing her distress in that way, too. She has been in touch with an officer of the Tramways Trust, who told her that nothing could be done about the matter, and that buses must continue to run during the time they were at the terminus. Therefore, she appealed to me as her local member for assistance to avoid this nuisance, which is something that I think the Attorney-General may agree with me may be a nuisance in law, although she does not want to explore that avenue of relief—not at this stage, anyway. Will the Minister of Roads and Transport be kind enough to take up the matter with the Tramways Trust to see whether this course of action by buses can be avoided in future, not only for the sake of this lady but I presume also for the sake of others who live at or near the termini of bus routes?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be kind enough to take it up with the Tramways Trust, but I was hoping all through the explanation that the honourable member might have brought up a practical solution, unless he was suggesting that the bus service in that area be curtailed completely, which I would not expect that he was suggesting.

Mr. Millhouse: Only that the bus could idle somewhere else or the engine could be switched off.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will certainly take up the matter with the trust to find out whether there is a solution, although it would appear, if what the honourable member has said is reasonably accurate (and I should think it would be), that it is unlikely that there will be a solution. After all, I do not think anyone would seriously suggest that the bus service should not be maintained. I do not think the honourable member would want us to cut out the first bus now running to the area or to cut out the service altogether. This is a service being provided to the area, and the honourable member knows that the policy of the Government is to foster public transport, not to do anything to harm it.

#### REREGISTRATION

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Minister of Roads and Transport intend advising the Government to implement, or does the Government intend to implement, a policy of compulsory annual inspections of all motor vehicles before they are reregistered?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As that is a matter of policy subject to determination, if and when it is decided as policy the House will be informed.

#### STRATHALBYN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. McANANEY: As Strathalbyn High School has applied for a matriculation class, can the Minister of Education say whether its application has yet been dealt with?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In 1971 matriculation classes will be commenced at Strathalbyn High School. They will also be commenced at Birdwood High School and at the Eyre High School in Whyalla.

#### BIRD SMUGGLING

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to consider the distressing problem of Australian birds, before the problem reaches proportions similar to those that bird smuggling in Victoria has reached? To explain my question briefly, I refer to a report in the *News* of September 16, headed "Breathing of birds giveaway", which states:

Customs experts in South Australia are using industrial stethoscopes to detect the breathing of birds being smuggled from their native land.

The report also states:

It was possible smugglers were using light aircraft to export birds to the United States and Europe, where collectors paid fantastic sums for them.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall examine the matter and get a reply for the honourable member.

#### QUESTION EXPLANATIONS

Dr. TONKIN: My question is to you, Mr. Speaker, and the substance of the question is: will you consider this matter? I ask your leave to explain the question. Because of my special interests, frequently it is necessary for me to ask questions of a Minister representing a Minister in another place, and, because of this, having asked my question, I must then wait for some time before receiving a reply. I am not complaining about that (it is very necessary), but the procedure means that I must devote several of my question calls to asking for replies that I have been told are available. Will you consider this matter, Mr. Speaker, so that replies that come back from another place may be interposed in the normal sequence of calls to ask questions?

The SPEAKER: This is another problem about Question Time of which I am aware, and it can be considered by the Standing Orders Committee. I shall see that it is referred to the committee for consideration, in the hope that we may be able to arrive at something satisfactory.

Mr. COUMBE: I desire to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker, regarding the ruling that you gave yesterday on the rights of members in asking questions of Ministers of the Crown. In future, if a private member of this House desires to ask a question of you, Sir, must he go through the same procedure as you ruled yesterday that we must adopt when asking a question of the Minister of the Crown, or may we ask a question of you in any normal way whatsoever?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked an extremely difficult question, and has referred to what is "normal". I ask honourable members, when addressing the Speaker, to observe the same procedure as they observe when addressing Ministers or any other honourable members of the House.

### DROUGHT

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to consider having the hundred of Goode and surrounding areas declared a drought area? I ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House to explain my question briefly by reading from a letter I have received from the Chairman of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated in the hundred of Goode, whose request is supported by the Chairman of the district council in that area. Part of the letter states:

Last year, 1969, most of us were wiped out with rust, and several had to buy seed wheat. Some of these same farmers will have to buy seed again this year. On my own property I have registered only 343 points of rain this year, and it fell in the following manner: January, 14 points; February, nil; March, five points; April, 17 points; May, 73 points; June, 50 points; July, 50 points; August, 134 points. There are at least two young farmers in my district who are in a very sorry plight financially, owing to drought rust over the last four years. Also in this area (hundred of Goode), we had two bad fires during summer and a lot of this country is still drifting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am certain that my colleague will be pleased to consider the representations that have been made to the honourable member by the union that he has mentioned.

### FISHING

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about research activities in the fishing industry?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Every effort is being made, within the limitations of available funds, by the Fisheries and Fauna Con-

servation Department to expand fisheries research activities. A fisheries research officer has been added to the staff of the department, and he is currently being trained in research techniques which will ultimately benefit the prawn industry. The full-time research staff of the department numbers three, but inspectors also undertake research work in conjunction with their inspection duties. It is also pointed out that the Director of Fisheries is project leader for the crayfishing research programme being conducted in south-eastern Australian waters. This programme involves co-ordination of the research work undertaken in Tasmania, Victoria, and South Australia, and by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization.

### AIR TRAVEL

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding air travel for members of Parliament?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chairman of the Public Service Board has recommended as follows:

In the circumstances referred to by the honourable member, it would seem appropriate to allow reimbursement of cost incurred on a charter flight to a maximum limit consistent with commercial fares for intrastate flights. It is suggested, therefore, that the approval "each member of either House to be entitled to six single journeys per annum between any two centres in the State" be extended by the addition of "A member may, at his discretion, travel by licensed charter flight in lieu of a commercial flight and be reimbursed the cost up to a maximum which is the equivalent of the commercial fare from Adelaide to Mount Gambier." On present rates this would be \$16.70 and bears a fair relationship to the various commercial rates.

### FOSTER PARENTS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked recently about foster parents?

The Hon. L. J. KING: At the end of August there were in foster homes 793 children who had been placed by the Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs. Other children had been placed privately by their parents or guardians in foster homes licensed by the department. Some additional children could be fostered if homes suitable to meet their particular needs were available. A greater number of foster homes would give the department better opportunity to apply matching procedures. The need for more foster homes has been publicized by display and other advertisements in the press. Various aspects

of fostering and the shortage of foster homes have been discussed on radio and television programmes and in press articles.

#### NORWOOD CROSSING

Dr. TONKIN: I understand the Premier has a reply to a question I asked recently about the Norwood Boys Technical High School crossing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Executive Engineer of the Road Traffic Board reports:

A warrant exists for a school crossing on Kensington Road adjacent to the above school. The council, however, has a policy which requires that the school concerned pays for the crossing rather than the general rate-payers and, in consequence, it is adamant on the question of the provision of funds for this crossing. It is understood, however, that the school committee is currently examining the possibility of providing funds for the crossing, and a decision on the matter is expected within the next few weeks. The board has already intimated verbally to the council and the school committee that approval will be given for the crossing upon receipt of detailed plans.

#### CAR FREIGHTING

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport taken any steps to investigate a procedure adopted by the Victorian Railways of carrying passengers' cars to their destination? Since Victoria has started this practice between Melbourne and Albury, I understand that this type of rail traffic has increased over the last year. Possibly this idea could be introduced in South Australia between, say, Adelaide and Mount Gambier or Adelaide and Broken Hill and other distant places.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware of any consideration having been given to this matter by the Railways Commissioner, but I appreciate the honourable member's raising the matter and shall have pleasure in bringing back a report for him.

#### PATIENTS ASSOCIATION

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General investigate the origins and *bona fides* of an organization in another State, sending letters to members of the public in this State and calling itself the Patients Association of Australia? A document was handed to me by a member of this place, who expressed some disquiet at the terms of the questions that were asked in it. Ostensibly, this organization exists to protect the rights of patients in hospitals and elsewhere. In its detailed report it sets out what

seem superficially to be quite worthy objects. However, on a more detailed reading of it, it is less obvious what its real intentions are. It states:

Assaults on and abuse of patients by medical and related personnel should be eliminated . . . . No patient should be certified without prior consultation with the Patients Association . . . . All medical records should be the property of patients. . . . . Surgery should be eliminated.

It would appear, on a more detailed reading of this document, that this is perhaps a little suggestive of some degree of persecution complex. What disturbs me is that the request for membership suggests that an annual donation should be one-twenty-fifth of the applicant's gross weekly income. The questionnaire accompanying the document asks for the most intimate details of income and assets. Frankly, I do not like the look of it at all. Will the Attorney-General investigate this matter and give some publicity to it with a view to guiding the public?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall do all I can to find out about the organization the honourable member has mentioned and let him have that information.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General an answer to my recent question about the Modbury Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The following information has been provided by my colleague:

There has been no change in the number of beds to be provided by the completion of the first phase of the Modbury Hospital or in the number that will become available upon the completion of the entire project. The respective number in each case is 236 beds in stage I, increasing to 450 beds in stage II. Additional trainee nurses have been recruited by the Royal Adelaide Hospital during 1969 and 1970 to provide a staff of trainee nurses in appropriate proportions of first, second and third years of training. No positive steps have yet been taken to recruit trained nursing staff or medical staff. Currently, it is expected that stage I of the building project of the Modbury Hospital will be completed by the end of 1971. Stage II has been tentatively programmed for possible completion in 1981.

#### CRESCENT YOUTH CLUB

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask a further question of the Minister of Local Government about a matter I raised with him in this House on August 25—the use by the Crescent Youth Club, of Colonel Light Gardens, of the institute there. Some further information has



come to me since I asked the original question of the Minister. At that time, in his reply the Minister canvassed the possibility of the institute, which is attached to the original farmhouse (well over 100 years old), being repaired, and he said that neither he nor I could form a judgment on that, after I had interjected. I have now been reminded that about 10 years or more ago the Housing Trust reported to the then Government that it would be uneconomical to spend any money on the institute, and that it should accordingly be pulled down. Has the Minister received a report yet on the future use of the institute and, if so, does it accord with the report to which I have just referred? If he has received a report, is he in a position to tell the present youth club whether it will be able to use the institute or whether the Government has been able to find any alternative accommodation for it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question raised by the honourable member adequately proves the value of always obtaining a second opinion. A second opinion was obtained only this week, and I place on record my sincere appreciation of my colleague the Minister of Works. I am not sure whether the member for Mitcham is now interested enough to listen to my reply or whether he will continue talking to his Leader.

Mr. Millhouse: The Minister of Education distracted me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I place on record my appreciation (and I am sure I speak for all the residents who use the facilities at Colonel Light Gardens) of the Deputy Premier who, as Minister of Works, made available the services of officers of the Public Buildings Department to inspect the building. Their report refuted the report of the South Australian Housing Trust in that it has stated that the building is completely sound structurally.

Mr. Hall: How could the Housing Trust make such a mistake?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not for me to say why people make mistakes. Many people make mistakes, as we witness from this side every day the House is in session. Concerning this hall, the Government (and I as Minister) does not intend to allow the Garden Suburb Commissioner to deprive the people of that area of the use of that building, unless there is a very good reason in the interests of safety so to do. As there is no such good reason, the people will continue to use the hall. At present we have a fairly comprehensive report that is being considered by the

Government, and I hope that within a few days a final decision on all aspects of it will be made. I suggest that perhaps next week I may be able to give further information to the member for Mitcham, if he cares to ask for it.

### ABORTIONS

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, obtain further details of the increase in the number of abortions performed in this State? In the *News* today it is stated that in the first five months of the year there were 378 abortions and in the next four months there were more than 400, which is a considerable increase. I should think it would be of interest to all members to know how many abortions were being performed; how many people were coming to this State from other States to have abortions; and whether any particular group of doctors was carrying out this operation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall obtain a report from my colleague. I think it may be of interest to members (and it will be to me) to know on what grounds these abortions are being performed and in what numbers.

### AIR RIFLES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary on what date he expects action to be taken to control air rifles in this State? Since the House last met there has been another tragedy in which an eye was lost in an air rifle accident. I know that the Chief Secretary has had consultations and that he intends to take action.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am not aware of any action that has been taken, but I will ask this question of the Chief Secretary and tell the honourable member when I have that information.

---

*At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:*  
The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

### THE ESTIMATES

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I take this opportunity to comment on the disgraceful incident that occurred in this House today when the Premier openly and publicly

repudiated the activities of the Police Force in South Australia. Having been a member of this House for more than 11 years and having been twice on the Government side and now twice on the Opposition side, I can say that this is the most disgraceful pronouncement that I have heard, and I shall give reasons for saying that it is a disgraceful and cowardly statement. For some time the public and the Opposition (and no doubt the Police Force) have wondered what the attitude of the Labor Government was towards the moratorium. We have had conflicting report after conflicting report, until today all has been revealed. The Premier said today that he would not accept the responsibility for what happened in the streets tomorrow, although for some time he has tried to give a directive to the Police Force that it should do certain things that the Police Force believed it should not do. To whom was the Premier trying to apply these pressure tactics? Was it to discredit a Police Force, a force perhaps that in the past has failed to be tolerant, has failed to protect the public, or has acted against Government policy? Have any of these things been the fault of the Police Force in South Australia? Everyone here and outside of the House knows that the answer is a resounding "No". Our Police Force has the admiration of Australia, and all members know how the advice of the South Australian Commissioner of Police (Mr. McKinnä) has been valued by the Commonwealth and other State Governments.

Mr. Coumbe: And overseas, too.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I wish the Leader would stop clowning.

Mr. HALL: I have just heard the most uncomplimentary interjection from the Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I did not interject: I was speaking to the Treasurer.

Mr. HALL: It may be funny to him to have the Commissioner praised in his hearing; perhaps it was funny, too, for one of his members to interject today and say, "Fascist dictators" when we supported the Commissioner of Police. Perhaps that is funny, too!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Stop clowning and get on with it.

Mr. HALL: The Minister says that I am clowning when I support the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. Jennings: You can't help it.

Mr. HALL: The Premier says he will not accept the responsibility for what happens tomorrow, having led the moratorium people to believe over many months that he supports them. The moratorium group recently published an advertisement. I cannot vouch for how much of it is correct, but I shall quote it and perhaps Government members can deny the relevant parts that do not fit. There are other statements, some of them by Ministers themselves, and I shall quote them later. The advertisement states:

The activities planned by the committee have been discussed at length at co-ordinating committee meetings and been well known to the A.L.P. The principle of occupation and the details of communication with the police were decided upon with the concurrence of the A.L.P. members of the co-ordinating committee. The principles of the current moratorium were known by the A.L.P. when the June State convention gave support to the moratorium. That the A.L.P. should now withdraw that support would indicate that political opportunism was a motive behind the original support decision.

It cannot be denied that the Australian Labor Party State Convention supported the aims of the moratorium, and thereby gave considerable encouragement to the organizers of the demonstration.

Mr. Ryan: So did the University Liberal Club.

Mr. HALL: Since that time we have seen some more conflicting reports. A report headed "A.L.P. Pulling out of Rally" in the *News* of September 9 states:

The Labor Party will withdraw its support for the Vietnam moratorium campaign demonstration on Friday week . . . Previously the Party had publicly supported the moratorium campaign with a non-violence proviso.

The leading article, headed "Labor Escapes Trap", in the *Advertiser* of September 10 states:

The State A.L.P. Executive has shown prudence and a sense of responsibility in dissociating the Party from the South Australian Moratorium Committee's plans for a demonstration in Adelaide tomorrow week. It was quite properly influenced by evidence that these plans, under radical direction, could lead to disruption and violence.

A report headed "A.L.P. Man to Join in Protest" in the *News* of September 11 says:

The acting State Secretary of the Labor Party, Mr. David Coumbe, said today he would almost certainly take part in next Friday's Vietnam moratorium march through the city.

I hope that since then that gentleman has reconsidered the matter and that he does not now intend to be involved in the march. I

assume from the Premier's statement today that no Labor Party member of the State Parliament will be in the march. The Premier said that Cabinet Ministers will not be in the march, and I assume that no other Labor Party member of Parliament will march, either. The Minister of Works is reported as saying:

I do not think people should sit down at a busy intersection.

He was referring to the Vietnam moratorium demonstration, and he appealed to all parties not to create violence. At that time the Minister and I participated in a television programme, during which he would not say whether he would give full support to the Police Force. Keen observers would not be surprised that the Minister's Leader repudiated the Police Force today, because the Minister, as Deputy Premier, took a similar attitude in the programme I have referred to. He said that he had complete confidence in the Police Force and he gave it every praise; however, he would not give it his full support. Today, he joins his Leader (unless he differs from his Leader) in washing his hands of the incidents that may occur; he does this after he has offered all encouragement to the moratorium demonstrators. A report headed "Rally Talks May Re-open" in the *News* of September 10 states:

The State Labor Party may reconsider yesterday's decision to withdraw support from Vietnam moratorium activities tomorrow week.

My reaction to that report was that it was nonsense. Having made the decision, the Labor Party could not, in the face of public opinion, go back into the moratorium as an active participant. Yet the puzzle goes on. A report headed "Labor Men at Port Rally" in today's *News* states:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, will address a mass rally at Port Adelaide at 10 a.m. tomorrow in support of the Vietnam moratorium.

This is one more of the many statements that have been made about the A.L.P. involvement, and it may or may not be correct. I will not charge the Premier with re-entering the moratorium argument: he can speak for himself and tell us whether that is so. The Deputy Premier can do that, too. I find it hard to believe that that report is entirely correct. Because of the previous attitude of Ministers, it would be incongruous for the Premier and the Deputy Premier to change course again and go back into the moratorium campaign. I therefore expect that the Premier will be able to deny that he will address a

supporting rally tomorrow. Meetings of Cabinet must be interesting, in view of the different views that have sometimes bubbled to the surface.

As a member of the public looking at Cabinet activities, I can see a change from the involved support by the present Premier at the last moratorium. The Premier made no secret of such support; in company with people with extreme political views he addressed a moratorium meeting and did not apologize for his presence. At that time one could only assume that he was giving full support to the moratorium. I must assume that there will be no involvement by A.L.P. members tomorrow and that there has therefore been a disengagement. Instead of disengaging cleanly and going along with public opinion (which is that people should be allowed to demonstrate properly), we find that the course of the Government has been a little erratic and that it has exerted pressure on the Commissioner of Police to do something other than look after the public interest. The Commissioner wants to use the tremendously capable Police Force as he sees fit to preserve law and order, which citizens in this State need and desire.

I find it a monstrous thing for the Labor Party to give active encouragement to disengagement simply because of the political dangers it has seen. It is in Government now—a completely different situation from that which existed a few months ago. I wonder what difference this has made to the Minister of Roads and Transport, who previously was such a vocal supporter of the moratorium and found it easy, when in Opposition, to speak so freely. Now, he finds it a contradiction to be a responsible Minister and to have useful information about the demonstration which previously he would not impart to the Police Force. If he had supplied this information it would have assisted not the suppression but the liberties of the people who live in and enjoy the facilities of the city of Adelaide. No doubt that was a most uncomfortable situation for the Minister. The Premier is backed by a Police Force that has undeniable courage and diplomacy in handling all sorts of difficult situations.

The Police Force has behind it the last moratorium march, which was a credit to all concerned. That march enabled a full expression of opinion, and no-one was denied the expression he desired, yet this time there is a repudiation. I do not believe that things will go wrong, because I believe tomorrow's march

will be basically peaceful. I expect the Police Force to be sensible and to provide preventive supervision. Therefore, I expect tomorrow's march to be a peaceful march without causing destruction and without causing harm to individuals. However, if something should go wrong the Premier has said today that he will accept no responsibility whatsoever. I say this clearly: if something does go wrong I will blame the Premier absolutely, and I will do so on the basis that I have outlined.

Having given full encouragement to a movement, the Premier then runs away from it, not because that movement has changed its aims but because it is politically difficult for the Premier to be associated with it, as he was associated with it as Leader of the Opposition, and the difficulty exists also for his Ministers. I use this opportunity to say how shocked I have been today in one respect, yet how pleased I have been to witness the independence asserted by the Police Commissioner, an independence which it is his right to assert. With the knowledge of the careful supervision given previously by the Police Force and of its deep understanding concerning the need to allow members of the public to present a proper expression of opinion in a peaceful demonstration, I have full confidence in the Police Force, and I give it my full backing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened carefully to what the Leader of the Opposition has had to say. If ever a speech was made in this House based on the most blatant of political motives, it was the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, and I will justify that statement. I have been accused on this occasion of political opportunism (that is what the Leader has said) and I have been told that I have run away from the Vietnam moratorium demonstration at a time when it is politically expedient for me to do so.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He called it a cowardly action.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it was hypocrisy and a disgraceful action to the State! May I point out to the Leader that, if ever there was a time when it might have been opportune for me to dissociate myself from the Vietnam Moratorium Campaign, it was during the recent general election campaign. The Leader's Deputy expressed great surprise that I had had such temerity as to appear

at the moratorium demonstration, because of the political consequences for me which might derive from it.

Mr. Clark: Even the Democratic Labor Party tried to make use of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was significant that members opposite did not have any full-page advertisements in the *Advertiser* on the day that the Democratic Labor Party advertisements appeared relating to the demonstration, and that those advertisements were placed by the very same agency that was placing the advertisements for the Liberal Party. It is now suggested that, with the Government in office (with a substantial majority and no election in the offing at all), it is suddenly expedient for me to dissociate myself from the demonstration, but that it was not expedient previously. What nonsense! Whom does the Leader think he is kidding? All he is capable of doing is to utter political abuse and denigration every time he gets to his feet in this House.

Let us make clear what has happened here: the Labor Party has constantly said that it believes in the rights of people peacefully to demonstrate their political views in this city, that this should be peaceful and orderly, and that, in order to ensure that it is peaceful and orderly, the necessary co-operation with the authorities must take place, so that it is seen that there is no undue disruption of the lives of the citizens in the city, and no possibility of undue confrontation or upset. The Labor Party, from the outset of the proposal for a further demonstration in this city, has made it clear that that is the basis, and the only basis, on which it will be involved. Unfortunately, the general meeting of the committee organizing the demonstration chose not to accept what the Labor Party and the unions supporting the Labor Party considered to be essential as the basis for the demonstration.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Leader knows all this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course he does. It was on that basis that the Labor Party said it could not be involved. We have said that, although we agree that we should demonstrate, that we do not believe in continued involvement in Vietnam, and that we are dissatisfied with the present National Service Act, our demonstration, whenever it takes place, must be peaceful, orderly and not interfering with the rights of other citizens. Because we could not guarantee that factor in any involvement on our part in the present

demonstration, the Labor Party withdrew, and that was the proper course for us to take. As the Government of South Australia, it is our duty to all citizens of this State to express our view on the way we think peace and order should be effectively maintained.

I would have been grossly remiss in my duty if I had not told this House the view taken by the Government on the matter and expressed to the Commissioner. We took the view that the way the matter should be handled was with due care and tact, that we should follow a course which has proved successful elsewhere, and that traffic should be redirected so that there would be no confrontation, and so that the demonstration could proceed peacefully and without violence. That view was expressed to the Commissioner, but he has seen fit to disagree with it. That is his right, and it is also his responsibility.

Mr. Becker: I hope he will not be penalized for it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What penalty can the Government exercise in respect of the Commissioner? The Commissioner, under the Police Regulation Act, is independent of Government, and I may point out to the honourable member that, in fact, the Government has just introduced into this House and had passed through it a measure to increase the Commissioner's emolument. What is this business about penalties for the Police Commissioner? The Government's attitude is that the Police Commissioner has, in law, the right to differ from the view the Government has expressed to him. He has taken this view, he has expressed it to the Government, and that is his right; it is also his responsibility. The Leader has seen fit to raise one other matter, namely, the fact that I will address a meeting tomorrow.

Mr. Millhouse: You will?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, certainly I will address a meeting tomorrow, but it will not be a meeting or show organized by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It has nothing to do with it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Several unions, which previously wished to have something to do with the moratorium demonstration but which have withdrawn on the very same basis as the Labor Party has withdrawn, have asked me to address their members in a hall in Port Adelaide at a public meeting organized in a perfectly normal way and without any sort of interference with the public whatever. When

there are people expressing a view on a political topic and they invite me to go and express my view on that topic, I will go there, and I intend to do so tomorrow. If the Leader thinks that that is wrong in this State, he has a very poor view of democracy indeed. Does the Opposition really suggest that if a public meeting is held that expresses opposition to continued involvement in Vietnam, no-one should be there at all? Is that what the Leader suggests? All the Leader wants is to try to put in some political dig somewhere but unfortunately at present he does not know how to do it. He is trying to find some means of slamming the Government, even though throughout this matter the Government has acted in a responsible and proper manner.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support what the Leader has said. There are two issues involved in this matter: first, there is the attitude of the Government, and particularly the Premier, towards the maintenance of law and order in the streets of Adelaide; and secondly, there is the action of the Government in repudiating the Commissioner of Police and the whole of the Police Force at a time when they are facing a very difficult task. I intend to deal briefly with both of these points.

To me, the maintenance of law and order is essential if citizens are to be free to exercise their right of coming and going without interference from others. Before the question of the involvement of the Australian Labor Party in the moratorium demonstration or the Party's withdrawal from that demonstration ever came up, the Premier had already done his best to weaken respect for law in this country by his public advocacy of defiance of the National Service Act. Now, in the statement he has made this afternoon, as far as I can see he has gone even further, because what he has suggested, in his own words to the Commissioner of Police, is that no sort of deliberate confrontation should take place tomorrow between the demonstrators and the police.

I do not know how far the Premier would be prepared to go in surrendering law and order to see that there was no deliberate confrontation between the police and the demonstrators, but I must say that I entirely disagree with the view that he and apparently the whole of the Government has taken in this matter. I believe I speak for all Opposition members (and I wish I spoke for all members opposite as well) when I say that I entirely support the

attitude of the Commissioner of Police in this matter as exemplified in the Commissioner's letter, this paragraph of which the Premier read earlier:

I could not ask my officers to neglect their duty and thereby deny the general public the rights to which they are entitled.

Some weeks ago we were told that the A.L.P. had taken control of the moratorium movement in this State, that it had the majority on the committee, and that it was to be in charge. Then, last week, during the absence of the Premier (and whether this is coincidence or not I do not know, but I have my own views on it), it was announced that something had gone wrong, that extremists (I think "anarchists" was the word used by the Minister of Roads and Transport, who was the spokesman for the A.L.P. and the Government on this matter) had taken charge, and that the Labor Party was withdrawing its support from the demonstration to be held tomorrow. Subsequently, the Minister was backed up by the Acting Premier.

We were told that support was withdrawn because the demonstrators intended to occupy an intersection in the city of Adelaide for two hours, four hours, or a quarter of an hour, or some period of time (I do not know what it was to be). The Labor Party was not prepared to tolerate this, and therefore it withdrew support. However, now the Government has said to the Commissioner of Police, "You ought to reroute the traffic so that the moratorium demonstrators can occupy the intersection and to avoid any confrontation." If that is not a contradiction, I do not know what a contradiction is. What is the avowed aim of the moratorium demonstrators? We have this in black and white in their own advertisement which appeared in the *Advertiser* of September 12 and which states in part:

This change of details—

this is one change in the march procedures tomorrow—

in no way affects the basic principles of the moratorium, those being to achieve an end to our involvement in Indo-China by mass strikes and actions that disrupt the life of the nation. These principles to be pursued by all means short of violence.

Yet it is those people with that aim that the Government asks the Commissioner of Police to leave alone. The Government asks him to reroute traffic in order that other people may be put to inconvenience so that embarrassment may be avoided. As I have said before, and as other Opposition members have said, I believe this is a disgraceful action on the part

of the Government. Of course, I suppose we could avoid confrontation by surrendering the city of Adelaide to the demonstrators for the period of the demonstration. I do not know how many members opposite would advocate such a course; I do not believe many on this side would.

One of the root fallacies in the arguments put by the Premier in his defence is that a peaceful demonstration is not an unlawful demonstration. People do not have to be violent to break the law, but in everything the Premier has said this afternoon he has assumed that if a demonstration is peaceful it must therefore be lawful, or certainly not unlawful, and should be allowed to proceed. I do not accept that one can equate peaceful and lawful: things that are peaceful can certainly be unlawful. The moratorium people themselves say as much in their advertisement. I for one am delighted that the Commissioner of Police has sufficient independence to pursue a course that will protect the rights of those citizens in this State (the overwhelming number of the citizens of the State) who want to have nothing whatever to do with the moratorium demonstration but want to get on with their business without interference and inconvenience. I say no more about how the moratorium should be dealt with. I entirely support the Commissioner of Police.

The second issue in this matter is the deliberate repudiation of the Commissioner of Police by the Government. Sir, it is truly a deliberate repudiation. The terms of the Premier's statement today show as much. What did he say? He has told us that the Government has no power to direct the Commissioner of Police in this matter, and about that I am very pleased. The Premier has also said that the Commissioner of Police has made a decision which, in the Premier's view, does not entirely agree with what has happened in relation to other demonstrations. Later the Premier said, "Unfortunately, the Commissioner of Police has communicated with me in these terms", and he referred to the letter and then said that the Commissioner would carry out his duties, as would other members of the Police Force, in the terms the Commissioner and the other members of the force believed to be right. The Premier then said, "In these circumstances, the responsibility will rest there."

In other words, the Government is washing its hands of responsibility for the maintenance of law and order in the streets of

Adelaide tomorrow. I consider that it is not only disgraceful but also unprecedented for a Government to take such action on the eve of a day that may bring forth what consequences we know not. I cannot recall a Government ever before repudiating one of its senior officers in such a damaging way as this. What must every member of the Police Force think now? Has he had the backing of the Government to go about his duty, or has he not? The Government has said that it disagrees with the preparations and with the intentions of the Commissioner of Police, the head of the Police Force. This statement must affect the morale of those who will be put, in any case, to a very severe test tomorrow, and I consider that I and all other members on this side speak for the overwhelming number of people in South Australia when we condemn the Government for this deliberate repudiation of the South Australian Police Force. All I can say is that I hope that, despite this stab in the back for the Police Force (because that is what it is), the police will succeed in maintaining law and order in the streets tomorrow and that those of us who do not want to have anything to do with the moratorium demonstration may be protected by the police and may be enabled to go about our lawful occupation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): From what the member for Mitcham has said, it seems that no-one in South Australia would be more pleased than he would be if there was a bloodbath in the streets of Adelaide tomorrow.

Mr. Jennings: As long as he didn't lose any of his blood.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: His speech this afternoon has been designed to encourage confrontation in the demonstration tomorrow.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you quote what I said?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has had his say and, in having mine now, I am commenting on the speech he has made this afternoon, which I consider to be disgraceful, thoroughly irresponsible and not becoming even of him. As I have said, he has done everything possible to encourage a confrontation tomorrow. On the other hand the Government, in my view, has done everything possible to discourage such a confrontation and violence.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Be serious about this.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am sure that the member for Alexandra will listen to me, because I am really concerned about this matter, as are other members of the Government, particularly those on the front bench. This is no joke and it is not something to be played with in the way members are playing with it in this House today. This is a serious business and the member for Alexandra knows that, even if his colleagues do not, and I hope that any speaker who follows me treats the matter as seriously as I am doing.

Mr. Millhouse: And as we all have done.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is utter rubbish. The Premier has told the House about what has happened since the Labor Party conference in June last committed our Party to supporting the aims and objectives of the moratorium. Those aims and objectives were to oppose Australian involvement in Vietnam and Indo-China and to oppose the National Service Act. I, as a member of the Australian Labor Party, was under the impression at that time that the activities that would be carried out so far as the moratorium was concerned would have been along lines similar to those adopted in May of this year. I think that was the genuine impression that most, if not all, members of the Labor Party had then.

This House has now been told what has happened in the last week or so about the organization of the moratorium, and I have said constantly, in replies to baiting by the Leader of the Opposition and other members, that I did not think it necessary for the State Government to have a policy in this matter. I have said this fully aware that we could not direct the police if we wanted to, one way or the other. Members should bear that in mind. I have said, and I repeat, that I have complete confidence in the Police Force to handle any situation sensibly and reasonably. However, because of the pressure that members opposite have put on us, wanting to know what is our attitude to the moratorium, what the police will do, and what we want the police to do, we thought it fair and proper that discussions should take place between the Government and the Commissioner of Police, not to direct him but to discuss the matter with him.

Mr. Hall: Yeah?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader says "Yeah", but I suggest that, if the discussions had not taken place, he would have been criticizing us this afternoon for not

having had them. This is one of those things in which we are criticized if we do not do anything, yet we are still criticized if we do something.

Mr. Hall: And here we have a responsible Minister!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader knows that that is what would have happened. It came to our attention that, because of the shape and form that the moratorium was going to take tomorrow, there was likely to be violence, and we have said consistently that we would be involved in a demonstration opposing the Vietnam conflict and the National Service Act, provided that demonstration was peaceful and orderly and there was no likelihood of violence. Clearly, it seemed to me that the organizers of the moratorium were proceeding in a way that did not make for that position. It seemed that there would be violence, and on this basis the Australian Labor Party decided to withdraw its support. I make no bones about saying that I supported the move then and I support it now. I think that decision was correct. As the Labor Party could not control the demonstration completely, the best thing the Party could do was keep out of it, because we are responsible only for something that we control completely.

Mr. Millhouse: Are all your members in agreement?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot answer for all our members but, so far as I am aware, no member will be participating in the march through the streets tomorrow. I have not checked with all members on this side, but they are free to do as they wish. If they want to march, that is their business; it is up to the dictates of their own consciences. The situation has now developed (and the Labor Party is quite firm about it) that it will not participate in the moratorium. That does not mean to say that its members cannot participate in a rally somewhere else that is opposed to Australia's participation in Vietnam, that is perfectly proper and orderly and that has nothing at all to do with the moratorium and the people who are organizing it. I do not want to delay the House, for we have much more important things to proceed with this afternoon.

Mr. Millhouse: There is no more important issue that has come before this House.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Mitcham is trying to whip up all the fear he can in the minds of the people of this fair

State of ours so that they will think it will not be safe to come into the city tomorrow. That is not so, and he knows it.

Mr. Hall: You are contradicting yourself now.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I am not. If the Leader had been here when I started, he would have heard what I think of the statements made by the member for Mitcham. I do not support them. They were designed to scare the people. They are so far from the truth that it is not even funny. The Premier has said this afternoon that, following discussions with the Commissioner of Police, certain of his suggestions were accepted by the Commissioner but one of them was not. The Premier has made clear the reasonable way in which he approached the Commissioner of Police. He thought the suggestion he made that traffic should be redirected would solve the problem of any confrontation. The Commissioner has seen fit to disregard that suggestion. That is his business and, as the Premier has also said, it is his responsibility.

The member for Mitcham says it is wrong to sit on an intersection. I agree with him but, if the police have been informed that his will happen, it is proper for them to make some alternative arrangement. This is a reasonable approach to the matter.

Mr. Mathwin: The public should not be inconvenienced.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member must be reasonable. The public was inconvenienced recently by the farmers' march. That march took place along a street. The marchers were orderly and peaceful. I do not object to that march; I would have marched with them. However, it is splitting hairs to say that a march down a street is not breaking the law (for, technically, it is) whereas sitting down at an intersection is and the traffic code should apply.

The other thing that concerns me about tomorrow is that, whilst we have talked only about the organizers of the moratorium and those involved in it, there are other groups or bodies of people which will be involved in this moratorium and are opposed to it and its supporters. They, too, have a responsibility to the citizens of this State and to the Police Force and everyone else to be reasonable. The sort of development I heard of last week (I do not know whether or not it exists) is a paramilitary organization called the minute-men. That is a serious development that we could well do without in this State. The Leader



need not grin about that, because it is obviously serious. It is an importation from America, and we do not want it here.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the returned men from Vietnam?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They would not be minute-men; I object to them, too.

Mr. Mathwin: I am not referring to the minute-men.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am.

Mr. Rodda: I object to the people on the front steps.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They are not interfering with you or me. If he is complaining about it, why does he not go out and try to influence them? He wants the police to come and carry them away and cause a scene, and then he will be happy. If that happened, the people sitting outside would have achieved their objective.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not think they are hurting anyone or anything. I am perfectly satisfied with the course of things as they have happened.

Mr. Rodda: I should like to see them thrown off the place.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would be breaking the law if he attempted to do that because he would be causing violence. He would be up for assault, and so he should be if he went out and attempted to interfere with them. They are not hurting anyone. They must be cold and uncomfortable at night. They are putting up with it for their own cause and belief, and good luck to them! I hope there will be no violence tomorrow and that people will be sensible and reasonable about the whole thing. I am confident that the police, in these circumstances, will be able adequately to handle the situation. I make it clear to the House that the Government has done everything possible not only to see that violence is avoided but also to assist the police in what has been described as and is or could be a fairly difficult situation tomorrow.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I agree with the Deputy Premier when he says he hopes there will be no violence tomorrow, but that is the only thing he said that I agree with. Everybody in this House has the same wish. For that reason, I object stren-

uously to the personal accusations that the Deputy Premier made about my colleagues. He has indulged in some very unpleasant personal accusations about the member for Mitcham, and, to a lesser degree, about the Leader of the Opposition. To say, as the Deputy Leader of the Government did, about the member for Mitcham that no-one would be happier than he if there was a blood bath in the streets tomorrow is disgraceful. It is a disgraceful personal accusation. It was made in reply to speeches that avoided personal abuse. The Opposition Party is most concerned about the possibility of trouble tomorrow. We want it as little as any other person does. We are not accusing the Government of trying to provoke it. If we had said that the Government was deliberately trying to provoke trouble, we might have merited some sort of counter-charge, as was made about my colleague that he would welcome it; but we said nothing of the sort. We are not accusing the Government of trying to provoke trouble, but what we are accusing it of is an abject abrogation and evasion of its responsibility. The Government is the leader of the State and it has denied its own Police Force. That is just what it has done. It is a Government whose members, as they freely inform us, have been associated with the moratorium in the past. Many of their members have been—and they make no secret of it. It is a Government led by a Premier who has stated his own personal detestation of the National Service Act and who went further than that and stated that he himself would defy it in every respect. In the way that I have outlined, the Government has encouraged the moratorium: it certainly did not in any way intend (and I am not claiming anything else) that there should be violence. I know that the Government wants as little of that as we do, but its actions have encouraged the moratorium up to a point. Then, a week or so ago, we had the announcement that the A.L.P. had dissociated itself from the moratorium. That announcement was welcomed throughout the State, and no complaint was made by members on this side. We were happy to know that the Government Party had dissociated itself from the moratorium. However, now it has come back, but not because of pressure, as the Deputy Leader claimed.

Without any prompting, the Leader of the Government volunteered the statement denying the Police Force. He did that early this afternoon when he asked leave to make a statement

in which he set out the matters that are now well known. He has pointed out that the Police Regulation Act gives the Commissioner of Police authority to control the Police Force within the terms of that Act. That is perfectly true, and I hope it remains that way. The Act has stood the test of time and the test of three years of Labor Government. In 1966, the Labor Government amended certain parts of the Act that were uncontroversial but it did not in any way suggest that the sections that gave the Commissioner of Police his powers should be altered, nor were they. I am thankful that they were not. Under this Act the Commissioner has the responsibility and authority to carry out his job.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That is what the Premier said.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What he badly needs is the support of the Government.

Mr. Payne: Where does it say in the Act that he needs support from the Premier?

Mr. Millhouse: Use some common sense.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Commissioner of Police has the authority to control the actions of the Police Force.

Mr. Harrison: Of course he has.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I repeat that what he badly needs is the encouragement of the Government to exercise that authority. Thank goodness we have a Commissioner of Police who is not afraid to take responsibility and will not back away from it, and who will not wash his hands of other people's views and make statements about it. We have a Commissioner who is capable and courageous, and authoritative enough to exercise the control that he should exercise. It is the Government that is running out on the Commissioner of Police, and this is a situation that I have never previously known. In his letter, the Commissioner, in the most moderate way, states:

It is the earnest desire of the police to avoid a clash with the demonstrators, but I could not ask my officers to neglect their duty and thereby deny the general public the rights to which they are entitled.

It is not merely implied that the Government asked him to do that: it is freely admitted by Government members that they have asked the Commissioner of Police to ask his officers to neglect their duty. The Commissioner has declined to do so. He has been asked to see that there is no sort of deliberate confrontation. How can the police be asked not to

make a deliberate confrontation? Confrontation comes not from authority but from the people working against authority. A police constable at a busy intersection cannot be told to avoid confrontation and, when he says, "What do I do to avoid it?", he cannot be told to walk swiftly away and keep out of sight. However, in effect, that is what the Government is asking the Police Force to do.

One of the side issues (which would be funny if it were not so serious) is the weak and contemptible attempt to compare this situation with the farmers' march. In that march were many people who certainly set out in no way to have a confrontation. They did not set out to flout authority, but they merely marched down the street, stopped at the traffic lights, and did everything they were asked to do, and no-one asked them not to do it. Yet the Government now says, "Oh! But this is the same as the farmers' march." That is a contemptible comparison and has no relevance to the moratorium march. This is the first time that I have known, in a situation where tension is building up, a Government to repudiate its Commissioner of Police and leave him as the one man with the authority to control the forces of law and order and not encourage him.

Furthermore, the Government has gone out of its way to make public statements in the Legislature that it disagrees with him. How much farther can a Government go in selling out its Police Force? I cannot imagine it. I hope fervently that there is no trouble; I hope as fervently as does the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham, but I think the Deputy Leader of the Government would admit in calmer moments that he had grossly maligned the member for Mitcham. I am sorry this occurred. I hope that there will be no trouble during the march. Also, I hope that I will never hear again a Government repudiate one of its senior and trusted officers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): We have been subjected to much ballyhoo this afternoon, climaxed by the remarks of the member for Alexandra, who repeated them about 20 times: however, they are so completely untrue that it is unbelievable to think that a member with his experience in this House would stand up and say such things, which he knows are completely untrue.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are you calling the honourable member a liar?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Kavel wants to place on my comment the interpretation that the member for Alexandra is a liar, he is free to do so.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That is what you think.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There may be many people who agree with him, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Kavel wants to join in this debate and let us hear his views, I am sure they would be most enlightening. It is completely untrue to say that this Government has repudiated the Commissioner of Police, and I am sure that the member for Alexandra knows that, as do the member for Mitcham and the Leader of the Opposition. However, they have seized on a weak point to try to make political capital for the Fascist groups that oppose the moratorium. The whole problem associated with this exercise is that people like members opposite have successfully shifted the focus away from where it should be, namely, in bringing home our precious boys from Vietnam, and stopping the lottery of death, and have placed it on a small group of people who, from the general viewpoint, do not matter in the community anyhow. It is directed so that there will be some sort of trouble coming out of the demonstration tomorrow.

Mr. Millhouse: Why was the Ministerial statement made at all then?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member would only untangle himself for a while and listen, I would be happy to tell him a few facts.

Mr. Millhouse: Just answer me.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interjection. I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting if possible. If members want to speak, they can rise and do so. Those who have already spoken have had their say, and it is up to them to pay due courtesy to the speaker who is on his feet.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I want to take the House back a little way, because of the incorrect statements the Leader made by partly quoting from press cuttings. As President of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party I made public utterances early in August. A press statement that I issued said:

The Australian Labor Party supports the Vietnam moratorium activities planned for September as an effective and legitimate means of displaying the Australian people's support for peace in Indo-China and opposition to

the continuation of the Gorton Government's policy of conscription, resulting from which young Australians are being killed in Vietnam.

I do not expect that many Opposition members will support that statement because they support war, but the A.L.P. does not support war. The statement continued:

These aims of the moratorium are consistent with A.L.P. policy.

And so they are. The aim of the moratorium is to stop the war in Vietnam and to stop the conscription and death by ballot of our young people. The Party makes no apology whatever for having such a policy; on the contrary, it is proud of it, and most Australians support it. The statement continued:

The Australian Labor Party approves and supports the principles of anti-Vietnam moratorium demonstrations, provided such demonstrations are planned and executed on a peaceful basis.

What happened? After this there were some changes of plans, as the Premier has said. The A.L.P. was informed that it appeared that the demonstration planned for Friday, September 18, might not be conducted peacefully. Consequently, the A.L.P. had no alternative to withdrawing its support. Yet the Leader of the Opposition made the stupid remark, "Why didn't Mr. Virgo tell the police?" The answer is that Mr. Virgo is not the pimp that the Leader apparently wants him to be. As I publicly said during a television programme, I have enough confidence in our Police Force to know that it is very capable of getting more accurate information than I am able to give it. I do not share the Leader's view that it is incompetent: it is competent to do what is necessary.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you back it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member would keep quiet and listen he would know full well that there was no failure on the part of the Government. The police are in exactly the same position now as they were when the first moratorium was conducted last April (when the previous Government was in power) and when the farmers' march took place.

Mr. Rodda: That was different altogether.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Alexandra and others have said it was weak and contemptible to compare the farmers' march with tomorrow's march, but no-one went that little bit further and told us why. I would be delighted if someone could tell me why it was different.

Mr. Mathwin: We have been told there will be violence.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Opposition members have let the cat out of the bag. We have taken every possible step to prevent violence. We do not want provocation but, when we hear from Opposition members like the members for Glenelg, Rocky River and Eyre, we realize that there are provokers around. This is what we are trying to avoid. If the march takes place along King William Street tomorrow and if the marchers occupy an intersection (I believe, from press reports, that they will do so for 15 minutes) do Opposition members think that the police should move them on?

Mr. Rodda: Yes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was in Victoria Square a few weeks ago when the farmers marched. On that day the police held up the traffic in Franklin Street for 45 minutes. It is right for the farmers to hold up traffic for 45 minutes, but it is wrong for the moratorium to hold it up for 15 minutes! Where is the commonsense of members opposite? It has been said that the A.L.P. opted out of tomorrow's moratorium demonstration.

Mr. Ryan: The Young Liberals will be in it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Premier, the Deputy Premier and I will be addressing a meeting at Port Adelaide. I am honoured to think that I have been invited to address that meeting and that I will have an opportunity of displaying my abhorrence of war and of death by lottery. The day when we in Australia are not able publicly to express our views is the day that dictatorship takes over, and takes over completely.

If that is what the Opposition members want, they are entitled to that view, and I do not try to take it away from them. However, I reject out of hand any thinking of that nature, for it is something that is completely abhorrent to me. Tomorrow's meeting at Port Adelaide will be held to express publicly our opposition to a continuation of the murder taking place in Indo-China. If members opposite want to condone what is going on there, that is their responsibility, and it is on their shoulders, but I completely dissociate myself from it and I will always do what I can to bring about peace in Indo-China and to revoke the National Service Act.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The statement made by the Minister of Roads and Transport that it was ballyhoo coming from this side

and that we were making political capital out of these people who are demonstrating against what he called a lottery of death is just so much poppycock. The motto of the Returned Services League, whose members include some distinguished servicemen, to whom I pay my respects, is, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

Mr. McKee: We don't agree with that, either.

Mr. RODDA: I am sorry to hear the member for Pirie say that; I am sure that he does not mean it. This motto has withstood the test of time and it has made Australia the great country that it is. The Minister of Labour and Industry may try to interject, but, as a member of a sovereign Government, he has a responsibility in this regard.

Mr. Simmons: We want to keep it a great place, too.

Mr. RODDA: That won't be done if the Government continues with its present attitude. Demonstrations seem to have become fashionable and are world-wide. However, I am sure that if there were no war in Vietnam these people would find something else to demonstrate about. I think the people of South Australia must have been shocked this afternoon to hear the Premier say that he and the Chief Secretary had had discussions with the Police Commissioner (and I am sure that they would have done this nicely) to the effect that, if these people are to occupy a city intersection tomorrow, traffic should be diverted. Why should the great masses of our people be diverted around these people who want to buck authority, as these people are doing? Here, I commend the Commissioner of Police for the stand he has taken. The Premier has told the House that he can do nothing about this, but it is a good thing that we have a Parliament to which the Police Force is responsible. That is one reason why people on this side believe in the bicameral system.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. RODDA: We have had a practical example this afternoon of anarchy in our midst and of people being given the green light to occupy an intersection. No-one wants to see a blood bath, and I do not think we will see one, because I have sufficient confidence in the police to keep this sort of thing under control. I have previously been outspoken about people occupying the steps of Parliament House. If I had my way—

Mr. McKee: You would shoot them.

Mr. RODDA: —I would have the police remove these people.

Mr. Ryan: You were in Government 12 months ago and didn't do that.

Mr. RODDA: I was not the Government; I am expressing my own opinion. It is not good for the member for Price to get so excited about something that is apparently so dear to him. I would not condone the farmers' standing on the steps of Parliament House and raising Cain about the price of eggs, and the same goes for the people there now. I think the Premier and all of us must be as soft as boiled turnips to put up with this sort of thing, the Minister of Labour and Industry included. He does not have the guts to stand up and have these people removed from the steps of Parliament House. If people wish to demonstrate, they can do so properly, as the Minister and I would do if we perhaps wanted to raise an issue; they can hire a hall or go to some other place, but they should not congregate on the steps of Parliament House. I heard one of these people tell a passer-by last evening that he or she stank.

Mr. McKee: It wasn't you going past, was it?

Mr. RODDA: It could have been; no, I think it was a lady walking past.

Mr. Jennings: What do you mean it was a lady? You said it could have been you.

Mr. RODDA: I do not think it sufficiently important to answer that. If the member for Ross Smith is too dense to understand what I am saying now, he may tell us about it in his Saturday column. The public of South Australia is fed up with these demonstrations on the House steps every time there is a yike. I tried to conduct an interview this morning in the interviewing room to the tune of pop music, and this was most harassing and something which I think we have tolerated for too long. It is little wonder that other groups in the community will also want to express themselves. We on this side certainly do not condone violence or the law of the jungle. There are reports that some of these people whom we have seen wearing a red circle on their arms and in other places have weapons for retaliation and, with this sort of thing in our midst, we can expect some real trouble tomorrow.

Mr. Lawn: You haven't worn your red tie today.

Mr. RODDA: No.

Mr. Lawn: You had it on last week.

Mr. RODDA: I did not. The member for Adelaide always resorts to abuse, but on this occasion I shall be charitable and say that he is being humorous. We on this side express our grave concern that the Government has seen fit not to support the police or to give the police its blessing in regard to controlling this march tomorrow. Let us hope that the demonstration turns out to be a damp squib. I express my concern at the attitude expressed by the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Mr. Lawn: You've said that 10 times.

Mr. RODDA: If it is news to the member for Adelaide, I will probably say it another 10 times. The Minister carried on, saying that the Opposition gloried in war. I do not think the Minister has looked down the barrel of a gun or been on the end of a bayonet.

Mr. Lawn: Would you like him to have been?

Mr. RODDA: Some of us who have done so would not like to do so again. No Opposition member is a warmonger, as someone opposite suggested. This Vietnam issue is with us whether we like it or not.

Mr. Ryan: Why should we like it?

Mr. RODDA: We do not want trouble in the streets of Adelaide tomorrow. I am sure that if we see these young people in five or six years they will be earning their own living and will probably be decent Australians.

Mr. Ryan: They are now.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 16. Page 1445.)

PREMIER AND MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT  
Premier's Department, \$307,720.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): What is the reason for the increase of about \$33,000 from \$56,512 to \$89,013, which is proposed as the provision for "Administrative Officer and clerical staff"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The increase is due to the appointment of the policy secretariat, and the officers of that department, including Mr. Bakewell, and that accounts for \$18,643; administrative officer and inquiry assistants account for \$8,240; variation in classifications accounts for \$6,000 and salary incremental steps account for \$2,000.

Mr. Hall: What does Mr. Bakewell do?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He remains a Commissioner of the Public Service Board but he is the senior officer of the policy secretariat and is responsible to the Premier.

Mr. Hall: How much time will he devote to the secretariat as distinct from his duties on the Public Service Board?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He devotes a considerable period each week to seeing to the work of the policy secretariat, which has a long list of activities now. For instance, one of these activities is the carrying out of the first full-scale report of the Housing Trust, pursuant to the Housing Trust Act, for many years. The preparation of the necessary inquiry involved much work that Mr. Bakewell originally oversaw. He is not a member of the inquiry committee but he was responsible for the administrative work in setting it up. A series of other inquiries in a number of other areas is being conducted; he consults with me twice a week on the work of the policy secretariat and about the rate at which the work is going. Therefore, there is much work for Mr. Bakewell in this area.

Mr. HALL: What is the reason for the reduction of about \$4,500 in the line "Industries promotion, research and assistance"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One engineer has been transferred to another department.

Line passed.

Immigration, Publicity and Tourist Bureau, \$882,257.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Provision is made for "Purchase of paddle steamer *Industry*," \$5,000. When I was Minister, we negotiated for this paddle steamer with the River Murray Commission. I think that at least two and possibly three organizations from river towns were seeking the vessel. At that time, we had not actually bought the vessel and had not decided to whom it should go, but it would clearly be the nucleus of a tourist attraction. The boat museum which, with substantial Government assistance, has been established at Swan Hill began with the *Gem*. This has given ideas to people in other river towns, and rightly so, so that paddle steamers are now sought after. Has any decision been made as to the disposal of the *Industry* or as to the terms of its disposal to one of these organizations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has been decided to purchase the *Industry*. Applications have been received from Loxton and Renmark for placing the *Industry* at one of those towns.

The local corporations and organizations interested in the tourist development of the towns have made submissions to a committee that is advising me. However, a decision has not yet been taken on the place where this will be established.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the subsidies for swimming pools, for which actual payments last year were \$154,780. This year expenditure has been reduced to \$43,800. Can the Treasurer give some valid reason why such a substantial reduction has been made? I point out that subsidies towards swimming pools are greatly valued by various swimming clubs, especially those in the country.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The sum last year was abnormally high owing to the fact that \$100,000 was paid in respect of the Adelaide pool in the north park lands. The subsidies provided this year are \$3,000 each for swimming pools at Coonalpyn, Elizabeth, Kingscote, Lamerou, Lock, Millicent, Minnipa, Nangwarry, Payneham, Strathalbyn, Tea Tree Gully, Waikerie, Woodside, and Wudinna; \$500 for Jamestown; and \$1,250 for Mannum. We have continued the subsidies on the previous basis according to applications received.

Mr. MATHWIN: Is there some explanation for the big reduction of about \$6,000 for National Flower Day?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I imagine that the reasons for the reduction is that last year we had the National Flower Day as part of the Festival of Arts, and the expenditure is largely in consequence. As far as National Flower Day other than this year is concerned, the expenditure would be for materials to replace the old rustic bridge that was used to view the War Memorial flower display. This bridge has been affected by borers.

Mr. McANANEY: I support the increase in the provision for the Murray Valley Development League from \$1,500 to \$3,000, but I am most disappointed that the expenditure on tourism generally is the most disappointing line in the Estimates. Despite the Labor Party's claim in its policy speech that it would increase expenditure on tourism, we have slipped back to what happened in 1966-67, when the Labor Party was in office previously. In that year the sum spent on tourism dropped back by \$26,000. In the next year it increased to \$55,000 and in 1968-69, under our Government, it increased to \$112,727. However, in the next year the figure dropped back to \$53,000. As far as I can see, this year,

taking out the revenue that the Tourist Bureau will collect and the amount being spent, we will drop back \$36,000 on what we spent last year.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about expenditure in respect of the Festival of Arts?

Mr. McANANEY: I have looked at the Auditor-General's Report and I do not think the figure for the Festival of Arts was included in the amount. Despite statements in the policy speech, it seems that the total amount spent on tourism will drop, whereas our Party promised a big increase in this provision. Further, the Government has all these additional funds from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Apparently, the honourable member has overlooked that some of the grants in the total under this line are included under another line.

Mr. McANANEY: There's an overall drop of \$33,000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is \$100,000 out for the grant in respect of the swimming pool at North Adelaide last year.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There was almost \$50,000 for the Festival of Arts last year, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, that goes to "Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous", and the provision there has been increased markedly. The total of the two sections of the Estimates shows an increase.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am pleased that the Government has increased the amount provided for the National Trust from \$1,000 to \$2,000, even though the Leader of the Opposition, in his policy speech, promised to increase the grant to \$5,000 and I am sorry that the present Government has not been able to provide a similar amount. I hope that at some time in the future the Government will provide what we would have provided had we been returned to office. My recollection is that the previous Government promised Austral House to the National Trust. Does the Government intend to hand over Austral House to the National Trust? If so, under what terms and when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provisions relating to Austral House caused the Government considerable concern when we took office. Preparations had been made to put the chest clinic on part of the Austral House site. An examination of Austral House by the Government showed that this would not be a well

advised course and that Austral House could be better developed far more comprehensively than had been previously intended. Following this view, discussions were held with the National Trust about the way in which it would be involved in the development of the Austral House site. The trust is happy for the Government to retain the title to Austral House and be responsible for its renovation. The trust would provide the furnishing and redecoration of the major historic portion of the house at the front. The Government has asked for a submission from a leading Adelaide firm of architects on a feasibility study for the total development of the site at Austral House, incorporating the work of the National Trust there.

Upon receipt of that and after consideration of it by the Government, it will be possible to announce the basis on which the development of Austral House will proceed. The Government believes that Austral House is one of the major architectural treasures of this State. It has an enormous potential for tourist development and we want to be able to use it to the very best advantage in conjunction with the trust. The item for the payment to the National Trust has taken into account the fact that the Government is accepting greater responsibility in this area.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to two lines under the heading "Publicity and Tourist Bureau". The first is "Local Tourist Associations", for which I note there is an increase in the proposed allocation; yet inquiry suggests that there is no knowledge by some tourist associations of how they can apply for financial help. The second line I refer to is "Subsidies towards development of tourist resorts". Already, local government has received information, dated as early as August 3, 1970, from the Tourist Bureau that money is not available for certain works. The statement made by the writer (the Director) was that unfortunately the finance available for subsidies was insufficient to meet the total demand. One appreciates that this will probably always be the case, but on August 3, one month after the commencement of the present financial year, the \$80,000 proposed allocation looked fairly thin for the whole year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will appreciate that for tourist subsidies, which are subsidies for a whole range of things, such as the provision of toilet facilities and boat ramps and clearing snags out of creeks, there is a backlog of applications

and it is difficult for us, since we propose a considerable increase in expenditure in the next three years in a whole series of tourist areas, markedly to increase this one. A wide range of subsidies has been granted for tourist offices at Nuriootpa, Barmera, Bordertown, Glenelg, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Port Elliot, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Renmark, Victor Harbour, Waikerie, and Whyalla, and increases in the grants have been made to Bordertown, Renmark and Glenelg. If there are people in the honourable member's district who are not aware of the way in which to apply, I suggest that they communicate with the Director.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Government have the use of some part of Austral House? The Treasurer said that the front rooms were to be renovated, but to what use is the rest of the house to be put?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A series of uses suggested to the Government have met with the enthusiastic support of the National Trust. The Government considers that this should be not merely a museum but a living part of the life of the city, and that there should be a constant involvement of organizations in the use of what is one of our great historic buildings. We hope to develop

the site in this way, and that is why we are having the feasibility study made.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 22, at 2 p.m.