

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

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

### QUESTIONS

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. HALL: Can the Deputy Premier say what consideration the Government has given to those industries which will be harmed by the introduction of daylight saving and whether the Government will reconsider applying daylight saving during February? Experience in Tasmania has shown that the drive-in theatre industry has been significantly harmed by the introduction of daylight saving. Moreover, people engaged in rural industry in South Australia have protested about the application of daylight saving (I believe several members have received protests about this: I certainly have). If we consider the late rising of the sun, the impact of daylight saving is severest in February. The time table for the rising of the sun for this year (and I take it that times for one year would be similar to those for the following year) shows that the sun would rise, with daylight saving, at 7.2 a.m. on the last day of February. Therefore, allowing for a difference of a minute or two, the sun will rise at 7 a.m. next year on the last day of daylight saving. At the end of January, judging by last year's times, the sun will rise at about 6.30 a.m., the difference in time over the month being calculated at about one minute a day. If daylight saving were not applied to February, this would greatly diminish the inconvenience suffered by those who believe they will undergo two winters, having regard to the time of the rising of the sun. Therefore, can the Deputy Premier say what consideration the Government gave, before it announced that it intended to introduce daylight saving, to those industries that will be hurt economically or inconvenienced and whether the Government will reconsider applying daylight saving in February?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government gave great consideration to the whole matter. As I think has been stated publicly, the Government had the policy secretariat of the Premier's Department examine the matter and report on it in great detail, so much so that about 26 Government departments and certain organizations throughout the State were asked to make submissions to the secretariat on their views and the diffi-

culties that might be experienced if daylight saving and Eastern Standard Time were introduced or if daylight saving only were adopted. Among those contacted were the drive-in theatre people and, naturally, as the Leader has pointed out, because this will mean some difficulty to them, they were opposed to any alteration.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The same applied in Victoria, too.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. I intended to point out to the Leader that the same position applied in both New South Wales and Victoria, which States indicated their intention of making this decision without having had any consultation with this State. True, after having made up their minds, they consulted this State, but that was not so much on whether they would adopt daylight saving as on what time and dates the period of daylight saving would cover. Therefore, this State had no opportunity to consult or argue with those States before they made an announcement, and the Government considered that, in view of this, it had no alternative but to adopt at least the one hour of daylight saving, because it would be intolerable for the time in South Australia to be one and a half hours behind the time in the Eastern States. It is recognized that there will be some difficulties, not only for the drive-in theatre operators but also for people in primary industries and other areas, as a result of this decision. However, I emphasize that it is being introduced as a trial only, and during this period we expect anyone affected by the decision to contact the Government, placing before it specific objections so that it can examine them further when the trial period ends. The Government announced yesterday that it intended to adopt the one hour of daylight saving to coincide with the time and dates adopted by the Eastern States. That decision was made after much consideration and deliberation, and I do not and cannot say at this stage that the Government will alter that decision.

#### SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

Mr. CLARK: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to replace the present system of subsidies for schools with a system of grants and, if it does, will the Minister please explain how the new system will operate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. Several suggestions on this matter have been canvassed recently and, indeed, I have received

submissions from those associated with schools and from teachers to the effect that a change to a system of grants in lieu of subsidies should be made. The Government has considered this matter and has decided to make the change. The way in which the system will be introduced is, first, to switch to a calendar-year basis of making grants to schools instead of the previous financial-year basis of allocating subsidies. The grants will be allocated by means of a formula that will have regard to the size of the school, the school enrolments, the number of "free" scholars, and the number of Aboriginal students. The formula for each category of school will be worked out on a similar basis but there will be separate formulas for primary schools, area schools, and secondary schools. For some years, there has been a carry-over of subsidy moneys (allocated to schools but not yet paid) into each new financial year. This has occurred this year as well, and some money will be made available between now and Christmas to schools having a backlog of subsidy money due to them but which has not been paid. The grants to schools will be paid in two instalments, one in January and the other in July, and it is hoped that the instalment for the first half of 1972 can be made available for schools in December this year, as an initial step. Schools will be free to spend their grant money on an approved list of goods for educational purposes, and the change to this new system will represent a considerable saving in the administration costs that were associated with the old subsidy system. I point out that, under the new arrangements, the expenditure to which the Government is committed this financial year will be about 15 per cent greater than that for last financial year, and for the financial year 1972-73 there will be a further 15 per cent increase, so that for most schools the change to the new system will not mean any reduction in the money they will have available from the Government. The other main reason for introducing the change is that it is a much more equitable way of distributing funds to schools. It has been suggested to us (and was suggested again in the Karmel committee report) that schools situated in more affluent areas of our community are better able to raise funds that are matched by a subsidy from the Government and, consequently, a system based mainly on school enrolments, plus the other adjustments to which I have referred, will involve a fairer allocation of funds. Also, the operation of this scheme will not affect the current allocation of funds from Loan money for

subsidies on capital works such as gymnasiums, swimming pools, and halls. This system will continue, and it may be necessary to extend the range of capital projects that can be catered for in this kind of way. Also, the provision of tennis courts, or of an oval for a school that does not come under the policy of ovals for new schools, may possibly be a matter for subsidy paid out of Loan funds. Within the next week or 10 days, we hope to be able to announce the formulas to be adopted for primary, area, and secondary schools.

#### FREE SPEECH

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. Will you give an assurance to members that you will not interfere with their expression of free speech in this Chamber, except in conformity with Standing Orders? As you may imagine, my question arises out of the front page article in last Saturday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Speaker bars M.P.'s 'educated guesses'". Reading the article, one wonders whether that is reflected in the comments that you have made, but the general drift of your remarks is that you are not satisfied with what members are saying in this House, and, as I have said, from the heading it appears that you intend to bar what are called educated guesses. I presume that you are referring to the comments made by the member for Hanson the other day about figures of the number of abortions, with which incidentally, I do not agree. I therefore ask you whether you will assure members that you do not intend to breach their right of free speech, even if you do not agree with what they are saying.

The SPEAKER: The reply to the honourable member's question is "Yes".

#### CALLINGTON HILL ROAD

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the Callington Hill road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The construction of a climbing lane on Callington Hill on main South-Eastern Road No. 1 presents problems because of the geological conditions at the location and the necessity for work to be planned so that it can be carried out without undue disruption to traffic movements. Fairly extensive investigations are necessary before designs can be completed and work commenced. At this stage, investigations are actively proceeding, and it is expected that construction work will commence towards the end of this

calendar year. Because of the confined working conditions, the period involved in construction is likely to be about six months.

#### TRANSPORT BAN

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry ascertain for me, if possible, how many man-hours have been lost as a result of the disastrous strike that occurred last week? I refer to the man-hours not only of the members of the Transport Workers Union who were directly involved but also of employees in factories normally serviced by members of that union who had to stand down as a result of the strike.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will try to obtain that information for the honourable member.

#### SMALL SEEDS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Deputy Premier assure the House that, following a statement on the matter made recently by the Premier, there will be a market in South-East Asia for the small seeds industry operating in this State? The Deputy Premier will be aware of the fairly extensive small seed industry carried on in the South-East, and he may also be aware of the setback that has occurred in respect of a market for that industry. As there is in both of our districts much interest in this possible market in South-East Asia, and as I believe that the Premier has referred to the possibility of establishing a market there, will the Deputy Premier assure the House that that market will be available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I should like to be able to give the House the assurance for which the honourable member has asked, I am loath to do that, because I should first like to confer with the Premier on his return. However, seeing that the honourable member has raised the matter (and I share his concern), I shall be happy to take up the matter with the Premier when he returns and to obtain from the Premier a report that I hope will indicate the reply for which the honourable member has asked.

#### CHAFFEY HOUSING

Mr. CURREN: Will the Deputy Premier obtain information for me regarding the waiting times for Housing Trust rental houses in each of the towns of Renmark, Berri, Barmera, Waikerie and Moorook, and will he also ascertain how many rental houses are being constructed by the Housing Trust in each of these towns, giving details of the number of these houses for sale and the number of current applications for rental houses?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

#### OATS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to give the assurance to this House that, when the oat-marketing legislation is introduced, sufficient time will be permitted not only to debate that legislation but also to give those people affected by it an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the measure before it is passed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague to give this assurance, if possible. I imagine that his intention would be not to rush the legislation through the House but to give an opportunity to those affected by it to consider the problems involved.

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister ask his colleague to assure the House that, before an oat marketing authority is established in South Australia, consideration will be given to existing contracts that have been entered into by grain merchants in this State? I have been approached by a grain merchant in my district who, just before the announcement that an oat marketing authority might be established, entered into a contract to supply a quantity of oats to the United Kingdom over a period of 12 months. He is now afraid that, if the oat marketing authority is established, he may not be able to honour the contract and may thereby render himself liable for breach of contract.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague to examine the matter.

#### MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Commonwealth Attorney-General intends to introduce legislation to validate the many maintenance orders which have been made by a Master of the Supreme Court in South Australia and which have been recently voided as the result of a High Court decision?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot give any more definite information than I have given previously. My information from the Commonwealth Attorney-General was that his office was studying the position and that legislation would be introduced as soon as possible.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to my recent question about maintenance payments?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The detailed examination made of maintenance accounts in the Social Welfare Department towards the end of 1970 revealed that the department should have been collecting about \$2,075,000 a year on about 5,000 accounts then regarded as current, but was actually collecting about \$1,795,000 a year. This left a

balance of about \$280,000 a year not collected (that is, 13 per cent). The percentage of accounts where charges were being made but no payments were being received was about 7 per cent of the whole. Only about 2 per cent of maintenance payees were receiving relief from the department when maintenance payments were not received or were irregular. Maintenance collections by the department are increasing rapidly. In the last three financial years collections have been: 1968-69, \$1,450,000 (11 per cent increase); 1969-70, \$1,657,000 (14 per cent increase); and 1970-71, \$1,846,000 (11 per cent increase). These figures suggest that at this stage the net cost to the Government to provide regular maintenance payments to wives and families entitled to such payments under court orders might be about \$300,000 a year. However, the cost might well be much higher for the following reasons: If the Government agreed to guarantee maintenance payments an unknown number of obsolete accounts (that is, accounts where no payments have been made and no correspondence received from either party for a considerable period—these accounts having been removed from the ledgers) would no doubt be revived. Frequently, in summary courts composite orders are made. In these cases the court orders payment of a stated sum a week to cover the maintenance of the wife and her children. When a child commences work a proportionate reduction in the amount to be paid is made if the wife agrees. Difficulty might be encountered in obtaining such agreement if payments were guaranteed by the Government. The department is frequently not informed when parties reconcile, children commence work, or other changed circumstances occur. The problem this causes would be accentuated if maintenance payments were guaranteed by the Government. As I have already stated, only about 2 per cent of maintenance payees receive State relief when maintenance payments are not received or are irregular. This suggests that most maintenance payees are in receipt of income to the extent that they are not entitled to relief benefits and people receiving relief, therefore, have the greater need. A substantial number of people in whose favour maintenance orders have been made is in receipt of Commonwealth pensions. If the State guaranteed maintenance payments in these cases a considerable saving to the Commonwealth would result from reduction in the amount of pensions, but that saving would be at the expense of the State Treasury.

The Government is very much concerned about the position of wives and families where maintenance payments are not being made regularly. The department has been instructed to act energetically to enforce orders in these cases, and the staffing position is being reviewed so that this can be carried out. However, it must be realized that the husband also has rights at law and if these are exercised in part or in full or the husband cannot be located the matter is necessarily delayed. One problem which caused me considerable concern was the practice of delaying disbursement of moneys received by cheque where the amount was more than \$40 until the cheque had been cleared by the bank. This practice was in existence when I assumed office and, following directions that I gave, the practice was discontinued last year. Moneys received by cheque are now paid out promptly. As I explained to the member for Fisher a few days ago, when I took office I seriously considered the practicability of the Government's underwriting, so to speak, orders made by the court so as to ensure that those who were entitled to the benefit of such orders would receive that benefit, irrespective of default on the part of the husband. Having considered the matters that I have set out in this reply, I concluded that such a solution was both impracticable and unjust: impracticable because of the cost to the State (a cost that is simply insupportable in present circumstances), and unjust because many persons receiving relief payments depend entirely on relief payments, and the payments of relief that are made to people without other means of support are by any standard inadequate, and certainly recognized by the Government to be so. If we had \$300,000 or any other sum that could be spared for provision for persons who were in need, by reason of the fact that they were without incomes or had been neglected or deserted by the breadwinner, that money, I should think, ought to go to increasing relief payments so that everyone could be expected to have something approaching an adequate standard of living. To simply select persons who are beneficiaries under a maintenance order and underwrite that order so that payments would be unequal would be an inequitable basis of application, in the sense that a wife who had an order in her favour, based upon her husband's means, of \$60 a week would be paid \$60 a week, whereas a wife who, by reason of her husband's means, was given an order for only \$30 a week would receive that amount, and someone who had

the misfortune not to get an order would simply get the relief payments. Therefore, the suggestion by the member for Fisher has an undoubted superficial attraction that appealed to me very much when I assumed office, but I do not think there is any doubt, upon a close analysis of all the factors involved, that it would not be a just approach to the matter.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say how many accounts were recorded as current in the years 1968-69 and 1969-70? The Attorney, in his reply, has mentioned only one of those years. Also, could he tell me whether the \$300,000 a year quoted as the net cost to the Government takes into account the possible saving in administration costs in other fields in relation to the collection of maintenance orders under the system that now operates? If the information can be obtained for me fairly quickly so that I could have it tomorrow, I would appreciate that. However, I know that that may be difficult.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will certainly obtain for the honourable member the information he desires regarding the two years that he has mentioned. The sum of \$300,000 certainly did not take into account any possible savings. I am not at all clear on how the honourable member believes that savings would arise in the system that he proposes, because it is obviously necessary to enforce maintenance orders against the husband, and this would apply whether the existing system continued or whether the honourable member's system was brought into operation. At the moment I do not see how there could be administration savings as a result of the changeover: Indeed I think administrative costs in the accounting section of the department may increase. However, as the honourable member has raised the matter I will ask the department to consider whether there would be any administrative savings and if so what the likely extent of them would be.

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What is the total number of maintenance orders payable to the Social Welfare Department of South Australia?

2. How many such maintenance orders are in arrears?

3. How many men were imprisoned for non-payment of maintenance arrears in this State during 1970?

4. What was the average term of imprisonment imposed on these persons?

5. How many men ordered to pay maintenance to the Social Welfare Department cannot be located because of unknown addresses?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The department is at present dealing with about 4,800 maintenance cases regarded as current where orders have been made by a court. Some of these orders have been transferred by interstate and oversea authorities for enforcement in this State. In other cases no maintenance order has been made, but moneys are being paid through the department, pursuant to an agreement between the parties.

2. About 3,200 of the above accounts are in arrears to varying extents. In some of these cases the payer cannot be located; in others he is unemployed or sick or there are other circumstances which make any enforcement action impracticable while they continue. The amount of arrears in many cases is small. They may result only from the payer making payments at longer intervals than is specified in the court order. Other payers are making regular payments, although there are some arrears on their accounts. Charges for current maintenance on other accounts have ceased, and there is a balance of arrears only outstanding. Not infrequently, a husband makes payments directly to his wife and the amounts paid have subsequently to be credited against the arrears on the account in the department. In many cases where there are arrears court action has been taken, and an order for imprisonment made and suspended whilst the defendant makes regular payments of current maintenance plus a stated weekly or fortnightly amount off the arrears. In suitable circumstances, enforcement proceedings may be withdrawn if the defendant gives an authority to his employer to make weekly or fortnightly deductions from his pay for payment to the department for current maintenance plus an amount towards arrears. Attachment of earnings orders are obtained in other cases.

3. Forty-six persons were imprisoned in South Australia during 1970 for non-payment of maintenance arrears. (It is not possible to supply figures for the number of South Australians imprisoned in other States.)

4. The average term of imprisonment was 73 days. The maximum term was 12 months and the minimum three days.

5. No payments are being received on about 350 accounts in the current maintenance ledgers, where the department is unable to take action, because details of the defendant's whereabouts cannot be ascertained. Where a defendant cannot be located it is usual practice to

issue a warrant. About 600 such warrants exist at present. Some of these have been outstanding for several years and, in the absence of contact by either party, the accounts are no longer regarded as current. Lists of warrants which have remained unexecuted are reviewed periodically so that old warrants can be withdrawn where that action seems appropriate.

#### VINE VALE SCHOOL

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Will the Minister of Education say what his present intention is regarding the closing of small schools in country areas? I have been approached by the Chairman of the Vine Vale Rural School Committee (in the Barossa Valley), who is concerned at the possibility of that school's being closed next year. He points out that the school is well equipped, that it consists of a stone building which has just been painted, that it is located on two acres of land, and that it has lawn, paving and tennis courts. If the school were closed, its students would have to travel to another school in the Barossa Valley at which conditions might not be nearly so congenial. The committee hopes that, before any move is taken to close it, discussions will take place. I ask the Minister the general question, having this specific school in mind.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Before the school is closed the teachers and the school committee will be told of the department's decision and be given the opportunity to make representations. As the honourable member will appreciate, it is the department's policy to consolidate the provision of educational facilities in country areas where this can be done to the advantage of the children concerned. It is considered that in almost every case educational advantages result for children who, having previously attended a small rural school, are transported to a larger school and placed in an environment where there are, generally speaking, better facilities and a greater range of competition so far as other children are concerned. Of course, for the same reason, it is also advantageous to the teachers. So far as a specific school is concerned, whether or not the closure is considered depends, first, on the prospective enrolment at the school; secondly, on problems of transport for the children to attend a larger school; and thirdly, on the accommodation at the receiving school. As I am not familiar with the position at Vine Vale, I will make a specific inquiry and tell the honourable member whether anything definite is intended in this instance.

#### HOLDEN HILL POLICE STATION

**Mrs. BYRNE:** Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report whether the soil mechanics division of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization is now able to give the reasons for the extensive cracking that has occurred at the Holden Hill Police Station, and whether a solution to the problem has been found so that remedial work can be undertaken? Also, can the Minister say whether the cracks now constitute any danger to the occupants of the building, and will he obtain a similar report about the adjoining policeman's residence? In reply to a question that I asked on October 9, 1969, on December 8, 1969 (which is some time ago now), the then acting Minister of Works informed me that detailed observations and investigations had been made by officers of the Public Buildings Department into the cracking of the buildings, and that, as the footings were designed in accordance with normal engineering standards, no reason for the extensive cracking that had occurred was apparent. The soil mechanics division of the C.S.I.R.O. was to carry out an investigation.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I will get a report.

#### SCHOOL PORCHES

**Mr. McANANEY:** Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the possible use of school porches?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Removal of partitions, without the provision of other facilities such as "wet" areas and withdrawal rooms, does not provide adequate space or facilities for the adoption of modern teaching methods. It is considered there are two important requirements for the successful teaching in an open-space area, namely, ample space and acoustic treatment of the floor and ceiling. Any alterations to a wooden room which do not provide the equivalent of at least two teaching spaces, a withdrawal space and a "wet" area are not warranted; and then they are warranted only if the timber building is in very good condition. The cost of such modifications is high and it is not possible to proceed with a large number of these conversions. The expenditure must also be examined in relation to the life of the timber building.

#### MINING LEASES

**Mr. BECKER:** Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a search for minerals on land owned by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Director of Mines reports:

The State Government has no jurisdiction under the Mining Act or any other Act in respect of land owned by the Commonwealth Government. The minerals contained in such land are owned by the Commonwealth. Accordingly, right to explore and mine can be obtained only through the Commonwealth. In the case of land owned by the Defence Department, such as the El Alamein area, application should be made in the first instance to that department. Several inquiries have been made for access to such land. To my knowledge, the Commonwealth has shown no interest in granting mineral rights.

#### YORKETOWN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently about the Yorketown High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Revised sketch plans for Yorketown High School have been drawn based on a basic design that has now been agreed upon for small country high schools. The basic design provides essential education requirements and at the same time ensures a more economical use of teaching space. These plans are being examined by Education Department officers and will shortly be returned to the architects for preparation of final sketch plans incorporating some modifications before submission to the Public Works Committee. At this stage, it appears that the projected date for calling tenders of August, 1972, can be adhered to, unless difficulty is experienced in allocating funds for the project. If tenders are called in August, 1972, the new school buildings will be ready for occupation at the end of 1973.

#### PARKSIDE INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport find out whether traffic lights, which are now being installed at the intersection of Greenhill Road and George Street, Parkside, have "turn right" indicators? As such indicators have been a great success at other intersections along Greenhill Road and have reduced the number of accidents to a minimum, their installation at this intersection, by providing uniformity, will further enhance road safety.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member.

#### METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about Drain No. 18 of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Drain No. 18 is scheduled to commence construction early in November, 1971, and will take about nine months to complete. Work will begin at Wigley Reserve adjacent to the Patawalonga Basin and terminate in the drainage reserve at Beadnall Terrace, Glenelg East.

#### STOCKYARDS

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked recently about the Port Lincoln stockyards?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that, in order to provide additional covered yards at Port Lincoln for its own purposes, the Government Produce Department temporarily removed the divisions forming pens from an area which, although it is used by the Eyre Peninsula Stock Marketing Company, is not covered by a lease to that company. The General Manager of the Produce Department expresses his regret that, owing to a misunderstanding, the courtesy of prior advice of the department's intentions was not conveyed to the company. He has apologized to the company for this omission, and has requested it to submit a written proposition of its requirements additional to those covered by the original lease. This submission, when received, will be given every consideration. As the removal of the divisions was carried out on land which is not the subject of the lease to the stock marketing company, and as the dismantled material has not been damaged, the question of compensation does not arise. The General Manager of the Produce Department points out that, since the original lease agreement was executed in 1954, the company has enjoyed a number of concessions granted from time to time by the department.

#### WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, a reply to the question I asked recently regarding wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government does not intend to alter the functions of the Wheat Quotas Advisory Committee.

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister a reply to my recent question about wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the report to which the honourable member has referred was submitted to him by the Chairman of the Wheat Delivery Quotas Review Committee on certain aspects of its operations in respect of the last

wheat season. Details of the number of appeals lodged and the number upheld have been published, and certain suggestions from the committee on procedural matters involving amendments to the legislation are receiving consideration. In these circumstances, my colleague does not intend to publish the report in full. It is unfortunate that, in a press item on this matter, the Minister was incorrectly reported as stating that growers could still appeal against their 1970-71 quotas. What the Minister actually said was that "the contingency reserve and the review committee itself should continue in existence for at least another season as there were quite a number of growers who did not appeal, who should still have the opportunity to do so." Although the inaccurate report was subsequently corrected in the press, I emphasize that the time for lodging appeals against the 1970-71 quotas has expired.

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister a reply to my recent question about the transfer of wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee does not favour the transfer of quotas at this stage. No action will be taken by the Government on this matter.

#### SCHOOL LOCKERS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the provision of school lockers?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is policy that every secondary student should have a private locker. If there are insufficient lockers or if very old lockers need replacement, it is the headmaster's responsibility to order an additional supply, which is normally readily available from the Public Buildings Department. If repairs are needed to keep lockers in working order, it is up to the headmaster to refer the matter to the district building officer, or he may arrange for the work to be carried out by a private tradesman if he considers it to come within the category of urgent minor repairs. Most cases of pilfering from lockers occur because students do not ensure that their possessions are kept under lock and key at all times.

#### LAND TAX

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Deputy Premier say whether, in the revaluation of rural properties to take effect from July 1, 1971, it is planned that the values will be arranged so as to return to the State the \$1,000,000 that the Premier has said previously is required from

this source, or whether the rate will be altered to give the same return? The Premier told the House that he intended to obtain \$1,000,000 from this source. In replying to questions in the House he has been unable to say whether, at the rates that were given the House, only \$1,000,000 would have been returned from the previous valuations as at July 1, 1970, which were conveyed to property owners. For that reason, I ask the question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I understand the position at present, if the valuations that applied at July 1, 1970, had been adhered to, the return to the State Government would have been more than the \$1,000,000 that the Premier said he would require from this source. I think the return could have been at least \$250,000 more, but I am speaking from memory only. Depending on the revaluation, the Government will decide whether it will be necessary to alter the rate in order to collect only the amount that the Government has indicated it wishes to collect from this source. The Premier has given that undertaking and it will be adhered to.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister a reply to my recent question about land tax?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The question refers to land used for primary production in localities where cold and wet conditions give rise to low productivity. It has been requested that consideration be given to extending section 12c of the Land Tax Act so that such land could be given a concession. Section 12c has application in areas where the value of land used for primary production is influenced by its potential for subdivision. The section allows a concession whereby the land is currently taxed on the basis of its value only as land used for primary production, the difference in tax for a maximum period of five years becoming payable if the land is sold or if it ceases to be used for primary production. The honourable member states that the value of the land to which he refers has not been influenced by any potential for subdivision. The unimproved value assessed to the land would therefore have regard only to the value of the land as land used for primary production, and no benefit would be derived from the provisions of section 12c. The unimproved value of land is assessed on the basis of the evidence of sales occurring in the particular locality at the time of the assessment. In the localities referred to by the honourable member, it would be expected that sale prices would reflect the lower productivity of the land as may be caused by local conditions,



and land tax assessments would be based accordingly. If taxpayers consider that assessments do not take into account disabilities associated with their land they may exercise their rights of objection and appeal, and such opportunity will occur at the making of the proposed new assessment of land used for primary production, as at June 30, 1971.

Mr. EVANS: As it seems that there has been a misinterpretation of my question, will the Minister investigate this matter further? In his reply the Minister said:

The honourable member states that the value of the land to which he refers has not been influenced by any potential for subdivision.

I repeat my question of July 15, as reported on page 99 of *Hansard* as follows:

This provision was introduced originally to help people near the city who wished to stay on the land and work it as rural land by rating the land as rural land, not as, perhaps, potential subdivisional land.

I continued:

Many of them are in the water catchment area and their land has no potential now for subdivision, but in many cases the properties are valued at much more than they would be valued as if the potential for subdivision had never existed.

In other words, values had been affected originally by the potential for subdivision. Also, the import of my question was whether the section of the Act could be extended to cover areas in the wet part of the State where productivity was low but the rural crisis was high: in other words, to take the meaning of the section further than the potential for subdivisional land. Will the Minister investigate this matter?

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

#### MURRAY BRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is expected that the old buildings at the Murray Bridge High School will be used for adult education purposes in future? The report on re-establishing the Murray Bridge High School, issued by the Public Works Committee in 1969, states on page 4 that the present high school solid-construction buildings will be available for adult education classes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Off the cuff I imagine that that is the position, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### FLUORIDATION

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about fluoridating water supplies outside the metropolitan area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Departmental records show that no applications have been received from people in areas outside the metropolitan area for their water supply systems to be fluoridated.

#### GLANDORE HOME TRANSPORT

Mr. WRIGHT: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to my question of July 21 about transport at the Glandore Boys Home?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The bus previously in use at Glandore Boys Home was purchased initially by the Education Department and used as a school bus. It is no longer serviceable and further repairs would be uneconomic. Pending the acquisition of another bus, it is intended that the Superintendent will hire buses for transport of the boys on excursions. Investigations are continuing to see whether other assistance with this problem can be provided from within the department's present resources. At this stage, having regard to priorities for expenditure, it is not certain when a new bus may be purchased.

#### SWANPORT NAVIGATION

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about navigation on the Murray River at the Swanport bridge site?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During August, 1970, approval was given for the Highways Department to operate work floats in the Murray River at Swanport at the site of the proposed road bridge. Because of the necessity for the floats to be positioned accurately and without movement when drilling and probing is in progress, they were moored by means of heavy steel cables stretching across the river to each bank. Because of the hazard thus created, it was decided, in the interests of safety, to close the river to all navigation at that point. The appropriate Notice to Mariners was published in the *Advertiser*, *Murray Valley Standard* and the *Government Gazette*. Notices are erected on the river banks at the site prohibiting the passage of vessels. The latest information from the Highways Department indicates that the work will be completed by the end of this year.

## CALF FOOD

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the supply of calf food?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that earlier this year stocks of Denkavit were accumulating, and planned forward manufacture was considered adequate to meet normal demand. Since then a number of circumstances, including the following, have resulted in a temporary shortage of calf foods, not only in South Australia but also in the Eastern States. First, because of an increase in cheese sales to Japan, cheese manufacturing quotas to factories have been increased. Secondly, skim-milk powder demand for the Australian Dairy Produce Board's milk reconstitution plants in South-East Asia has also increased. Thirdly, dairy companies have been able to negotiate contracts to supply oversea countries with skim-milk powder. Fourthly, there has been an increase in the rearing of dairy beef, resulting in an increase in the demand for milk-replacers or substitute milk-based feed. All this increase in demand for milk and skim-milk powder has coincided with a marked decline in milk production during autumn and winter. Some districts report a 10 per cent to 15 per cent reduction in milk intake at factories. It is expected that adequate supplies of milk-replacer calf food will be available when milk production rises to the spring flush during September.

## SWEETS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my recent question about the sale of sweets in a form that resembles medicinal preparations?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that the similarity between some sweets and medicinal tablets and capsules is a problem that has concerned public health authorities in most countries, because of its possible influence on accidental poisoning, particularly of children. Information from the Principal Poisons Information Centre, at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, in this State indicates that about 30 per cent of the cases of accidental poisoning of children are due to tablets, with coloured tablets predominating. This pattern is very much the same in the other States and in other countries: it would seem to indicate that it is the colour of the tablets rather than the packaging or shape that is attractive to children. Colour is traditionally used in sweets, and it would be difficult and unpopular

to limit its use in such food. With pharmaceutical products, there is, too, the need to make them attractive and hence more easily given, particularly to children: flavours and colours are extensively used in most medicaments whether liquid or solid.

Pharmaceutical manufacturers have often stressed the need for the use of colour in the production of tablets, particularly as it enables accidental mixing of different products in the manufacturing processes to be readily seen. The use of colours in this way has been sanctioned in some pharmacopoeias. With the gradual introduction by the manufacturers of embossed tablets, it may be better to press for the discontinuance of the use of colour in tablets and the introduction of embossing for identification purposes, rather than to try to stop sweets looking like medicaments. The National Health and Medical Research Council has been asked to consider this matter on a national basis.

## FESTIVAL OPENING

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Deputy Premier explain to the House the reason for the apparent dual standards that appear to operate with regard to inviting official guests to South Australia? It has been widely reported that the Prime Minister of Singapore (Mr. Lee Kuan Yew) will be asked to open the 1972 Festival of Arts. This is apparently the result of discussions that have taken place between that gentleman and the Premier, during the latter's recent visit to Singapore. Although neither I nor any other member on this side has any objection whatever to Mr. Lee's visiting South Australia (we believe that there should be no discrimination against anyone), nevertheless the politics of the Singapore Government are to many people as abhorrent as are the politics of the South African Government and other Governments to other people. As his Government refused to recognize the recent visit of the Springbok rugby team (indeed, it placed many difficulties in the team's way) because of its dislike for South African politics, will the Deputy Premier say how this Government can justify inviting Mr. Lee, whose politics are also distasteful to many people in this State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I welcome the question, as it gives me the opportunity to clear up a misunderstanding that has occurred as a result of an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail*. Although I do not know whether the person responsible for the article

was flying a kite, I draw the attention of the honourable member and the Leader of the Opposition, who has had something to say about this matter—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He says something about everything.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, but I think that he will have to retract everything he has said about this matter, as will the member who has just asked the question. I refer to an article appearing on page 5 of this afternoon's paper which is headed "Festival invited Mr. Lee". The press release was conveyed to me this morning by the Chairman of the Festival of Arts (Sir James Irwin), and the article states:

The invitation to Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, Singapore's Prime Minister, to open the Adelaide Festival of Arts in March came from the Festival organization. Sir James Irwin, Chairman of the Board of Governors, said this today.

Mr. McAnaney: By whom was he directed?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The article continues:

"We decided long ago to invite him and made approaches through the proper channels to the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, and the Prime Minister, Mr. McMahon," he said. The Lord Mayor, Mr. Hayes, as Festival President, had issued the invitation in a letter taken personally to Singapore by Mr. Dunstan. "We have every reason to hope that Mr. Lee will accept although we have not officially heard from him yet," Sir James said. In his letter, Mr. Hayes said: "This Festival is being programmed substantially around the theme of the Pacific area and South-East Asia and we feel it would be particularly appropriate if you, as Prime Minister of Singapore, one of the countries to be represented at the Festival, would perform the opening function."

I hope that clears up the matter for the honourable member.

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Deputy Premier say whether, as the invitation to Mr. Lee Kuan Yew has originated from a source other than the Government, the Government intends to discriminate against Mr. Lee, because of his activities in his own country, as it discriminated against the Springboks because of their Government's activities in their country?

The SPEAKER: Order! This question is substantially the same as that asked previously. If the Deputy Premier wishes to reply, he may do so.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government is not aware that the Prime Minister of Singapore practises racial discrimination in any way.

Mr. Carnie: I didn't say that.

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

#### STRIKE LEGISLATION

Mr. HALL: In view of the reported statement that the Minister of Labour and Industry will introduce legislation to prevent employers from taking action in the civil court regarding the type of intimidation that we have recently seen against bus operators in South Australia, I ask the Minister whether he has been properly reported. But for the ability of the bus owners concerned last week to obtain the protection of the civil court in this State, I have no doubt that they would have been subjected, successfully, to intimidation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is starting to comment. Comments are strictly out of order. The Leader is allowed only to explain his question.

Mr. HALL: May I say that many people thought that the bus owners would have been subjected to intimidation. The reports conveyed to me indicate much support for the action taken by the bus operators, and they also indicate great relief that the strike was solved in that fashion.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It wasn't solved in that fashion.

Mr. HALL: It may not have been satisfactory to the Minister, but he is out of order, anyway.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister say whether the reported statement to which I have referred is a correct and fair report of his intention?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The statement is correct: we are considering inserting such a provision in the new Industrial Code. If the Leader is patient and waits for a while, he will eventually see the Bill introduced into Parliament, and he will then have the chance to debate its merits or otherwise. I point out that had the injunction order not been served by the bus proprietors on the union the strike would not have occurred.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The proposed legislation is one step towards trying to avoid strikes that the Government believes is necessary. I point out that similar action has been taken by the Liberal Government in Queensland and that similar provisions exist in that State, preventing civil action against unions being taken in the Supreme Court. We are considering introducing legislation similar to the Queensland provisions.

## BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether further progress has been made on widening that part of Brighton Road extending from Dunrobin Road north towards Glenelg? When I asked a similar question last March, the Minister replied, in part, that the laying of a new water main along Brighton Road from Seacliff to Glenelg was being investigated.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope the honourable member is not suggesting that we should go on building the road and then allow the Engineering and Water Supply Department to come along and tear it up in order to install a water main. I think he will appreciate that every precaution must be taken before road-works are commenced.

Mr. Mathwin: It depends on how many years—

The SPEAKER: Order! There must be only one question at a time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It matters little who is involved: if the road had to be dug up at some future stage, I hope all members would agree that all the necessary work should be done before the road is built in the first place.

Mr. Mathwin: But what if it takes—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member is anxious to obtain further information on the matter, I shall be only too delighted to help him by bringing down that information for him.

## LERP

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister for Conservation a reply to the question I asked on July 15 about lerp?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Having discussed this matter with the Minister of Agriculture and the Conservator of Forests, I am informed that the lerp insect is widespread in the South-East and is attacking red gum, blue gum and pink gum. The insect is native and attacks have been reported on gum trees over many years. The trees normally recover unless the damage is very severe and other insects join in and attack the weakened trees. The clearing which has taken place in the Upper South-East in recent years also tends to accentuate the damage caused by the insect. Lerp attack fluctuates from year to year depending on the season. The insect is freely parasited and this usually constitutes a natural control. The Conservator considers that it would not be practicable or economical to control heavy attacks by artificial means over any large area.

## EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. McANANEY: Last week, Mr. Speaker, you permitted me to ask the Minister of Education a question. However, I was not satisfied with the Minister's reply, so I ask my question again. Can the Minister explain why the sum spent on education last financial year increased by only 20 per cent, whereas the sum received by South Australia from the Commonwealth Government by way of taxation reimbursement and other grants amounted to \$159,500,000, compared to \$128,800,000 the year before, an increase of 24 per cent? Will the Minister also explain why he criticized the previous Government for retaining in the Loan Fund about \$14,000,000 that he claimed should have been spent on school buildings?

The SPEAKER: Although I allowed some latitude last week, I will not permit it to be abused, because that is not the right attitude for honourable members to adopt. I am not going to continue to permit the same question to be asked twice. Does the Minister wish to reply? He does not have to.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It disturbs me, first, that the honourable member has used figures that he has not explained in detail. I presume that he must be including the grant made to the State by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. I presume also that he is aware that the Commonwealth Government opposed the commission's making that grant to South Australia, and I should like to know what justice he sees in including that provision. However, I point out that overall Government revenues did not increase by 24 per cent and that the position in relation to any one item in the Budget must be judged in terms of the overall revenue position. I also point out that tax reimbursement grants from the Commonwealth Government increased by 17 per cent—less than the increase in education expenditure. Regarding 1970-71 compared to 1969-70, the sum received in aid for teachers colleges, science laboratories, Commonwealth libraries and technical colleges was about \$1,000,000 less, and no doubt the member has not bothered to take that into account either. To my knowledge the 20 per cent increase in expenditure on recurring items is an all-time record; the increase in school-building expenditure is also a record; and the \$17,900,000 spent on school buildings last financial year has never been matched previously in the history of the State. The honourable member should make sure that his figures are accurate, and he should also take into account the overall revenue position and give credit where credit is due.

### SCHOOL CLOSURES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether he intends to close any public schools at the beginning of the 1972 scholastic year? If he does, how long will it be before the members in whose districts the schools are to be closed will be told? The Minister will no doubt appreciate the situation that unfolded last year. He told us earlier that he would inform members of his intentions in this regard. As we are now past the half-way mark for this year, and as this matter is causing concern to schoolmasters and parent bodies who recall what happened last year, it is imperative that we know fairly soon.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In a reply I gave earlier this afternoon, I said that I would look into the problem raised by the member for Kavel regarding the Vine Vale school. In the course of looking into that case, I will also investigate this matter and try to give the honourable member a general time table to be followed.

### NORTH ADELAIDE BRIDGE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the footbridge at the North Adelaide railway station?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Railways Commissioner reports that it became apparent some time ago that substantial work would be required on this footbridge, but before taking any action in this regard a census was taken of persons using it between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. on three consecutive days. The usage varied from 26 to 36 persons a day, the maximum in any one hour being 11. In the light of this small usage, the footbridge was closed. Since that decision was taken, a further circumstance has arisen, namely, the likely agreement between the State and Commonwealth Governments to provide a standard gauge railway from Adelaide to the East-West network. This work, which will be carried out within the next few years, will necessitate demolition of this footbridge.

### POLICE PAYMENTS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about payments to members of the Police Force during the recent moratorium demonstration?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The additional cost in penalty payments for members of the Police Force concerned in the direct policing of demonstrations since September 18, 1970, to date is \$16,650.

There is no evidence that the overall rate of crime increased when demonstrations were held, although detective police were held in reserve and prepared should any such contingency have arisen. On June 30, 1971, 34 commissioned officers, 92 sergeants and 755 constables were directly employed in the policing of the demonstrations, and four commissioned officers, four sergeants and 52 constables were from country regions. In addition, 162 police cadets were used in the security of police buildings and to replace police officers brought in from suburban stations, etc.

### TRASH RACK

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Works say what progress is being made in regard to the erection of a trash rack at the Sturt Creek entrance to the Patawalonga Basin? During the past month, because of the heavy winter rain considerable household rubbish and debris has come down the Sturt Creek into the Patawalonga Basin: I understand that, before the bare-foot water ski championships on the Patawalonga Lake began recently, members of the organization concerned waded through the lake, discovering a 44-gallon drum, an old refrigerator, and several drink cans and bottles floating in the lake which could have caused serious injury. In view of the serious pollution of the Patawalonga Basin and the Sturt Creek, can the installation of a trash rack be speeded up?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have a look at the matter.

### HILLS BRIDGES

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when work will be completed on the bridges over the Hills Freeway at Verdun and Carey Gully? A letter from a constituent of mine states that the Carey Gully bridge was to have been finished in July, 1971, but that there has been no work on that bridge for some time. I am worried about this because this constituent has made the following suggestion:

To this end it might help for you to borrow some of the gelignite that is going to waste on the neglected bridge site which, with a little judicious emplacement, might evoke some results in the right place.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable Minister wish to reply?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In the first part of his question the honourable member asked for information, which I shall be pleased to

obtain. Officers of the Highways Department and I will disregard the final comments of the honourable member's constituent; I am sure they are not supported by the honourable member.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Deputy Premier say how many members of the Public Service Board investigation team have academic qualifications?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Does the honourable member mean the policy secretariat of the Premier's Department?

Dr. EASTICK: The Public Service Board investigating officers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain that information.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Attorney-General expedite a reply to my question about justices of the peace, which I raised with him in a letter? I raised this matter on behalf of the Royal Association of Justices and in conjunction with the member for Gilles, who is also interested in it. Does the Attorney know that this request was made to him about six or seven weeks ago?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall try to obtain the answer.

#### FIRE BRICKS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about fire bricks?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has asked me to express his thanks to the honourable member for his observations on the danger of fire bricks. He is already having an analysis made of the material used in the preparation of these bricks to determine the degree of flammability, and the matter will be submitted to the Bush Fires Advisory Committee for its consideration. My colleague points out, however, that, while the provisions of the Bush Fires Act have been invoked in the past to prohibit the sale of certain types of highly flammable matches and to prevent the use of ignitable wadding in firearms, it is neither practicable nor desirable to prohibit the sale of all materials and substances which may be dangerous in irresponsible hands but which, if properly used with reasonable precautions, are basically safe.

#### RECOVERY GROUPS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to my recent question about financial assistance for recovery groups?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Cabinet has approved a grant of \$3,000 being placed on the Estimates for Recovery Groups (South Australia) to assist in meeting the salary of a full-time organizing secretary.

#### INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Deputy Premier tell the House what the Government is doing to improve industrial relations in South Australia? It has been espoused commonly around Adelaide that the trade union movement, during this year, is taking and will continue to take action to implement its objectives and ambitions.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commenting, not explaining his question. The honourable member sought leave to explain his question, not to comment.

Mr. VENNING: I am explaining what is being espoused around Adelaide.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot—

Mr. VENNING: Next year—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Deputy Premier desire to reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I must admit that I am a little vague about the question.

Mr. Venning: I was explaining it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I understand the question, the honourable member asks what the Government is doing to improve industrial relations in South Australia.

Mr. Venning: That is right.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member went on to explain or try to explain exactly why he had asked the question. In reply, I want to say that this Government is anxious, as any Government would be, to move continually towards improved industrial relations in the State. I consider that many of the problems that face the Government or the State industrially have been brought about primarily by lack of dialogue between trade union officials and employers, and I should be pleased to see (as the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council suggested, I think only yesterday) an improved relationship in this area. The Government will give any encouragement that it can give, because I consider that is one area in which we can seek and find some improvement. I hope that the legislation the present Government has introduced in the past and will introduce in future will also lead to an improvement in industrial relations in the State. The Government is looking constantly at ways and means

to improve this relationship, and it will do everything in its power to see that the relationship is improved.

#### BURNSIDE RUBBISH DUMP

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister for Conservation have an investigation made into the Burnside rubbish dump, which is perpetually polluting the surrounding area? It is claimed that, last summer, sparks from the dump caused a big fire in the hills. I do not know whether this matter is under the jurisdiction of the Minister, but the problem caused by noxious weeds in the national parks around the eastern foothills also is a big worry to primary producers in these areas. Will the Minister try to have these noxious weeds cleared up before the coming summer?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I assume the honourable member is speaking of the Belair National Park.

Mr. McAnaney: No, the Cleland Reserve as well, and all the areas close to it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the matter examined to ascertain the position in those two areas. Regarding the part of the question dealing with the Burnside rubbish dump, I shall be pleased to have this matter examined also. I point out that the burning of rubbish in dumps is causing problems for most councils concerned, and the State Planning Authority has set up a committee to consider the problems of garbage waste disposal in South Australia, having regard to the matter of finding areas to dump rubbish and also having regard to the problems in areas where the rubbish is burnt. I shall be pleased to examine both aspects of the question for the honourable member.

#### TEACHER RESIGNATIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education tell the House the number of resignations from the department in the first six months of 1971 and in the same period in 1970?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain the precise figures for the honourable member, but at the end of May the number of resignations was down compared with last year. I think the reduction at that time was about 75. In the last figures I saw there was a similar reduction to the end of June.

Mr. McAnaney: Will you get the percentage of resignations to the total?

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The percentage to the total at this time of the year is small, but I will get that information.

#### KEITH BY-PASS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say what proposals are in hand to upgrade the by-pass where it leaves Dukes Highway (Highway No. 8) at Keith and joins the Mount Charles Road? This road has recently been a forest of signs, and I understand that the Minister has corrected that. However, the fast flowing traffic from Adelaide and from Melbourne causes confusion to the driver of a car turning into the by-pass and creates a highly dangerous situation. Many accidents, one of which was fatal, have occurred there. As I understand the Minister's department considers that there is a need to hasten the solving of this problem, will he ascertain when action is to be taken?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain information about this corner, but from my knowledge I doubt that there is any urgency about the situation. Indeed, I would stick my neck out and say that, if people travelled at a normal speed, there would be no danger at this corner.

Mr. Rodda: It is not a straight road.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is a junction, and I understand that this is where the problem exists.

Mr. Rodda: My question related—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When we read the *Hansard* pull we may get a clearer indication of the position but, if we cannot, I will obtain further information from the honourable member before getting for him the reply he seeks.

#### UPPER GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain what is the present programme for the possible reconstruction of the upper Greenhill Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to do so.

#### THEVENARD HARBOUR

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When is dredging expected to be completed at Thevenard harbour?
2. When completed, what will the depth of water be in the channel?
3. What will be the maximum size of vessels able to berth at Thevenard?
4. Is any further work planned for deepening of the Thevenard channel?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. All the soft dredging will be completed by the end of September, 1971, and all the rock dredging should be completed by the end of December, 1971.
2. The depth of the new channel will be declared at 27ft. L.W.
3. It will be 22,000 dead-weight tons.
4. No.

#### POLDA-KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many miles of the Polda-Kimba main have been completed to date?
2. How many miles are scheduled to be completed this financial year?
3. When is it expected to be completed?
4. How many men are at present working on this project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 34 miles 3,200ft.
2. Eleven miles.
3. The approved scheme is programmed to be completed in December, 1974.
4. Twenty men.

#### COOBER PEDY COURTHOUSE

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What stage have plans reached for the building of a courthouse at Coober Pedy?
2. What type of building is expected to be erected?
3. What provision will be made for single staff quarters in the building?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Sketch plans and estimates have been completed.
2. All buildings are to be metal-clad transportable units.
3. Provision has been made for single-staff quarters in air-conditioned transportable units containing six bedrooms, kitchen, dining, living, ablution, and laundry facilities.

#### ROAD MAINTENANCE

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How much was collected under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act for the financial year 1970-71?
2. How many people were employed in the operation of this Act as at June 30, 1971?
3. How much did it cost to administer this Act for the abovementioned period?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. \$2,957,526.
2. 39 clerical officers and 39 inspectors and assistants.
3. \$245,309.

#### FLINDERS HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Why has the Highways Department stopped construction of the Flinders Highway between Talia and Streaky Bay?
2. When will construction of this section recommence?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Work on the reconstruction and sealing of the section of the Flinders Highway between Talia and Streaky Bay has not yet commenced. The work, therefore, has not stopped as suggested by the honourable member.
2. It is expected that commencement (not recommencement) of work on this section of the Flinders Highway will be made late in the current financial year.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Extensions to Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Laboratories at Mount Gambier Hospital,  
Road Safety Instruction Centre, Marion.  
Ordered that reports be printed.

#### PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

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

That Standing Order 83 be so far suspended for the remainder of the session as to enable the Parliamentary Counsel and his Assistant to be accommodated with seats in the Chamber on the right-hand side of the Speaker.

Motion carried.

#### CARRICK HILL VESTING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 22. Page 297.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): As I understand that there is some urgency in regard to passing this Bill, I am happy to help the Government in this respect. I am sure that the purpose of the Bill, as set out in the relatively short but concise second reading explanation, will meet with the approval of all members; indeed, we are deeply grateful



to Sir Edward Hayward and the late Lady Hayward for their magnificent gift to the people of South Australia in the form of this most desirable property. I think that all who know Sir Edward know how much time, effort and pride have been put into developing this property, and it is a magnificent gesture that this is now to become the property of the State.

I commend the Government for introducing the Bill and for the obvious spirit of co-operation in which it has carried out the negotiations with Sir Edward Hayward with a view to incorporating the technical details in the Bill and making this gift possible. I note that in the second reading explanation the Deputy Premier said that the deed provided that Carrick Hill could be used as a home for the Governor, as a museum, an art gallery, or as a botanic garden, although according to the Bill itself the residence is defined particularly as a residence for the Governor. The Bill therefore has two major aspects: the first relates to accepting this gift; and the second is what appears to be a change of policy regarding the use of this property as a residence for the Governor. I should like the Deputy Premier to comment on the deliberate reference in clause 4 regarding a residence for the Governor, or to say whether the property may be used for the other purposes referred to in the second reading explanation.

I think I would be unfair if I were to criticize the Government on this matter until I received further information. However, at this stage I believe that the Governor's residence should be located on its present site, for I believe that the convenience of the Governor and of those in government, as well as others, who have business at Government House is best served if the residence remains at its present location. As I will have the opportunity to develop that point further in Committee, I shall appreciate definite information on this matter from the Deputy Premier when he closes the second reading debate. Although it is stated in the second reading explanation that this is a hybrid Bill that will be referred to a Select Committee, I understand that the Government has changed its mind and decided that it is not now a hybrid Bill.

This Government has been in office only about a year and, as we have often said in the House, it is not a perfect Government, but I will not develop that theme at this stage, especially as both Parties are in accord regarding the acceptance of this magnificent gift. Although it is a matter of small moment, I

merely draw the Deputy Premier's attention to the fact that his Administration has yet again changed its mind. I heartily support the Bill, with the one reservation that I believe is separate from and independent of the acceptance of this gift: I must have further information on the Government's intention regarding the use of this property as a Governor's residence.

The SPEAKER: Since the Leader of the Opposition has referred to the fact that the Government has apparently decided that this is not now a hybrid Bill, I point out, as Speaker, that it is not the Government's function to determine that matter. I rule that the Carrick Hill Vesting Bill is a public Bill and not a hybrid Bill as defined in Joint Standing Orders (Private Bills) No. 2. Its reference to a Select Committee, after its second reading, is therefore not mandatory.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill, and my remarks will be along similar lines to the remarks of the Leader. I note that you have ruled, Mr. Speaker, that the reference of this Bill to a Select Committee is not mandatory. The Deputy Premier said that it was a hybrid Bill—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No, I didn't. You might have read it, but I didn't say it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I know what is in *Hansard*. When I read *Hansard*, I assume that the remark in question has been made.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I accept what appears in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter can be cleared up when the Minister speaks. However, you, Mr. Speaker, have said that the Bill's reference to a Select Committee is not mandatory, but the Minister is reported as having said that the measure must be referred to a Select Committee. I am wondering whether, when the Minister gets up and denies that he ever said it, he will tell us whether or not he intends to exercise an option in regard to referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

I heartily commend the gesture of Sir Edward Hayward and the late Lady Hayward in making this property available for the purposes set out in the second reading explanation. I assume the Minister is correctly reported in *Hansard* as having said that Carrick Hill could be used as a home for the Governor, as a museum, an art gallery or as a botanic garden. However, I note that clause 4, referring to the use of Carrick Hill as a

residence for the Governor, provides for no alternative uses.

I am wondering whether supporting the Bill will be interpreted as supporting a move to transfer the site of Government House to Carrick Hill. That decision should be taken when Carrick Hill becomes available and not before. I support the Leader, who said that the present Government House is an adequate and proper place for the Governor to occupy. Much attention has been given to that fine old residence which, in spite of its age and its extreme value to the State, is necessarily costly to maintain. However, it will have to be maintained by the State in any circumstances whether or not the Governor lives there, because no-one will stand by while it is allowed to deteriorate further. It is difficult enough to keep it in its present condition. In these circumstances, it is proper that the Governor should live where he now lives. There is nothing wrong with the site. Government House is traditional, which means something at any rate to many people and, what is more, it is convenient. I cannot imagine the Governor being more conveniently situated anywhere else in the metropolitan area.

At present, the Governor has two residences: one in North Terrace and one at Victor Harbour. It will be admirable if Carrick Hill becomes the Governor's residence, but if the Bill is passed it should not be taken that we are deciding that the Governor should eventually vacate the present Government House. If what I am saying is supported by the House, I believe it would be proper for us to oppose clause 4, which would mean that it would remove the obligation for Carrick Hill to be maintained as the Governor's residence. The deed provides for certain alternative purposes for which Carrick Hill may be used and, if clause 4 were deleted, its use would be controlled by the terms of the deed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Clause 4 specifically provides that, on the death of Sir Edward Hayward, the Government shall use Carrick Hill as the Governor's residence. I do not think it would have been right or proper to accept the gift without having first of all considered the uses to which Carrick Hill could be put, and informing the House what the Government considered was its best use. As expressed in the documents signed by Sir Edward Hayward and the late Lady Ursula Hayward, Carrick Hill was to be used for the purpose set out in the Bill or for one or more

of certain purposes, bearing in mind that 96 acres of land goes with the magnificent residence.

The Government felt obliged to indicate to the House its thinking on the use to which the residence should be put. Clause 4 specifies that on and after the day on which Carrick Hill is vested in the Crown the Government shall hold and maintain it as the Governor's residence. I say that, because the Leader asked that I spell it out on the Government's behalf. Regarding my second reading explanation of the Bill, as reported in *Hansard*, the sentence that included reference to the Bill as being a hybrid Bill was struck out in the copy that I read. Unfortunately, *Hansard's* copy had not been so treated, but I will have the report of my speech corrected in the annual volume. As a result of a conference with the Speaker and with the Clerk, it was decided that the Bill was not a hybrid Bill; therefore, it will not be referred to a Select Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Carrick Hill to be held and maintained as a residence for the Governor."

Mr. HALL (Leader of Opposition): I am disappointed that the Government should make a decision by such a back-door method. There are no plans of which I know for vacating Government House at present. No statement has been made outlining the reasons for the possible change of site of Government House. This would be a decision of some moment. The change of site of Government House will not immediately affect thousands of people, but it will make significant changes as years go by in the convenience of the Governor, of his work in the community, and of those who go to Government House for any reason. The site of Government House is also a matter of pride for many citizens. Therefore, the Government is taking an important decision without saying why. The conditions of the gift do not insist that Carrick Hill be used as a Government House, so that this is the Government's choice. The Deputy Premier has given insufficient reason for this decision. It would be rather unseemly to have a long debate on this Bill; I hope the Government did not include this clause in the Bill merely to stifle debate on this matter. From my experience and from the information I have, I do not agree with the Government's decision; my general approval of the Bill does not mean that I approve of this clause. I urge the Government to reconsider its decision, and at least

to make a clear statement of policy before this clause is passed.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This Government should not make decisions that will bind future Governments. We hope that Sir Edward Hayward will be spared for many years. As this property will not vest in the Crown until the death of Sir Edward and in the light of other provisions in the Bill, it may be a completely academic argument whether or not the Governor's residence is moved to Carrick Hill. Therefore, it is unnecessary for us to argue the merits of moving the Governor's place of residence at present. The deed allows the ground and property to be used as a Governor's residence, a museum, an art gallery, or botanical gardens. Because of the definition in clause 2, if clause 4 is passed the whole 96 acres of this magnificent property will be maintained as a residence for the Governor; under the terms of the Bill, it cannot be used for other purposes referred to in the deed. It is unnecessary for us to restrict ourselves in this way. Other provisions in the Bill take care of the generous donation of the Hayward family. I believe that the present Government House is suitable for the Governor at present, although I do not say it will always be suitable. The time to consider moving the Governor is when it is appropriate to move him, and not before then.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Had the Government not specified what it intended for this property, I am certain that one of the first questions raised by members opposite would have been about what we intended. The Government believed that, when asking Parliament to support this Bill, it should say what it intended to do with the property and, after much consideration, it decided that it should be used as a future residence for the Governor. I do not argue that the present residence of the Governor is eminently suitable for that purpose, but I believe Carrick Hill is also eminently suitable. I believe many South Australians would agree with me that the opening of the present Government House grounds for the use of the public would be extremely desirable. It is not that we will destroy the building; that can be put to extremely good use as well. I suggest that, in view of the modern transport facilities now available, it will be no problem for His Excellency to move to and from Carrick Hill.

If I ever happened to be Governor (and I do not think that is likely), I would much prefer to reside at Carrick Hill than at the existing site, as Carrick Hill is away from the

noise of traffic and the hustle and bustle of the city. I cannot think of a better use for Carrick Hill than as a Governor's residence. Although other uses for the property were stipulated by Sir Edward and Lady Hayward, I know that it is Sir Edward's desire that, if possible, the property should be used as a Governor's residence. I do not say that to influence members, and I do not suggest that, it is the only factor that has been considered by the Government: I think that the main factor affecting the Government's decision is the tremendous advantage it will be to the people of South Australia (and we do not know when this may be possible) if we can open the magnificent grounds of the existing Government House, using the building for another purpose.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot stress too strongly that we hope that this decision will not have to be taken for many years. Therefore, we should not be asked to take that decision now. By including clause 4, we are virtually ensuring that Government House shall be moved to Carrick Hill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's right, and it's the right decision.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Education is entitled to speak, but he should not do so from his chair. We are deciding what a future Government is to do, and that is wrong in principle. Has the Deputy Premier considered the wonderful value to the public of the alternative use of Carrick Hill as a botanic garden, museum, or art gallery, all of which are mentioned in the deed? The Government is trying to restrict the use to only one purpose, and I ask what will happen about the future maintenance of Government House, whether it will be kept on a basis that the Governor will have to leave it without much notice, or on the basis that it will be used as a residence in which the Governor can stay.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have spoken but for the unmannerly interjection by the Minister of Education, who has made clear that Carrick Hill is to be our Government House. I cannot agree with that. We hope that Sir Edward will not die for many years and that he will be able to live at Carrick Hill in the meantime. It is wrong for Parliament now to bind a future Parliament. The deed contemplates several alternative uses for Carrick Hill and, when the Government became a party to the deed, it acknowledged those. However, about a year later it is opting for one use and will not consider the

alternatives, such as a museum, art gallery, or botanic gardens. By doing that, the Government wants to bind a future Parliament, but we know that one Parliament cannot bind its successors on ordinary matters, although it can perhaps do so on constitutional matters where entrenchment clauses are involved. Circumstances may be entirely different in the future and Carrick Hill may be inappropriate as a site for Government House. We should wait until Sir Edward dies before making a decision.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran (teller), Crimes, Curren, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman (teller), Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5, preamble and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 22. Page 306.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): In supporting the motion, I voice the usual expression of loyalty, and I offer condolences to the relatives of those who have passed away. Sir Collier Cudmore and Mr. Rowe were known to me; Sir Norman Jude, who has retired, has the blessing of us all; and all of these gentlemen lived in my district. I congratulate the new Chairman of Committees and wish him well, although I do not know how the Public Works Committee will perform without him. As I have often said in this House (and I believe), it is about time we returned to the good old-fashioned principle of honesty.

Mr. Harrison: No educated guesses!

Mr. COUMBE: Integrity, fair dealings, and forthrightness may be considered old-fashioned and out of date by some people, but I firmly believe that these principles are essential to the tenets of democratic and responsible government. Members should be as vigorous as possible during debate in expressing their points of view, and this is a fundamental right of every member. However, this Government has

repeatedly made statements or given evasive replies, actions that do not show it as a responsible Government. Also, it has failed to produce information when requested to do so. Its actions are no credit to itself or to the institution of Parliament.

Members have been pressing for some time to obtain from the Government (and, in particular, the Minister of Roads and Transport) an indication of the road policy for the metropolitan area over the next few decades. We know the history of this matter going back to the 1962 plan, the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, and the Breuning report, and perhaps the Minister during his recent trip abroad may have seen many projects which will be of interest to this State and which he is anxious to introduce. We have heard much about the benefits of freeways or high-speed corridors, of the technology of the dial-a-bus system and the new methods of transport that may or may not be adopted, and we have been told much about the underground railway to be constructed under King William Street. Probing by the Opposition (and I am sure I speak on behalf of some Government members) has not yet been able to obtain a clear indication of the Government's thinking on this important matter.

It is important, not only to members but also to our constituents and the general public who reside in the city, in the metropolitan area, or elsewhere in the State. What action the Government takes in this matter will affect everyone in South Australia for many years, not only those who travel but also those who are taxpayers. However, I believe that people living in the metropolitan area (and elsewhere, for that matter) are confused about the Government's plans, and they are necessarily concerned at the future, whether they be travellers or owners of real estate. They do not know what the Government will do. The motorist does not know what is the future for our road system; the householder, who may live on an intended freeway route, is not sure whether his property is to be acquired, and neither does the person living near a suggested freeway. Industries may wish to be sited near a prospective freeway or high-speed corridor, but no information is available. I plead with the Government (and I think it is a fair plea) to be frank with the House and the people of this State by issuing a broad statement of its road policy for metropolitan Adelaide. Many people would be relieved to hear that statement, whether they agreed with it or not.

The other aspect to which I refer is that of finance. We have heard repeatedly during this debate from Government members (and we also hear almost daily from Ministers either here or outside) that the Commonwealth Government is to blame for the present Government's financial position. I invite members to study the financial results contained in His Excellency's Speech, because this is an official statement of the Government. The Speech states that the Revenue Budget presented to Parliament last year forecast a deficit of \$4,900,000, but that the Government would record a small surplus of \$21,000.

Apart from receipts from State taxation, this is the result of increased grants from the Commonwealth Government, as the statutory financial grants were much higher than were expected, apart from the grants from the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Therefore, it is the Commonwealth Government that has helped this State out of its mess, although the State Government and its supporters blame the Commonwealth Government for everything that has happened.

Leaving the Revenue Account to one side, let us look at the Loan Account, which, having been increased in the last year by \$1,780,000, now stands at about \$14,000,000 in credit. I remember vividly, when seated on the other side, being castigated by members of the present Government (then in Opposition), particularly by the present Premier and the Minister of Education, because we had \$12,000,000 in the kitty and were saving it for a rainy day. How does the Minister of Education equate the present situation with his previous remarks and with all his bleatings about what was happening in regard to education?

I had the pleasure of initiating the survey undertaken into the education needs of this State, but we find that as members we do not always get the reports to which we are entitled. When Minister of Works, I had the pleasure of setting up the committee to report on South Australia's water resources up until about the year 2000. I know (and the Minister has admitted) that the report of this committee was presented to the present Government shortly after it came into office and, although this committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Bennett (formerly of Whyalla), carried out an important exercise, its report has not yet been tabled. I have frequently asked the Minister to table the report, but his answer is "No", and the report has now been in his hands for about 14 months. Another com-

mittee was the one set up to inquire into the incident of water rating in South Australia and to see whether a more equitable system could be evolved (following many complaints that had been received) and whether the system could be based, wholly or in part, on payment according to the quantity of water used, as well as according to the assessed value.

However, although we have asked for that report, the answer is "No", and it has not been presented to Parliament; it is being assessed by the department, and goodness knows when we will see that document. Further, what has happened to the Mander-Jones report on libraries? My predecessor as Minister of Education (Mrs. Stee'le) initiated an inquiry into the library systems in South Australia, to be undertaken on his retirement by Mr. Mander-Jones, a former Director-General of Education and a competent officer. This report was presented to me about one week before the last election (about 14 months ago), and I have asked what will happen about it. Other members, too, have asked about it, but we have not yet heard what will happen in this regard. The report, having been presented to me, was subsequently tabled, but we have not heard one word about what will happen in this respect. This subject is of great interest throughout the State, and many people gave evidence to the committee.

During the Address in Reply debate members traditionally receive an opportunity to sound off (if I can use a colloquialism); they can speak on any subject they wish, if they make a fleeting reference to the Speech, and I hope private members are never denied this opportunity for, as we all know, private members have few opportunities to have a grouch session, as it is known in the Commonwealth Parliament. When dealing with other measures, members must keep to the matter before the Chair and, although I have heard some wild and woolly speeches in this debate, I would defend the right of private members to have an opportunity, as I say, to sound off.

I have read His Excellency's Speech at great length; at first glance, it looked good, but as I started to look at it more closely I became more concerned, and I find that my concern is justified. I can liken this Speech to the modern glossy magazine: it has a flashy cover promising the world, but when it is opened and read one is sadly disappointed and let down badly.

The Speech refers to the Industries Development Act and to what will happen in that regard; to the agencies that have been set up

in various parts; and to the Housing Trust expansion, and so on. I notice also a reference to metric conversion, and here I point out that in some States weights and measures are administered by the department of the Minister of Labour and Industry, and not by the Lands Department. References are made in the Speech to community work, industrial matters and education, and I must agree with all those references. But what about the great construction and development departments of this State? What about those departments that have developed the State's resources in the past to such an extent that we can now establish industries in and attract industries to this State?

I refer here to the Electricity Trust, which is usually referred to but to which no reference is made in the Speech. What about the Marine and Harbors Department? The Engineering and Water Supply Department is referred to, for the Speech states that during the current financial year work on improving the State's water supplies will be continued and some new projects commenced. The Government intends to extend and improve the sewerage system. However, the Speech goes further regarding the Marine and Harbors Department, in which the member for Eyre and the member for Flinders are interested. It states:

My Government intends introducing amendments to the Harbors Act and Marine Act to raise the penalties for offences under those Acts.

That is all it says about the development of the State by these big departments. What about hospitals and health services? There is not one word in the Speech about the hospitals which we hope to build and which we are building in the State. No doubt the Chief Secretary is feeling a bit sour about this. What about local government, the third tier, that essential part of government in this country, and the Highways Department and the roads programme? There is not a word about them. I can only assume that the Minister must still have been away when the Speech was written, because I am sure he would have had some say in having something put in the Speech.

There is nothing about the M.A.T.S. Report or the Breuning Report or about what the public road system in the metropolitan area will be. The public is upset, and there is much disquiet on this subject. What about the great rural problems? They are largely ignored. The Speech mentions oats, timber and citrus.

Mr. Clark: That is most unusual!

Mr. COUNBE: I have read and heard almost as many Opening Speeches as my colleague has. No doubt, he will recall that most of the departments to which I have referred are notable by their omission from the Speech. What they will do or what they have done is usually referred to in the Speech, irrespective of the Party or Government. Some interesting points have been made by speakers in this debate. I recall the member for Playford giving a dissertation on his views on how the State's industrial legislation should be amended and improved. I was interested to hear him say that he came out firmly against collective bargaining. I do not know what he will say to Mr. Hawke, who told me when I was a Minister that he was in favour of collective bargaining. Mr. Hawke looked good in the picture of him taken in Red Square, Moscow.

Mr. Langley: You're jealous of his ability.

Mr. COUNBE: I am jealous, am I? The *Sydney Morning Herald*, reporting the comments of Mr. Allan Fraser, Labor member of the House of Representatives, stated:

Labor Party members were worried also when he accused Mr. Hawke of taking over the role of the Prime Minister. Mr. Hawke may be a clever trade-union advocate, but he is over-stepping his position. He is becoming a heavy load for the Labor Party to carry into the next elections.

What did Mr. Fraser say about Parliament? Government members know how long Mr. Fraser has been in the Labor movement and in the Commonwealth Parliament. He said:

It is the difference between the law and taking the law into your own hands, a dangerous path to which no-one can tell the end.

That is what he thinks of Mr. Hawke. The member for Playford was talking about collective bargaining.

Mr. Gunn: He was against it.

Mr. COUNBE: So am I. Some interesting moves have been made on the national sphere during the last week or two.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Gorton could tell you about it, too.

Mr. COUNBE: I have read what Mr. Whitlam had to say about Professor Arndt. Is the professor still a member of the Party? Honourable members know that he was one of the Labor Party's back-room boys for many years and that he advised so many Labor leaders. In fact, he wrote the speeches of many of them.

Mr. Jennings: Don't be silly.

Mr. Clark: Opposition members should get someone like him to do the same for them.

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Ross Smith was about to disown the professor a moment ago. We all know that last week the professor said that he had resigned from the Labor Party because of Mr. Whitlam's behaviour in China. He continued:

I have decided to resign because I regard Mr. Whitlam's behaviour in his interviews with Mr. Chou as, in every respect, contrary to Australia's national interests. With a naivety astonishing in someone who hopes to be Australia's Prime Minister, he gave away in advance every bargaining counter Australia has in future negotiations with China.

That attack on Mr. Whitlam was probably one of the most damaging to Mr. Whitlam and to the Labor Party in the national sphere for some years. If honourable members are not satisfied with that, I remind them of what happened in Queensland last Saturday when two by-elections were won by the L.C.P. Government. One seat had been held by Labor for about 39 years, the other seat had been held by the Government Party, which increased its majority. Government members cannot laugh that one away. The minute I mention something uncomfortable to them, they come up with a nice little red herring, hoping that I will bite on it. They do not like it. Recently, I asked the Minister of Labour and Industry for unemployment figures, which he gave me, and the following day the Deputy Premier gave me additional figures. At the end of June, 1970, 1.23 per cent of the estimated work force was registered as unemployed. This compares with 1.52 per cent for this month, and represents a rise of 25 per cent for the year. I recall what happened during the term of office of the Walsh and Dunstan Labor Governments from 1965 to 1968 regarding unemployment in this State.

Mr. Hoggood: And elsewhere.

Mr. COUMBE: I vividly remember the situation at the time, when many skilled tradesmen, particularly in the building industry, were leaving South Australia to go to other States, particularly Western Australia. We found then that our work force fell and our unemployment figures rose.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That was general throughout Australia at that time.

Mr. COUMBE: Although there was an increase throughout Australia at the time, I am making the point that it was most marked in South Australia, and that workers left this State to go to other States to find work, which

they could not obtain here. What are the present and past unemployment figures for South Australia?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What are they for Australia as a whole?

Mr. COUMBE: I will give the percentage figures, and the Minister for Conservation, who was formerly the Minister of Labour and Industry, will find that the South Australian figures are well above the Australian average. I have taken these figures from the bulletins of the Bureau of Census and Statistics for the financial years ending June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1971. At June 30, 1965, which was just after the Playford Government left office, 3,533 persons were unemployed in this State. During the next three years, when the Walsh and Dunstan Labor Governments were in office, unemployment figures rose from 3,533 in 1965 to 7,357 in 1966, to 8,484 in 1967, and to 8,359 in 1968. Just prior to June, 1968, the Hall Liberal and Country League Government assumed office, and at June 30, 1969, the unemployment figure fell to 6,300, and in June, 1970, only 6,360 persons were unemployed. Just before June, 1970, the Dunstan Labor Government assumed office, and the number of unemployed persons at June 30 this year increased to 7,975. I sincerely hope that we are not to see a repeat of what happened previously.

I will now give the percentage of the work force registered as unemployed in South Australia in those years. In June, 1966, 1.57 per cent of the work force was registered as unemployed; in June, 1967, the figure was 1.74 per cent; in June, 1968, it was 1.69 per cent; in June, 1969, it was 1.25 per cent; in June, 1970, it was 1.23 per cent; and in June, 1971, it was 1.52 per cent. These figures show that the big reductions in unemployment were in the years of the L.C.L. Government between 1968 and 1970. The point I make is that a Government must have the complete confidence of the people of the State when it introduces legislation; it must build up confidence in the investing public, workers, employers and other inhabitants of the State. Between 1965 and 1968, the Labor Government introduced legislation that unfortunately destroyed some of this confidence, with the result that we have the employment figures to which I have referred. What alarms me is that unemployment figures are again rising in South Australia, so that our percentage of unemployed is well above the Australian average. In New South Wales at present a fraction under 1 per cent of the work force is

unemployed. Many years ago we thought such a low figure of unemployment was unattainable, but it has been achieved for some years now. I hope that my fears will prove groundless.

The Governor's Speech refers to mineral development and to the expansion of the Housing Trust, which must take place. Unfortunately, there is an ever-growing waiting list for rental and purchase houses. Houses are important for the work force, for the more houses that are built the more tradesmen are required. Can any honourable member refer to any other item in the Speech which will create more jobs and which will help South Australia to develop and to attract more industry here? The Speech contains no reference to progressive work of that type. Much is said about industrial legislation, a subject on which Government members and Opposition members have varying views. I only hope that some of the legislation on industrial matters that is introduced does not frighten away potential employers of labour who might otherwise set up their establishments here. As the member for Peake knows, I know of some of the industries that are inquiring about coming to South Australia and about others that definitely plan to come here, but I hope this source does not dry up. I hope that the Industries Assistance Corporation, which was established by legislation passed last session, functions as it was hoped that it would, and that it will provide assistance to industries that need a little capital and support to get them off the ground. However, there is little in the Speech that would encourage members of the work force to believe that new job opportunities will be created.

We must create a climate of stability in which potential employers are encouraged to establish their industries here, thus increasing the work force of the State. Potential employers look for several things, among which are stability of Government and stability of employer-employee relationships, with not too many industrial disputes. Employers also look for facilities, such as electricity, natural gas, water, transport and the like. Governments can assist not only by providing these facilities but also by providing the climate to which I have referred and which is so absolutely essential if industries are to expand or to come here. References have been made in the press to industries that have perhaps hesitated before coming. In the last week or so, some industries have made statements that

are more than hesitant. People have asked me whether or not they should expand their industries, and I have tried to talk them into expanding. I think it is any honourable member's job to do that. Anyone who wishes to expand and has the capital to do so or is investing shareholders' money will not be such a culpable fool as to throw that money down the drain by expanding industry when the climate is not right. He will not expand unless he can see that his projects will create employment and services and that his propositions are viable.

I plead with the Government to try to establish a climate that will encourage such people, but when I see these figures I am a little disheartened; I hope they will be reversed. Unfortunately, the graph shows that there is now the beginning of a curve of increasing unemployment, with job vacancies beginning at the same time to reduce, and that is an ominous sign. Unless the Government watches carefully what it does in regard to legislation, South Australia will have a repeat performance of the 1965-68 debacle, when there was such a deterioration in the employment situation.

Mr. Keneally: What about 1961?

Mr. CUMBE: I am talking about the years when Labor came into office with the Hon. Frank Walsh as Premier. He had done what at one time had seemed impossible: he had beaten Sir Thomas Playford, and had formed a Government with a majority of four. Yet, in three years his successor (Hon. Don Dunstan) had lost that majority, and one of the seats lost was represented by a Minister, while in another seat (Millicent) a Minister tied. That is when the debacle occurred, and I say to the member for Stuart that history has a habit of repeating itself. Because my friend the member for Mawson is a great historian he knows how history repeats itself. The honourable member will see that these things have a habit of changing.

The Labor Government is in office at present with a majority of seven members, and it is coasting along very nicely—in its opinion. However, it is in that kind of situation that things start to go wrong, because the Government becomes a little too cocksure. It takes the attitude that it has the numbers and can, therefore, bulldoze legislation through the House. The Government may get carried away, but the day of reckoning will come. Consequently, the Government should not think that it is impregnable; the people of this



State will show that they are fed up with socialistic policies and they will toss out the Government.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): It gave me much pleasure to hear the Speech of Sir James Harrison and to hear the Government's programme in many fields. The Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament has always been progressive and sound since we have had a Premier and Ministers who have been willing to work hard and long with such dedication to their task. This is an indication of a live Labor Party that is earnestly trying to fulfil its commitments; indeed, it is already justifying the people's confidence by its handling of the affairs of State. That is a little different from what the member for Torrens said.

I always like to hear Opposition members saying that we bulldoze legislation through this House because we have the numbers to do it. I assure the member for Torrens that, when I was an Opposition member, legislation was always bulldozed through by the then Government, which had the backing of only 38 per cent of the votes. A Labor Government has never had to rely on someone else to carry it through, but two Liberal Governments had to rely on such a person. A previous Liberal Premier tried to tell members that they were not allowed to speak during debates, and woe betide them if they spoke after Sir Thomas Playford had waved his hand! In most cases it was clear that the then Premier ruled members of his Party with an iron fist.

I am sure that all members were delighted to see the Governor looking so well when he opened Parliament, and we hope he has perfect health for many years to come. I express my sympathy to the families of those former members who passed away during the past 12 months. I wish to refer particularly to the two members whom I knew well. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Rowe and Mr. Lawn, who gave sterling service to this Parliament and were liked by all. The Hon. Mr. Rowe served as a Minister of the Crown and Mr. Lawn served as Chairman of Committees.

From the day of my election to this House in 1962, Mr. Sam Lawn was a great help to me. We often met after a sitting, and I appreciated Mr. Lawn's friendly way of relating the happenings of the day and the difficulties involved in being a Parliamentarian. In his electoral district he was known as "Sam the Man" for over 20 years, and his passing

is a great loss to this House and to all who knew of his qualities and achievements; he will be long remembered in the Adelaide District. I congratulate the new member for Adelaide on his election, and I am sure that he will adapt himself to the rigours of Parliamentary life. Already he has twice shown his ability. He moved the adoption of the Address in Reply, which was ably seconded by the member for Florey. I congratulate both members on their contributions to the debate.

On behalf of the Government, I wish to say that we were all sorry to hear of the illness of Sir Thomas Playford, and we wish him a speedy recovery. We hope to see him again in the same old jovial mood in this place. I extend to Sir Norman Jude my best wishes for his retirement. The member for Hanson made great play about the visit of the South African cricket team. He said:

Why is there discrimination now? I have never known the member for Unley to refuse people an opportunity to play cricket in South Africa, so it will be interesting to know what are his views on the proposed visit of the South African cricket team.

I point out to the honourable member that I have no authority to refuse permission for a team to enter South Africa, nor have I authority to refuse permission for a team to come from South Africa. It is up to the sporting authorities of the day, not Parliament, to decide who should come to this country. I should like to see the Government telling the cricket selectors that they cannot pick a certain man because of his colour! That does not happen in this country. Why should the members of the cricketing conference (West Indies, Pakistan, India, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa) not be allowed to play home-and-away games with each other? It is all brought about by politics. It is about time that countries settled down and played the game of cricket. If they did, I am sure the world would be the finer for it. If members of cricket teams were able to concentrate on international cricket, they would be fine ambassadors and would ease the tensions that now exist. I hope the present situation does not continue.

I was lucky enough to go to South Africa in 1949, but circumstances have greatly changed since then. This country seems to be out on a limb in the sporting world, but I hope the situation changes in the future. I pay a tribute to those South African cricketers who in one or two games walked off the field to show their disgust at the way teams had been selected; that

was a fine thing to do. I am looking forward to those players visiting Australia very soon.

The member for Glenelg is always chiding me about my being a member of a union, and the member for Torrens has said that the honourable member has told us what union he belongs to. I assure the member for Glenelg that I belong to a union and that it is not the Kindergarten Union, as he tried to suggest.

Mr. Mathwin: You surprise me.

Mr. LANGLEY: Well, that would not be unusual. I am forthright enough to say that I am a member of the Electrical Trades Union, and proud of it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And you're financial, what is more.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am financial. I would not be a member if I were not. If I were not financial, I would receive a note to say that I was not doing the right thing. The benefits derived by people who are members of unions help them during their lives. I am sure members opposite have had people interview them on workmen's compensation matters. If a person who is not a member of a union is injured at work, he finds it hard to get the right amount of compensation and to be looked after as he should be. The unions do much for injured workers without charging for that, but when a person goes to a solicitor and, in the end, to court on these matters, we generally find that he could be out of pocket by a considerable sum.

Mr. Millhouse: What is your union subscription?

Mr. LANGLEY: My subscription is \$18 a year. Perhaps I should ask the honourable member how much he has to pay the Law Society. Many unions even have funeral benefit funds, and they also try to help persons who are unemployed. We know that a person can easily become unemployed. The member for Glenelg has said that he was a member of the Painters Union, but I am not sure whether he is a painter now.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He may be unemployed as a member of Parliament.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes.

Mr. Mathwin: You hope so, but you will never do it. If you get my district, you will deserve it.

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Torrens has said that it may not be long before we all lose our seats.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is not what his Leader said; he said this Government is here for 12 years.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley is quite capable of making his own speech.

Mr. LANGLEY: There are certainly conflicting views on the other side. I assure the member for Glenelg that we have a good candidate standing in his district, and I shall be only too pleased to go to that district and door-knock to help our candidate win.

Mr. Mathwin: For goodness sake, don't pick a Liberal to oppose me next time!

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not concerned about that: I say we will win the Glenelg District. As I have said, I am proud to be a member of a trade union, and I honestly believe that any member of a union should get his just deserts. I have not heard members opposite say that persons who are not members of a union should not take the benefit of improved awards and wages for which a union fights. If a person does not pay into an association or union, whatever it may be, and then takes the benefits, he has not got a conscience. If members opposite do not agree with that, they will have their opportunity to say so in this debate. I consider that a person who is not a member of a union should not receive the amenities for which other persons pay. There are two sides in industry, the employers and the employees, and I am in two different fields, because I am also a member of the Electrical Contractors Association. However, that is nothing at all. The only pleasure that I get from being in it is that it helps me at times.

Mr. Mathwin: You can't serve two masters.

Mr. LANGLEY: As I have told the member for Mitcham, the fee for being a member of the Electrical Trades Union is \$18 a year, but the fee for membership of the Electrical Contractors Association is \$49 a year, and I get less for being a member of the latter organization. What I receive for my \$49 bears no comparison with what I receive for my \$18 a year as a member of a union. However, I suppose it is right for a person to be in an organization, such as the Australian Medical Association or the Law Society. After all, it is not compulsory to be a member of the Electrical Trades Union.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think it should be?

Mr. LANGLEY: But I also think, as I have said, that persons who do not pay into the union should not get the amenities they are receiving.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think they should be ordered in?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not compelling anyone to be in it, but I say that, if a person is not in a union, he should not get the benefits.

Mr. Becker: If a Liberal voter asked you to help him, you would do so, wouldn't you?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, because I represent the whole district.

Mr. Becker: Well, what are you grizzling about?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley is quite capable of making his own speech.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sure that there are many Liberal voters in unions. If everyone in the unions voted Labor, there would be a massacre. The member for Hanson has spoken of strikes and such matters. I remind him that I am not so sure that he was a member of the Bank Officers Association when that association went on strike. There was a certain amount of negotiation but, in the end, the bank officials did not get very far and they did strike. That was in November, 1969. I have looked at most of the newspaper cuttings dealing with that matter, but I have not seen the honourable member's name in them. During his speech he did not say whether he went out on strike on that day but, according to the press (and we cannot always believe press reports), 75 per cent of the members of the Bank Officers Association in South Australia and the Northern Territory took part in the stoppage. I am sure that something must have happened for the Bank Officers Association in this State (indeed, I think the strike was Australia-wide) to go out on strike and leave the poor public to worry about depositing or withdrawing money. The position is different when it hits the side of the fence that members opposite are on.

Mr. Clark: Perhaps the member for Hanson was on annual leave then.

Mr. Becker: I was, too.

Mr. LANGLEY: I shall now draw attention to some matters affecting the State. Usually, at Question Time, when honourable members question the Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government, they "give him the works". However, I do not intend to do that now. He is helping me to get works done in my district and I congratulate him. When I was in Opposition I asked the then Minister of Roads and Transport to consider having "turn-right" lights installed at the intersection of Anzac Highway and Greenhill Road, but to no avail. Since the present Minister of Roads and Transport has moved on to the Government front bench, Greenhill

Road and most intersections along that road have functioned well since "turn right" lights have been installed along almost its entire length. It is almost complete now. I assure the Minister that since this innovation there have been very few accidents. The people living in that area are grateful that there is now less screeching of brakes, which previously was almost monotonous in its regularity every evening. That has almost stopped.

We should also congratulate the Minister on making many roads, not only in my district but also in other districts, clearways. Naturally, when clearways were first introduced people did not understand how they should be used. It took time for them to appreciate their proper use. I assure the Minister that they are now functioning well and are of benefit not only to my district but also to the district of the member for Mitcham.

I now refer to a matter that concerns also the member for Mitcham and the member for Bragg, between whose districts lies one of the most dangerous streets in the whole metropolitan area—Duthy Street, where there have been more accidents over a period of years than in any other street. The northern section of Duthy Street is in my district. During the Minister's term of office, we have come to appreciate that he is quick to see where something can be improved to lessen loss of life on the roads. Even after 1,304 petitioners wanted something done about Duthy Street, it was the Minister of Roads and Transport who got into hot water when he erected "stop" signs at the intersection of Duthy and Frederick Streets, in my district, and at the intersection of Cheltenham and Duthy Streets, on the border of the Districts and Bragg and Mitcham. This in no small way, led to fewer accidents and I hope that after reports from the Road Traffic Board it will not be long before that street, which is used by people travelling to the hills, will become much safer.

I turn now to a local matter. This year the member for Mitcham, the member for Bragg and I attended the festivities associated with the celebration of the centenary of local government in the Unley District. The historical display and the way in which the people of Unley rallied to the cause of making it a successful week showed how much they appreciated the work done by local government over a period of 100 years. The mayor of the city (Mr. Colman) and the Town Clerk (Mr. Payne), with the help of their staff and outside people, ensured that that week would go down in the history of Unley in memory of

those people who, during the past 100 years, had given so much of their valuable time in a community effort.

Mr. Mathwin: I thought you didn't like the Unley council?

Mr. LANGLEY: I always give praise where praise is due.

Mr. Mathwin: You said last time that you didn't like that council.

Mr. LANGLEY: I said I did not like some of the members of the council regarding some of their habits, and I can say that if I want to; but, if I want to give praise, I will. I do not believe in running people down if there is no need to, and in this case it was a good combined effort to ensure the success of the centenary celebrations. Also, one of the most outstanding Speakers, known to every member of this House, was present: I refer to Sir John McLeay. (That remark shows I am not biased.) It was a revelation to hear him speak at the dinner and to witness his knowledge of the city of Unley as it was many years ago and of people who were not as fortunate as people are today.

Mr. Mathwin: Conditions were hard in those days.

Mr. LANGLEY: I can remember when years and years ago we moved around in that area and ate nasturtium leaves to keep us going. I recognize the work done by the people of Unley, and also the very fine work done by Meals on Wheels and in respect of the swimming pool at Forestville and the men's basketball stadium. The community organizations of the citizens of Unley have done a fine job, and the Unley City Council has done a magnificent job in the erection of its senior citizens club buildings. Also in connection with the celebrations a special section of the *Unley Courier* showed the life of the people and incidents over 100 years ago which were described in an illuminating manner. Those celebrations will go down in the history of Unley.

I should like now to touch on two points in the Governor's Speech which are dear to the people of the metropolitan area. I have not heard any member of the Opposition say much about the Government's intentions in paragraph 15 of the Governor's Speech, which deals with the rural situation. Paragraph 22 of the Speech states:

It is the intention of my Government to implement further steps and introduce legislation for the further protection of purchasers of goods and services. The proposed legislation will deal with sales of used motor cars and door-to-door sales. The Government also has

in hand a revision of the law relating to consumer credit and a number of law reform measures.

Mr. Gunn: Your Government believes in increased taxation.

Mr. LANGLEY: Did not the honourable member's Government increase taxation? His Government was not frightened to increase taxation.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The Hall Government increased it by 20 per cent in one year.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. It lasted only two years and then out it went. The Governor's Speech contains things that affect many people. I have found myself in the position several times in the last month or so of trying out some of the newspaper advertisements about motor cars. Only the other day the Attorney-General referred to several companies in this State that had not been observing proper sales methods. Legislation on this subject would be a good protection for people, because we live in days when most people can afford to have motor cars. An aspect of door-to-door salesmen that worries me is the fact that elderly people are easily attracted by the smoothness of these salesmen. When the Leader of the Opposition introduced a Bill concerning the operation of door-to-door salesmen, it was supported by this Government. Unfortunately, many elderly people take these salesmen at their face value: elderly people are usually honest and are not familiar with the changes in sales and service that apply today. Many of them have been enticed into signing contracts, because they do not know that the law provides for a cooling-down period. Anything that the Attorney-General can do to ensure that elderly people will not become the victims of door-to-door salesmen will be of great benefit to these people. Paragraph 26 of the Speech states:

My Government will introduce a Bill to continue the operation of the Prices Act.

I am not sure that, at present, we are doing as much as we could with respect to this Act, and I hope that any amendments will further improve its operation in order to ensure that any price rises are in keeping with present-day wages. I hope, too, that one day we shall be able to peg wages and prices, as this action would benefit the whole community.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you blaming the Government for its inactivity?

Mr. LANGLEY: I have never known a Government that accepted so many amendments from the Opposition as the 1965-68

Labor Government did. I have not noticed similar actions by the Liberal Government when in power. With other members, I have been lucky enough to visit the Flinders Ranges, a wonderful tourist attraction. I have always found that most people visiting that area are from New South Wales and Victoria, as I have seen few South Australian number plates on cars in that area.

Mr. Mathwin: Have you been to Glenelg as a tourist?

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member will have plenty of time for touring Glenelg after the next election. I am sure that more advertising of the attractions of our tourist resorts in this State will be appreciated by many members of the community and by people in other States. Perhaps I may be pardoned for referring to another member's district, but it is about time that something was done about Windy Point. A restaurant should be built there and other action taken to ensure that the wonderful view of the scenery and the lights is made more attractive to tourists. I support with pleasure the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and look forward to the fulfilment of all that is contained in His Excellency's Speech.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): It was with pleasure that I attended the other place when His Excellency the Governor opened Parliament. One can recall that 12 months ago His Excellency was regrettably absent from this ceremony because of a cardiac condition. We must be thankful that in South Australia we have a cardiac care unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital that is making a significant contribution to the treatment of people admitted to this unit. I heard recently of a person well known in this State (indeed, he is known far beyond the borders of this State) who graced this Chamber for many years: I refer to the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, who was a recent patient at this unit. The people of this State must benefit because this cardiac care unit is available. In her speech, on which I congratulate her, the member for Tea Tree Gully referred to her concern about pollution. I remember a former Governor of this State, Sir Edric Bastyan, when making a pronouncement on the problems of this State, referring to the great Australian daisy, subsequently identified as the beer bottle, which not infrequently adorns the roadsides in our reserves.

Last week I was surprised to hear a question asked by the member for Chaffey about the

accident that had occurred at Greenock. I was not concerned that he had asked the question about an area outside his district, because I realize that he used this road frequently, but I considered that it was a question that could have been asked more easily in private of the Minister of Roads and Transport. The situation that evolved at Greenock was one that had to be seen to be believed. I had never seen on the faces of men (and particularly the members of the Emergency Fire Services) such a look of fear and of fright, as though they could not believe that what was before them had happened or could happen.

This occurrence had another tragic aspect. The Secretary-Treasurer of the E.F.S. unit at Greenock (Mr. A. R. Nenke), was one of the first people to attend at the accident, and he suffered a heart attack two days later and died after a further 24 hours. This gentleman initiated the appeal on behalf of the survivors of this tragedy, and within minutes of the completion of the mopping-up operations (or of being able to come back to terms with life) he had made a personal donation of \$50. I pay a tribute to the late Mr. Nenke for his years of service to the district of Greenock, and not only as a member of the E.F.S. At the time of his death he was the Assistant Secretary of the Agricultural Bureau, a member of the park committee, and past President of the school committee, and he had devoted much time to church work.

Another person to whom I should like to refer is Mr. Albert Kernich who, approaching 60 years of age, has given much time and effort for the benefit of the Greenock community and who, on this occasion, will admit that he does not know why he looked through and broke the window but, on doing so, saw a movement in a bed; he smartly got in through the window and was able to save the two-year-old son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Burman. Not content with that, Mr. Kernich went back into the house to see whether he could help any other inhabitant.

A further problem resulting from the Greenock disaster has not been at all solved by some of the comments subsequently made: it has been suggested that as a result of local opposition there has been no progress regarding the by-pass to be constructed in the area. However, I suggest that in this regard local residents, whether they be at Greenock itself or farther along towards Nuriootpa, have merely exercised their right to inquire where

the by-pass will be situated and, if appropriate, whether they will be entitled to compensation or what will be the overall effect. Genuine requests for information have not been answered. I have here two letters, one from the Freeling District Council, dated November 12, 1970, and the other from the Highways and Local Government Department, dated November 13, 1970, which are both directed to a person who inquired about the effect that this by-pass would have on his property.

Although a public meeting was held in the Greenock area at which an outline was given of the possible route of the by-pass and its effects, this person who conducts a farming property has received no official pronouncement on the matter since November 13 last, on which date a letter was sent to him, stating:

Thank you for your letter and map of November 4, 1970. The contents have been noted and will be taken into full account before the by-pass alignment is finalized.

The person concerned has a property of about 300 acres, and it is intended at present that the roadway will cut diagonally through his property, completely isolating one side from the other. This person has received no indication or positive statement that he will be able to have an under-pass constructed to allow stock transfer having regard to this being a major road. Unfortunately, the suggestion has been made that local opposition to the by-pass could be partly responsible for this tragedy, which one hopes will not be repeated at that site or elsewhere.

It is interesting to note the statement in His Excellency's Speech that South Australia benefited to the extent of about \$104,000,000 in the past year from mining activities. In the financial pages of the *News* on July 20, a report indicates that Northland Minerals Limited has heralded its reinstatement to the lists of the Sydney Stock Exchange with news that an intensive drilling programme will start on a newly-acquired mining tenement in South Australia, and that about \$200,000 has been paid for this concession; in addition, 5,000,000 fully-paid 10c shares will be given to the person who has sold this area. The interest here is copper, and a little research that I have undertaken indicates that the copper mine at Kapunda was discovered in 1842, operations ceasing in 1877. For some years, there has been an interest in this area, and since the late 1950's several prospectors and organizations have been investigating methods of extracting the balance of the copper known to be there.

On July 20, 1961, exactly 10 years before this announcement by Northland Minerals Limited was made, it was stated in an edition of the South Australian *Chronicle* that a large mining company was interested in commencing operations in the old Kapunda mine. Incidentally, the smallest high school in South Australia is at Kapunda, and an announcement on May 31 last indicated that it was 50 years to the day since Mr. Kidman (later Sir Sidney Kidman) had made his house "Eringa" in Kapunda available to the Education Department as a high school. Even though this is the smallest high school in the State, I hope that, bearing in mind the way this property was so generously donated to the State, it will never lose its identity as a high school. A booklet put out in the 1927 ceremonies held in Kapunda stated that the high school, with its buildings, gardens and environment, was one of the finest in the State. I have recently had the opportunity to inspect the high school, and the students and staff alike are keen that the individuality of their high school be retained. Students at that school who, having gained the Leaving Certificate, desire to study for the Matriculation are now being transported by bus to the Nuriootpa High School about 13 miles away.

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

Dr. EASTICK: Paragraph 7 of the Governor's Speech states:

The State Planning Authority will continue with the preparation of development plans for towns and regions throughout the State and my Government proposes to introduce legislation to amend the Planning and Development Act.

Paragraph 12 states:

The Government has approved plans for the reorganization and revitalization of the welfare services of the State. In carrying out these plans the department will promote and provide welfare services to the community on a decentralized basis from community welfare centres situated in various parts of the metropolitan area and in country towns.

This is commendable, but I trust that the information on which decentralization is based, especially the surveys undertaken to determine the actual centres of community interest or need, is fully and positively researched. Recently a tremendous cover in the centre page spread of a newspaper was given to the results of a survey undertaken by Mr. P. J. Smailes, who is a senior lecturer in the Geography Department at the Adelaide University. The photographs and other material in the article show that, in Mr. Smailes's opinion, a number of country towns should lose their identity. In fact, he says amalgamation should take

place, with many of the towns disappearing from the face of the earth. Although this may be looking at things realistically, I point out that the information compiled by Mr. Smailes is not necessarily complete. A person who has no real authority to obtain information from community leaders or from other persons in business in communities can, by using the limited amount of information made available to him, come up with all sorts of answers that may not be correct.

Saddleworth was one of the centres that Mr. Smailes had much to say about, but he was not fully acquainted with the amount of commerce undertaken in that town. Although he had an idea of the amount of expenditure incurred in relation to commercial undertakings in the main street (whether the butcher, baker, grocer or car salesman), I suggest he did not make full use of the information that would be available to the Government if it were to make inquiries about the considerable agricultural grain business associated with that town. Grain, especially peas and oats, is transported throughout the world by one enterprise based in that town. Much commerce concerned with lucerne seed from the town of Marrabel is dealt with in Saddleworth. Near the town is a seed cleaning service that undertakes much commercial enterprise from this and other districts. When this information is put alongside the information to which Mr. Smailes had ready access, I suggest that the town of Saddleworth has received from him less than its due consideration. The following letter, which was written to me on July 20 from the Geography Department of the Oslo University by Mr. Smailes, confirms my opinion:

Thank you very much for your recent letter, which I have only just received. As you will note from the address, I am at present overseas in Norway, where I expect to be for approximately three years in order to take a doctorate. However, my first priority here is to complete the work you refer to in your letter on the Mid or Lower North of South Australia . . .

Even though the press has used the information in the Smailes report, Mr. Smailes himself says it has not yet been completed. Therefore, any inference drawn from it is not necessarily in the best interests of the town or any other town mentioned in the newspaper article.

I should now like to refer to a deficiency in the Government's legislative programme, which was dealt with in His Excellency's Speech. On September 22 of last year (on

page 1510 of *Hansard*), in reply to a question about professional salaries in South Australia, the Premier said:

To upgrade those services we must employ additional persons and provide salaries that will encourage them to come here to provide the services.

On October 22 (on page 1995 of *Hansard*), the Premier was asked the following question:

Can the Premier say whether the Government has made a positive review of salaries of professional officers employed in the various Government departments?

In reply, the Premier said:

Some time ago when difficulties were encountered in recruiting officers in certain professional areas, I made several submissions to the Public Service Board on this matter. I have had interim reports from the board, but the matter of recruitment of professional officers and how far the State can go in meeting the general market for professional people in specialized categories is still being negotiated by the Government and the board.

On November 12, 1970 (on page 2641 of *Hansard*) the Premier replied to a question about professional salaries; part of that reply is as follows:

At the present time the Public Service Board and the Public Service Arbitrator are considering claims for increases in the salaries of scientific officers (including analysts, chemists, agricultural scientists, foresters, curators, veterinary officers, psychologists, surveyors and librarians) . . .

I make no apology for the fact that I shall now refer to the profession of which I am pleased to be a member; I know more about the problems of that profession than I do of other professions. As a result of the information given in Ministers' replies to questions about the availability of professional staff, I am sure that Ministers are concerned about the difficulty of making professional appointments to their staffs. They realize that some projects are being delayed as a result of that difficulty. In many instances, the Government has seen fit to go outside the Public Service and award contracts to professionals, particularly architects, surveyors and engineers, so that urgent projects can be commenced. I understand that the Public Works Committee accepts that this is the case. On April 26, 1970, a senior officer in the Agriculture Department, in making a recommendation on behalf of his subordinate staff, said:

In November, 1968, an application for a salary review was made on behalf of Government veterinary officers. This application has not been acknowledged by the Public Service Board, but in the interim the South Australian Public Service Association made application for salary increases for veterinary officers,

together with claims for other professional officers in the Public Service. An agreement was reached between the Public Service Board and the association and this was presented to the Public Service Arbitrator for ratification and was gazetted on November 20, 1969. In the course of the negotiations it was stated by the veterinary officers that in their opinion this was an interim agreement only, pending a full assessment of veterinary salaries based on interstate comparisons with officers performing similar duties.

On September 11, 1970, a senior officer of the department, in a submission to the Public Service Board, said:

The position regarding the recruitment of veterinary staff continues to cause considerable concern. Although it is realized that departmental salaries can never equate those obtaining in industry and private practice, it is nevertheless a fact that other State departments of agriculture do not seem to be suffering the same disabilities as we experience in this State. I would therefore ask that your board give some consideration to the submissions which were forwarded by me on June 4, 1970.

In November, 1970, the first-mentioned officer made further submissions in much the same tone. One paragraph of his submission states:

The long delay in reaching a decision or an offer based on the claim submitted six months ago is causing increasing staff dissatisfaction and three of the senior officers have current applications lodged for outside the State services.

On November 30, 1970, the highest authority in the same department referred to his submission of June 4, 1970, and said:

I have now been informed that in the absence of any acknowledgement by the board of its receipt of these submissions, it is now proposed to refer the matter to the Public Service Association.

So action was taken through the association, but no information is yet to hand and no other action has been taken. What does that mean? Without reflecting on the Public Service Commissioners, I suggest that the board system requires urgent consideration so that not only the claims of the officers about whom I have spoken can be adequately considered but also those of other officers.

The Premier, on November 3 last, when dealing with professional salaries, stated:

In recent years the Public Service Board has provided the opportunity for progress through the classification structure to take account for professional and sub-professional officers in the department to be paid according to the increased value of their work and to recognize the desirability of staff's continuing to work in a specific programme area.

The third paragraph of the same report states:

In accepting that research and/or project work should be adequately serviced to com-

pletion (which should include the writing and publishing of papers) recognition of the value of varying experiences in staff training and development for greater responsibility professionally and managerially is also important.

What is the situation in the Agriculture Department in this field? Work undertaken as far back as 1964 and 1965 has still not been written up, because there is an inadequate number of staff to undertake the urgent work, let alone complete the work which they have undertaken and which could and would bring about a tremendous saving for the rural community in this State. There is a tremendous amount of information relative to response to the drug selenium. It is tied up with the clover disease problem on Kangaroo Island. A tremendous amount of work has been completed and is ready for compilation and distribution on urinary calculus as it affects sheep. Wimmera rye grass toxicity, which was a problem originally found in the Black Springs area in 1956 and has been found subsequently to affect a much wider area, has not yet been adequately researched or written up so that the information will be available to the farming community.

Mr. Allan Banks, when he was a member of the staff of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, Frome Road, Adelaide, did much work in respect of worm diseases, particularly in sheep. He pioneered work that is accepted throughout the world as being of tremendous advantage, more particularly because it lays out a planned programme that permits useful production without over-use of worm drenches. This is not being promoted and cannot be promoted by officers who know the details of the problem, because these officers are dealing with other problems. So it goes on.

We have the situation associated with zinc response or problems associated with stress. We also have weaner arthritis, bent leg in stud rams, the sudden death syndrome, associated with phalaris tuberosa and a new alkaloid on which information should be made available to the community. Too little has been produced by way of extension material relative to the poisonous plants that affect stock in South Australia. These are but a few of the problems that are causing concern because there is an inadequate supply of veterinary officers. In October last, when discussing the Cattle Compensation Bill, I was able to point out that the number of cases of tuberculosis in cattle had increased. It was pointed out that in 1967-68 78,000 cattle were tested for a total of 227 positives; in 1968-69



99,289 were tested for 257 positives; and in 1969-70 150,037 were tested for 1,115 positives—a threefold increase in the percentage of tuberculosis found in cattle in South Australia.

The figure to June 16, 1971, slightly less than a full 12 months' period, was 189,593 cattle T.B. tested, for which there was a positive figure of 1,627—an increase of .12 per cent on the previous year, the figure standing at slightly less than .86 per cent of those tested. This is important work that requires to be continued. It is work which, if it is not continued or carried through to finality, could cause an increased dissemination of tuberculosis in South Australia.

Let me forget for the moment the problem of the veterinary staff of the Agriculture Department and let me consider an officer in a certain department of the South Australian Government who is currently classified as a superintendent. He has been in his position since 1965; he is a person with a university degree. He has had no reclassification even though he has sought it individually and his director also has sought it for him. He sometimes assumes higher duty and becomes the deputy director or acting director of that department. His work load has increased considerably since he first took office. Here is a person who has sought promotion, has been promoted as a person to receive consideration, and yet receives no consideration. He is a person who in our community rates the following series of positions or services. Since the creation of his position in 1965, he has had increased administrative responsibility, the scope of the advisory technical services in which he is involved has increased considerably under his guidance. He is recognized and gazetted as the Commonwealth Quarantine Officer, Plant Quarantine. For this purpose he receives some payment by way of Commonwealth funds but does not receive it independently. Those Commonwealth funds are available to the Government to part recompense the work he does.

He assists the Police Department. The Superintendent is the Vice-President of the Forensic Science Society and lectures to police officers undertaking police courses at the South Australian Institute of Technology. Since his appointment, the Superintendent has undertaken additional official duties. He is one of the Government representatives on the Royal Zoological Society; he is an inspector under the provisions of the Vine, Fruit and Vegetable

Protection Act; and, as I have said, he is a quarantine officer under the Commonwealth Quarantine Act. He is an inspector under the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act, 1965; he has had three new Public Service appointments (people who are responsible to him) appointed under him since he commenced his duties; and he gives a series of lectures on ornamental horticulture—in fact, he has been responsible for conducting all of these lectures. His application for reclassification has been considered constantly since 1968, but to date it has not been granted.

I now refer to the Roseworthy Agricultural College. During debates last session it was possible to seek information from the Minister of Education about the Sweeney report, which was a report of an inquiry into the salaries of lecturers and senior lecturers in colleges of advanced education. It was pointed out that these colleges, under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Education, had received the advantages that were outlined in the Sweeney report. In fact, senior lecturers and lecturers at the South Australian Institute of Technology had received increases in salary in October, 1970, but not the lecturers and senior lecturers at the Roseworthy Agricultural College. Although they had had an application before the Public Service Board since 1969 they had not received any consideration. Yet the Karmel report stated, at page 312 paragraph 11.76, that the work they were undertaking was similar to that at advanced colleges of education. This report also stated at page 314, paragraph 12.5:

Three other areas in the total provision for further education should be mentioned. The first of these is post-secondary non-tertiary agricultural education. Roseworthy Agricultural College offers some courses at certificate level in addition to its diploma courses. The Agriculture Department undertakes what is essentially adult education through its extension work. In 1968 the South Australian Government appointed a Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Education under the chairmanship of Mr. A. M. Ramsay, and, as its report will deal in detail with these matters, they will not be further discussed here.

When the Minister of Education was asked questions about the salary claims by lecturers and senior lecturers at this establishment, which had been elevated to the position of an advanced college of education, he said that it was being viewed in relation to the Ramsay report, which had been tabled. He then corrected himself and said, "It is in the process of being made available." Even after many questions have been asked in this

and another place about the release of this report, no such report has been forthcoming. Concerning lecturers and senior lecturers at this agricultural education college, the Public Service Board notice, issued on July 14, 1971, called for applications for five senior lectureships, and for two ordinary lecturers or assistant lectureships. This was precisely the same information as that which appeared in the classified pages of the *Advertiser* on Saturday, July 17, wherein applications were called for the position of senior lecturer (plant science), senior lecturer (animal science), senior lecturer (oenology), senior lecturer (extension), senior lecturer (farm management), assistant or lecturer (agricultural engineering), and assistant or lecturer (horticulture).

Although an application for increased salary lodged by all the officers of this establishment had been with the board for a considerable time, they had heard not a word; then they learned by means of this information that the positions at the college would be elevated. Section 21 (1) of the Public Service Act provides:

In the exercise of the powers and functions conferred on it by this Act the board may hear and consider evidence, argument or representations and shall, so far as is practicable, before making any decision which will affect a significant number of members of a recognized organization—

- (a) notify that organization; and
- (b) hear any evidence, argument or representations from that organization.

The people concerned, whose livelihood has possibly been upset (certainly changed) by these alterations being made, received no intimation from the Public Service Board or anyone else that their positions were being considered. What do those who currently hold senior lectureships and lectureships at this establishment do now? Do they apply, or do they just sit and do nothing? The information circularized and contained in the advertisements in the *Advertiser* points out that considerable extension experience (in the case of the extension officer) or extensive post-graduate qualifications and experience are required. Where do these people fit into the picture?

Obviously, progress is being made by the Government and the organization concerned in regard to creating a true college of advanced education, yet no consideration is being given to the people who are part and parcel of that useful and wellknown organization, the Roseworthy Agricultural College. These people are responsible for the education of future

agricultural technologists and of people progressing to other university degrees, yet they do not know where they stand. The irony of it all is that the person to whom I referred, who is a superintendent in another department, has qualifications that would make him eligible for the position of senior lecturer in oenology at the Roseworthy Agricultural College at a salary of between \$9,540 and \$11,130, whereas his present salary, with all the responsibility that he has, is a little more than \$8,000. Does he leave the establishment where he is now? Who will replace him? If the Director was no longer with the organization tomorrow and a new deputy director, who is called a supervisor and who is on a very low salary, took over, how would he fit in?

There is other information of this type that I could provide, but time does not permit it. I reiterate that I do not suggest for a moment that the members of the Public Service Board have any but the highest motives in the actions they take, but I believe they are being bogged down by the system under which they are required to work. In Tasmania, Western Australia and New South Wales, a need has been found to improve the situation. Section 9 of the Tasmanian Public Service Tribunal Act (1958) that relates to the Public Service indicates that, once a determination is made on behalf of a group of officers, except for normal annual or biannual increments, that determination will stand for a minimum period of three years. This indicates to all groups that, as they have had a determination in their favour, there is no point in their seeking to improve their position for three years. This gives every group an opportunity to be in the queue for advancement. I suggest that the Government should consider amending the Public Service Act to improve this position, giving some thought to the section to which I have just referred.

The penultimate paragraph of the Governor's Speech states:

In the light of the very heavy increases in costs which the Government will have to meet during the forthcoming year as a consequence of recent increases in wages and salaries, and because of the necessity to expand and improve essential social services beyond what can be accomplished out of revenues presently in sight, the Government will feel bound to submit to Parliament some further measures for the securing of additional revenues.

What a hidden statement to find in a penultimate paragraph! I hope that the Government's actions will be more seriously thought out

before they are brought forward. On the first day of this session the Premier said that the tax on entertainment charges, which had been operating for only two weeks, was to be taken off because it would be too costly to collect the money involved. Surely it could have been worked out before. Last session the Premier often said that, based on figures known then and related to valuations for the year ending July 1, 1970, he would obtain from rural land tax a maximum of \$1,000,000. However, for the first time, today, a Minister (in this case the Deputy Premier) said that the figures to apply to the year beginning on July 1, 1971, based on values at July 1, 1970, would have returned on the rates determined the sum of \$1,250,000. A figure approximating this was given to him and other Government members by members on this side during the debate on land tax. Today the Government acknowledged for the first time that the information given by the Opposition was, in fact, correct.

Government members and Opposition members alike have received letters from the Country Womens Association seeking help in relation to the cost of licences for conducting raffles for charitable purposes. Many other organizations are affected by that cost, too. For example, the Meals on Wheels organization is affected by it; last year that organization provided almost 500,000 meals to needy people in the community, and it received about 6,000 hours of voluntary work a week. Other such organizations are the St. John Ambulance Brigade and service clubs such as Rotary, Apex, Lions International (which provided this State with a useful adjunct to the Strathmont Training Centre), the Adelaide Childrens Hospital Auxiliaries and the Crippled Childrens Association Auxiliaries. All these organizations provide money voluntarily for social benefits to the people of this State, but they are now being taxed for doing so. I suggest that, when we consider alterations to the regulations relating to raffles and lotteries, which we have been told will come before us this session, we should consider removing this tax on voluntary effort, as such a tax has no place in this community. I support the motion.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): Like the member for Torrens, I have listened to many Address in Reply debates in this House. I do not know whether I have learnt much from them but I always like to listen to them. I sincerely regret the death of members and former members over the past 12 months; I

knew all of them well, and I respected them. I refer particularly to my old friend Mr. Sam Lawn, who represented the Adelaide District. He was here when I first became a member of this House, and he will be sadly missed by us all. The stage has now been reached when it makes one feel old; only one member of this House, the member for Alexandra, has been here longer than I have, and only one member of the Legislative Council, Sir Lyell McEwin, has been a member of Parliament longer than I have. Some may say that that indicates that I have been here long enough, and I am starting to think that myself. Mr. Lawn, a worthy Parliamentarian, gave good service to his constituents and was a good mate. My first introduction to him was in March, 1952, when I went along to the Trades Hall for pre-selection, and he happened to be the President of the Australian Labor Party at the time. I had never spoken on the platform there before and I did not know that there was a little bell which was worked by the foot and which showed that the speaker had a minute or half a minute to go. I always remember that when Sam trod on the bell I nearly took off, as I was only about a yard away from it. I went on to know him well and respect him.

Although I have spoken many times in the Address in Reply debate, this is the first time I have spoken since the timing device has been installed in the Chamber. When I have watched other members speak, it seems to me to be a remorseless instrument, but I hope that it will be as charitable to me as it was to the member for Mawson, to whom it gave a good go. I congratulate my new colleague Mr. Wright on his election to replace Mr. Lawn. From the speeches he has already made, one can see that he will make an excellent member of this Chamber. Sometimes when I look around it is saddening to notice the absence of the old faces. As Charles Lamb said, "All, all are gone, the old familiar faces." There is one consolation, however: new faces have come before us, particularly in this Parliament, and the members who wear those faces are proving to be an asset to Parliament.

While in a charitable frame of mind, I also congratulate the member for Price, who has been a valuable member of the Public Works Committee for many years, on his election as Chairman of Committees. I know that he will perform this task admirably. Finally, I mention for the first time (and I think this will probably be one of the few

things on which all members will agree) my appreciation of the *House of Assembly Digest*, edited by the Clerk (Mr. Combe) and compiled by his staff. I have found this to be a useful publication, and I know that other people only vaguely associated with the doings of Parliament have found it a handy book of reference. I think this is the fourth year that it has been published, and it is becoming part of our institution.

I have been here since 1952 and I have never yet heard an Opening Speech by the Governor which the Opposition has thought much of. Most of my time, through no fault of mine, has been spent in Opposition. If Mr. Lawn were still with us he would go into some detail to explain why we were in Opposition so long. However, I shall not go into that, because I think all members know the reason. In this debate, such expressions as "colourless", "of no significance" and "a stereotyped document" have been used by other speakers. I looked up *Hansard* for the last year of office of the Hall-Stott Government, before the then Premier committed hara-kiri and cut the throat of his own Party with his own rusty sword. I had to read only two speeches to get these references. One honourable member, speaking of the Governor's Opening Speech that year, when we were in Opposition, stated that it was one of the dumbest speeches that he had ever read. As I recall that Speech, it was dull, too.

Another honourable member said that it was a colourless document reflecting the colourless Government that wrote it. I like that statement: I probably made it myself. I think most people inside and outside the House consider that such criticism was much more justified then than it is now. I have always enjoyed a good speech, regardless of who makes it, even if an Opposition member makes it. Unfortunately, as the member for Ross Smith correctly remarks to me, on this occasion the speeches from the other side have been uniformly poor. I say this not in any spirit of criticism but as a plain statement of fact.

Mr. Venning: What about commenting on the speeches from your side?

Mr. CLARK: I congratulate most members on this side who have spoken. There have been several good speeches from this side and I think there has been one good speech from the Opposition. I hope that my saying that it was good does not harm the honourable

member who made it. The only first-class speech made by the Opposition was that made last week by the member for Mallee. I consider that the poorest Opposition speeches have been made by those honourable members whom we would expect to show the way to others.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Name a couple of them.

Mr. CLARK: I will come to that. After all, we should remember that the Opposition's function of criticism is important indeed but that it is not the only function of the Opposition. An extract from *The Parliament of South Australia*, by Mr. G. D. Combe the Clerk of this House, a handbook that we all use and find useful, states:

Opposition in the form of criticism of the Government has a threefold value. Firstly, it is a perpetual check upon injustice and an incentive to efficiency. In the second place criticism of the Government by the Opposition furnishes the voters with the material on which it can judge the worth of the varying policies. Thirdly, in its criticism of the Government, the Opposition is on trial as an alternative Government and cannot afford to be simply carping and destructive. A responsible Opposition is as necessary to the effective working of Parliament as a responsible Government.

I think all honourable members would agree with that but in this debate, on these criteria, only one Opposition member has fulfilled the duty of an Opposition. We have heard the Leader and the Deputy Leader, and no-one could say that they were not critical. I considered that they were critical to the point of mania, but that was all. They have either forgotten or have never learnt that an Opposition cannot afford to be simply carping and destructive.

Let me say a few kind words about the Leader's remarks in this debate. As many honourable members know, he recently proclaimed in a television interview that he was inclined to favour some Cabinet Ministers coming from outside the Parliament. That seemed to me to be a great reflection on his colleagues. Unfortunately in most cases, on their showing in this debate, I think he may have had something. On his own performance in this debate, and indeed in the last session, if the Government changed, the new Premier, too, would have to come from outside the House. This, of course, is unlikely to bother members on this side for some considerable time. The Leader's performance on this occasion was, I thought, slightly worse than usual.

To my way of thinking, he seemed to be ferociously trying to convince himself, but without much success. To convince oneself of one's correctness is one of the hardest things to do. Possibly the best way to describe his style of speech in this debate would be to call it a raving rhodomontade.

Mr. Jennings: For the benefit of members opposite, what does that mean?

Mr. CLARK: I know that the honourable member is always seeking information, so for his benefit I checked with a fairly good dictionary of my own and found that "rhodomontade" can be defined as "vain, boasting, empty bluster or vaunting rant". If that is not a good description of the Leader's efforts on this occasion, what is? To my way of thinking (and, I would say, to the way of thinking of many members) the Leader's speech fulfilled not one of the criteria on which an Opposition can be judged.

Let me now come to the Deputy Leader, a gentleman for whom I have always had the highest respect and admiration. It was pointed out to me today in the new portrait of members, which, I take it, will be there for posterity to see, the photographs of the Deputy Leader and myself are side by side. I take no exception to that. I know that the Deputy Leader will feel the same way, but some of my colleagues do not seem too happy about it. Personally, it does not worry me at all.

I have been disappointed (I try to say this charitably) in the Deputy Leader, who came into this House as a young man not so very long after I did, and I took him then to be a first-class debater and a particularly good thinker. I am not trying to be funny when I say that. Many people are wondering why this is so no longer. This has puzzled people in this place and outside: it has been mentioned to me several times. I went to the trouble of listening carefully to the honourable member's speech in this debate and I read it after it was printed. I studied in particular his remarks on law and order. It is obvious to me that his arguments in that regard have been warped by his envy of the two legal men in Cabinet. I advise every honourable member to read his recent speeches, and they will find that that is so.

Studying his remarks in this debate, it appears to many impartial observers that this envy has become (perhaps I should not say it) almost pathological in its intensity. A friend of mine, not a member of the Government, suggested to me that the main reason for this

was because the honourable member's divine right to be in Government had been upset. If the honourable member had bothered to read his speech critically, particularly his remarks about the Premier and the moratorium issue, I am certain that he would have found that his anti-Dunstan bias had perverted every attempted argument, and that logic had gone with the wind. I believe that the honourable member concluded his speech with something worth saying when, speaking about Parliamentary behaviour, he said:

The standard of our conduct is not as high as people outside expect that it should be. I do not except myself or anyone else.

A jolly good thing that he did not, because others would not except him, either. Everyone has noticed in recent months the honourable member's pettiness and the many examples of what seem to be deliberate defiance of Parliamentary authority. Most of us have noticed his rude mutterings and grumbings, and the obvious suggestion that Parliamentary Standing Orders may be all right for others but that he was above them. Most members would agree with his remarks about Parliamentary behaviour; I do, anyhow. I know that the behaviour in this place is not what it used to be. However, I think most members would agree that probably the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is the most constant breaker of Parliamentary rules. He knows this as well as I know it.

Mr. McAnaney: He is not as bad as the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Mr. CLARK: His remarks brought the publicity he sought from those who do not know what his behaviour is like in this place. I now turn to Commonwealth aid for education. If the member for Eyre would listen, he may learn something. At present, he has the idea that Tumby Bay is the capital of South Australia: I assure the honourable member that it is not.

Mr. Gunn: It isn't even in my district!

Mr. CLARK: Well, Streaky Bay. Members who have known me for some time would realize that it has often been said that I am biased about education, and so I am. I sometimes do my best to overcome this bias, but I have not been doing very well.

Mr. McAnaney: You are not much good at persuading your Government about it.

Mr. CLARK: I know that I should not reply to interjections, no matter how useful they may be. I cannot understand the point of the honourable member's remarks. If he would speak to me privately, perhaps we

would come to an amicable agreement. I was amazed that some Opposition members, especially the member for Hanson and the member for Kavel, seemed to oppose Commonwealth aid for education. It seemed to me that the reason for their attitude was that we were seeking aid from a Government of the same political complexion as the Party opposite. However, I think those days are over; I believe that nowadays, irrespective of politics, the majority of people in South Australia are interested in children, schools and the future, and consider that Commonwealth aid for education is a necessity.

Here, I am not having a dig at the present Commonwealth Government; I do not think it is necessary for me to do that, and I say, even to my own colleagues, that I think it would be advisable to forget about rubbishing the Commonwealth Government, for it is doing this itself, through its own actions, every day that it is in office. Indeed, I would be saying the same thing if the present situation existed with a Labor Government in office. The member for Hanson may not know any better, but I think the member for Kavel does. Many years ago, I was certainly the first man in this Parliament (possibly in an Australian Parliament) to advocate what was an unpopular thing at that time, namely, Commonwealth aid, urging that the States should obtain specific grants for education without any strings attached.

However, in those days it was simply a voice crying out in the wilderness, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies as he then was) telling us that the Commonwealth Government could not legally do this. But since that time things have changed and we now receive much assistance from the Commonwealth Government in regard to education needs in secondary and tertiary institutions, although unfortunately assistance concerning primary schools seems to be almost negligible. I am happy to pay a tribute to the then Minister of Education (Mrs. Steele) who, on March 21, 1969, announced that all State Education Departments would conduct a national survey into education needs. I believe that this is one of the most important things undertaken in Australia regarding education. The national survey for the five-year period from 1971 to 1975 reveals that there will be a gap between resources and education needs to the extent of well over \$1,000,000,000. This survey, far from being based on guesswork, represents a careful collation of tabulated statistics, and those responsible in every State went to much

trouble to collect the relevant figures. The survey does not propose any radical changes at all: in the main, it simply shows what is necessary to continue the education system. All members should have read a brochure circulated publicizing the Norwood meeting, although it is fairly obvious from their remarks that some members have not seen it. The brochure states:

The implementation of the national survey would mean that every child would learn in classes of reasonable size. That each child would have a reasonable chance of receiving the individual attention he or she needs. That handicapped children and children with special learning difficulties would have new opportunities.

They do not have many opportunities now. The brochure continues:

That the shortage of teachers, and the present staffing difficulties in schools would be substantially overcome. That schools would have reasonable numbers of clerical staff, teacher aides, laboratory assistants, bursars and caretakers, to enable teachers to spend all their time in teaching.

This is one of the greatest needs in schools. At present many highly qualified teachers are wasting time doing things which have to be done but which could just as easily be done (and they would probably be done better) by a trained officer. The brochure continues:

That relieving teachers would be appointed in sufficient numbers to prevent the administrative and educational chaos which often occurs today when a teacher is absent.

The member for Kavel would know that often grave difficulties occur when teachers are absent, especially if they are absent for a few days. The brochure continues:

That social workers, career advisers and counsellors would be appointed to secondary schools to help cope with the special needs of a generation growing into a difficult and changing world.

That is another gravely important matter. I am sure that young people often get into trouble because the right advice has not been available from the right person at the right time. The brochure continues:

That many more children and teachers would receive the benefits of working and learning in a pleasant, conducive physical environment.

I know that we have some magnificent schools as well as some fairly poor ones. On Friday, the Public Works Committee inspected two schools that it is intended to replace with new schools. All I could say on seeing them was that it was about time they were replaced. However, because of the situation that has obtained, those two old schools have remained

for years longer than should have been the case. At least, I hope the schools will be replaced; after all, I am only the Chairman of the committee. The brochure continues:

That all new schools would be fully equipped and, by the end of the five-year period, 25 per cent of existing schools would be equipped to the same standards.

Only 25 per cent is referred to, even with that sum of money. It continues:

That teachers would be given more opportunities to keep up to date and extend their professional knowledge. That the scheme for boarding allowances, supply of textbooks and school transport would be maintained in their present form.

Those things were set out in the brochure distributed before the meeting at Norwood. I fear that some members opposite believe that this was a political meeting.

Mr. Venning: How else could you describe it?

Mr. CLARK: If any honourable member believes that, his ignorance appals me. At this meeting, I sat amongst a group of people who knew who I was, and from those people in that small part of the hall I heard every shade of political opinion. Surely not one Opposition member will say that the South Australian Institute of Teachers is a Labor Party organization. It is not a Liberal Party organization, either: it is a teachers' organization. This meeting was arranged by the teachers themselves, the South Australian Institute of Teachers, members of school committees, school councils and welfare clubs, hundreds of people who were simply friends of schools, and some who had no relationship with schools through students but who were simply interested in education. The people at the meeting represented all shades of political opinion: it was a non-political meeting.

Of course, there is a tendency to think that it was a political meeting because pressure was applied to some extent on a Commonwealth Minister but, had there been a Commonwealth Labor Government, it would have been a Labor Minister who was there. Of course, a Labor Minister would have had a little more to say, but I sympathize with the Commonwealth Minister, who, having only recently taken office, was faced with wildly enthusiastic people. Our own Minister, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, should be congratulated on his charitable behaviour that night. We have all seen the Hon. Mr. Hudson in action, and we know that he can at times be very scathing when he strongly disagrees with someone else's opinion, but he did not display that characteristic at the Norwood

meeting. He was very charitable; he behaved as a Minister seeking to get something should behave. I was amazed to hear the member for Hanson accuse the Minister of Education of arrogance because the Minister told him to contact Commonwealth members of Parliament to urge that greater consideration be given to providing what was asked for in the national survey. After all, that survey was made in the name of the Liberal Government, not a Labor Government. Of course, that situation was accidental, because a Liberal Government was in power. If a Labor Government had been in power, we would have been making it, and I believe that the result would have been the same.

I did not understand the speech of the member for Kavel, who gave the impression to me and everyone else to whom I have spoken about it that he thought he was scoring a good debating point by telling the Minister of Education that he should inform the Commonwealth Government just how it should alter or adjust taxes or priorities to give to the States the money required under the survey for education. He repeated his argument most forcibly three or four times. I believe that when he was teaching he could clean the blackboard from the back of the room with his strong voice. Members should imagine, if they can, the reaction of the Commonwealth Treasurer, the Hon. Mr. Snedden, to the Hon. Hugh Hudson's explaining to him in detail just how he must adjust his Budget to fulfil educational needs in South Australia. I do not mean to imply that the Hon. Mr. Hudson could not do that: he could do it very adequately. I ask members to imagine the reaction of the Prime Minister, the Hon. Mr. McMahon, to the Hon. Mr. Hudson's suggestions on how to tax and who to tax to give the same result. Let us be charitable and forget about it, because I do not think the reaction would be very satisfactory. Nothing is of greater national importance than education, and I use the word "education" in its widest sense. I am certain that the future of our country depends more and more on the development of educational standards and human skills to the highest possible degree, and I believe that funds can and must be found to give this an opportunity of coming to fruition.

I close on a subject that is giving us all some food for thought, namely, protesters, dissenters, non-conformists or whatever one likes to call them. I quote the remarks of four gentlemen who might be regarded as four of the most

profound political thinkers in Australia today on this matter. In 1969, the Hon. John Gorton said:

Dissent will be tolerated as long as it is ineffective.

I ask honourable members to examine that interesting sentence. I also quote another political thinker, the Hon. Malcolm Fraser, not always a friend of the Hon. Mr. Gorton. In May, 1970, Mr. Fraser said:

They are trying to change Australian policy by demonstrations, and this is not part and should not be part of our democratic process.

Mr. Gunn: Hear, hear!

Mr. CLARK: I expected that. In May, 1970, the Hon. Mr. Sneddon said:

Of the organizers I can only say this: I regard them as a mob of political bikies out to pack-rape democracy.

Finally, in 1966 the Hon. Mr. Askin recalled with pride a comment he made to President Johnson during his Australian tour—"All the way with L.B.J." Mr. Askin said:

Well, some scruffy long-hairs came out and lay in front of the car. I turned to the President and said in a loud voice to the driver, "Run over the bastards." The President laughed.

Back as far as 76 B.C., Spartacus and his followers were crucified for having the effrontery to lead a revolt of gladiators and slaves against their masters. Since that time, and probably before then, those who have protested against authority or who have advocated changes in the church or State have been spurned, and worse. However, gradually from their protests, even when puny and lit only by the fervour of a belief, have come the reforms that we now value. Surely no-one considers that our imperfect society cannot be improved further. We have tried to do this by legislation because we consider that this is the best way to do it but, after all, who helps to shape the forces that influence legislation? I suggest to honourable members that they make their own list of protesters down the ages and I think they will find countless noble names and the names of some saints. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Let me first express my sympathy to the families of those former members of this Parliament who have passed on during the last 12 months and who have been mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. I was pleased that His Excellency was able to deliver his own Speech after having fully recovered from his illness last

year. I also congratulate the new member for Adelaide on his election to this Parliament and on the way he delivered his maiden speech. In fact, perhaps he was fortunate in one sense to be able to make two "maiden" speeches on the one day, if that was possible, because he spoke on an urgency motion and then he moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

I was very pleased to hear His Excellency refer to the recent visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh to South Australia last March. The Duke of Edinburgh is certainly a very outspoken person and a very knowledgeable man. He has been most outspoken, particularly on Britain's entry into the European Common Market, and I agree with his thoughts on that matter. It is interesting to note that, when I was in the United Kingdom last year, all the politicians to whom I spoke (and I spoke to many from both sides of the House of Commons) said that England ought to go into the European Common Market, and that in fact it was the only thing she could do. One must remember that no-one was keener than Mr. Wilson when Prime Minister. I am speaking of the time before the 18-year-olds had the privilege of voting. Of course, when they had this privilege they tossed Mr. Wilson out. Mr. Wilson had been very keen for Britain to join the European Common Market. I suppose one would wonder why Mr. Wilson should change his mind so quickly and jump on to the other side of the fence. Of course, another important thing happened at about that time. Our own Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport visited the United Kingdom and perhaps, I may suggest, had a word with Mr. Wilson and were able to change his mind.

Mr. Jennings: He was in the United States at the time.

Mr. MATHWIN: Was he? Perhaps it was the member for Ross Smith who helped Mr. Wilson change his mind; perhaps he was there as an adviser to Mr. Wilson at that time, because I remember that Mr. Wilson had been quoted as saying, at the beginning when he was Prime Minister of England, "We will enter the Common Market at any cost".

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: When did he say that?

Mr. MATHWIN: He has been quoted as saying that.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: When?



Mr. MATHWIN: I can quote something about the political levy that will make the Minister leave this Chamber, as he has done every time I have mentioned the matter. The Minister has done it every time I have brought it up: he has walked out of this Chamber. I will have another go later and see how he goes about it. Let me now quote from last Saturday's *Melbourne Age*, where we see the following report from Peter Cole-Adams:

Having caught a glimpse of chaos earlier this week, the British Labour Party appears to be struggling back to the path of sweet reason and brotherhood—at least temporarily. Yesterday the Labour leader (Mr. Wilson) called in junior pro-market members of his front bench team to tell them his harsh words on Tuesday night were not meant to impugn their integrity. Nor did he regard campaigning for British entry to Europe as incompatible with a front-bench seat.

Looking further, we see:

The Left-wing weekly, the *New Statesman*, edited by former Labour Minister Richard Crossman, called on Mr. Jenkins to resign as deputy leader. It accused him of shattering the party unity which Mr. Wilson had been trying to build up. Another Left-wing journal, *Tribune*, reported that anti-Marketeer Mr. Michael Foot would stand against Mr. Jenkins later this year in the election for deputy Leader.

So that is the position in the United Kingdom about this matter. I was pleased to see in the Governor's Speech mention made of tourism and what will happen in some small way in this State. The member for Hanson in his speech told us of the efforts made by some of the traders and interested public in Glenelg—the seat that I hold, of course. I agree that I am doing a better job than the previous member for Glenelg. These people met and formed the Glenelg Development Committee. It was supported by all the council members, the Mayor and the Town Clerk. At a meeting held on July 5 last, 118 people committed themselves to paying \$25 per business and at least \$1.50 a week to stimulate tourism in Glenelg. So here are people interested in and willing to do their bit in trying to stimulate tourism, particularly in the premier seaside resort of the State—Glenelg.

The origin of this meeting lies in the Glenelg Tourist Association and the Chamber of Commerce, which joined together and formed this steering committee. The result was a successful meeting. One idea that came from that meeting and had a sympathetic hearing by everyone there was a mall in Jetty Road, Glenelg. I think that would be

a step in the right direction. I think the tramline should remain and the trams should continue to run, though perhaps on a single line down Jetty Road. It would provide a tourist attraction and, if people were lucky, they could get on the one painted tram. I suppose the Minister realizes that we shall have to paint a few more trams to get people to use this tourist attraction. The Premier must realize the importance of tourism to this State and the fact that it could be a million-dollar industry. Government speakers have referred to the last attempt made by the Government to amend the Local Government Act and they have said that it was tossed out by the Upper House.

Mr. Crimes: Wasn't it?

Mr. MATHWIN: What would the honourable member expect?

Mr. Brown: Don't you realize—

Mr. MATHWIN: If the honourable member will wait he will learn something, but I am pleased that he is wide awake and listening. I agree that there were good points contained in the Bill that would have greatly assisted the community. However, the Government dosed it with Socialism, and we all realize that a little bit of sugar with the medicine makes it go down easier. The Minister introduced this Bill and included a smattering of Socialism.

Mr. Brown: Have you read the recommendations of the committee?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes.

Mr. Brown: Well, read them again.

Mr. MATHWIN: It would take too long. I suggest that the Government should consider the provisions of the Libraries (Subsidies) Act. I have been concerned about the problems facing municipal and district councils, which are operating free libraries under this Act, that have resulted from the formation of a metropolitan subsidies libraries committee and the investigations of this committee among its member councils. It is evident that the whole procedure relating to the supply of books from the State Library, and the basis on which they are supplied to council-operated libraries, requires further investigation. Whilst some of the problems now being experienced by the libraries stem from some misunderstanding of the manner in which the State Library administration interpreted to councils the assistance they would receive, an unfortunate position has arisen by which many libraries do not have an adequate book stock to meet the needs of their ratepayers. The quota system that operates and determines each individual library's book stock depends

or the yearly financial allocation provided by each council for the purchase of new books. In theory, this may be a reasonable basis for this purpose. However, instances have occurred in the last few years where councils, having made payment to the State Library for books, either did not receive the books or received only some of them.

This situation seems to have been unsatisfactory, for it seems to have created some continuing book shortage problems in some councils. For two years the Brighton Municipal Library deliberately withheld payment to the State Library for books, because it had not received the books paid for in the previous year. This non-payment has had the effect of reducing the quota for this council, and it has now reached the position where its book stock is at the lowest level that it has been for many years, 9,864 books. I understand that the rule of thumb applied in regard to an adequate book stock is one book for each person, and on this basis the Brighton library's book stock is much less than 50 per cent of the desired level. It would be interesting to know how many books have been returned this year from the library and remain stored and unused at the State Library.

As these books are returned to the State Library and kept and stored there, one wonders what useful purpose they serve. Many would not be good books for the libraries in question but, because of this system, there must be literally thousands of books lying around unused in the State Library. While some libraries have a book stock in excess of quota, it seems unnecessary for the State Library to request the return of over-quota books in the meantime, the State Library having no further immediate use for them. Why on earth does the State Library need them? It seems to me that the Minister of Education, who is responsible for the administration of the State Library and, through it, the free library system, should have a full investigation made into the present basis of making books available to councils operating these libraries.

Finally on this subject, I am most concerned at the sum being made available under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act as a financial contribution to the councils concerned. Whereas it was expected that the running costs of these libraries would be subsidized by the Government on a 50/50 basis, the subsidy being received by the Brighton council, for example, represents less than one-third of the running costs, and I believe this would apply to most other councils.

Obviously, therefore, for councils to provide the required standard of library, further subsidy funds must be available.

Mr. Langley: Have you a free lending library in your district?

Mr. MATHWIN: I represent three metropolitan districts: a third being Brighton; a third being Glenelg; and a third Marion, and in two of those districts there is a free library. Much has been said about pollution and associated problems, but no-one has referred to the serious problem involving refuse disposal. In an article in the local government booklet *Australian Municipal Journal*, of June, 1971, headed "Plastics Industry Tackles Refuse Disposal Problem" the following statement is made:

The problem of man's pollution of the earth is becoming increasingly evident. Furthermore, public awareness of the problem is rising as the result of articles and discussion in the press and other media. Elimination or reduction of the problem must be tackled immediately. Air and water pollution are receiving the most attention at the moment, but the problem of solid waste disposal increasingly occupies the minds of most municipal engineers. A highly visible form of solid waste is that of the plastics containers, films, etc., and because plastics do not degrade or rot as do naturally occurring solid products, they pose a special problem, although at the moment not a particularly crucial one. Already much has been done in studying this matter. For the information of those who are closely associated with it, it is important that an up-to-date summary of the present situation be made available to them, including a reference to current literature.

In Australia, the only disposal of refuse is by land fill. The cost of refuse haulage is becoming most uneconomical. New sites are difficult to find, and people rightly object to having rubbish tips near their houses, as these tips attract flies and vermin, newsprint is blown about, and seagulls scavenge for food. The public realizes that large costs are involved in refuse disposal, and that this is a major problem.

Refuse bulk is increasing (especially with regard to plastic articles) at an alarming rate, much of this being the result of modern diets. Plastic containers are a problem and non-returnable bottles left on the beaches are often broken by children who may then cut themselves. This is a cause for concern at local beaches. It is interesting to note that in 1949 there was little more than 3 cub. yd. of refuse a ton whereas in 1969 the average was about 7½ cub. yd. of refuse a ton, an increase of more than 2 times the volume in a

ton in only 20 years. Another matter is that of composting, and this has great disadvantages. At page 16 of his report, the Churchill Fellowship scholar Mr. Chaston states the disadvantages of this type of disposal. There are presently few outlets for compost and salvaged materials. A sanitary land fill is still needed to dispose of those materials that are not salvaged or will not compost.

Another alternative that is probably the best available is the incineration method. The first incinerator for this work was completed in the United Kingdom in 1968 at Middleton by the Lancashire council, the unit being able to handle 60 tons of refuse a day. It is situated in the township, forming part of the redevelopment of the area. At page 35 of his report, Mr. Chaston refers to the advantages of such a method as follows:

The land requirements for the plant are small. The operation is not dependent on weather conditions. It can be put in urban industrial areas, reducing haulage distance. It provides volume reduction. It reduces landfill requirements for solid wastes disposal. It produces a stable odour-free residue.

Therefore, this would seem to be the type of disposal that should be sought. I compliment the Minister for Conservation on appointing in May, 1971, a refuse and industrial waste committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. Beaney. It seems that the ultimate answer is incineration, and the question is how soon? As far as I can gather, I do not think the time is very distant.

The best way of speaking about the problems of trade unions is to give a short history of trade unions, which have played a significant part in Australian life. Between the 1850's and the 1890's, unions were established in a wide range of crafts and industries, and characteristic union policies were consolidated. Central bodies that linked the activities of individual unions were established. As a result of previous developments, at the end of the period unions were on the verge of playing a part in politics. However, during the 1890's the unions suffered a series of set-backs, as a result of strike defeats and economic depression. Between the beginning of the First World War and the outbreak of the Second World War, the unions faced the uncertainties associated with post-war dislocation of the economy. Revolutionaries saw the trade unions as instruments in the class struggle whose policies should be concerned less with mitigating the conditions of the workers within a capitalistic economy and more with overthrowing that system and replacing it with a

socialistic one. Such political activity is even more noticeable today, when we find the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions juggling for complete power and domination. It is very evident that Mr. Bob Hawke has little real concern for the worker.

Mr. Crimes: How dare you attack a personal friend of mine like that!

Mr. MATHWIN: If that were not so, more thought would have been given to solidarity of employment. I am strongly opposed to any form of compulsion, particularly to the insidious methods used by trade unions to force workers to pay political levies.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You sound just like the ignorant person you are.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am glad we have the Minister back. Things were a little quiet while he was absent from the Chamber. Government members will no doubt protest that I am exaggerating, but I ask them to say how many workers are actually paying the political levy without having received an instruction from their trade union leaders that they have the right to contract out. Of course, by contracting out, the worker is open to victimization and loss of employment. I suggest that that happened to the Herseys in the Hersey case.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about the demands your Party puts on industry? Pay up or else! Do you want me to show you the letter that was sent out? I have it in my files, but you would be very embarrassed if I produced it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Workers are open to victimization and even loss of employment if they contract out. It is my firm belief that union fees only should be deducted from a man's wages, and then only if he wishes to be a member of the trade union. The law should be changed to enable a man to contract in if he wishes to subscribe to the A.L.P. political fund. In this way, no worker would be victimized or have his freedom of choice stunted by the fear of reprisals. The 1927 United Kingdom Trade Disputes and Trade Union Act, which was the sequel to the 1926 general strike, was a threat to Parliamentary government and to the Constitution. The Act laid down principles vital to political and industrial freedom without interfering in any way with genuine trade disputes. The Act was intended to protect the State and the community against such acts of coercion as the general strike and to safeguard individual trade unionists against intimidation and victimization. The Act's four principles are

that a general strike is illegal; no man shall be penalized for refusing to take part in it. Intimidation is illegal; no man shall be compelled by threats to cease work against his will. No person shall be compelled to subscribe to the funds of a political Party unless he so desires. Any person entering the established Civil Service owes undivided allegiance to the State. The Act comprises seven operative sections that deal with illegal strikes and lock-outs; protection of persons refusing to take part in illegal strikes or lock-outs; prevention of intimidation; provisions as to political funds; regulations as to organizations to which established public servants may be members; provisions as to the persons employed by local and other public authorities; and restraint of application of funds of trade unions for illegal strikes and lock-outs. The general strike had the most serious consequences on trade and industry and, most of all, on the workers themselves, whose families were the greatest victims. In the strike the miners alone lost £40,000,000 in wages.

Mr. Crimes: But that Act has been repealed long ago.

Mr. Hopgood: Give us the Charleston while you are about it.

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Mawson talked about B.C. in his speech. The 1926 strike cost the unions £5,600,000. I suggest that the continued strife we are experiencing today under the leadership of Mr. Hawke and his henchmen is the same grim possibility that faces every worker in South Australia today. I call on this Government to overhaul completely the position of trade unions and their bosses. To bear out the facts, I will quote from a book entitled *In Place of Strife, a Policy for Industrial Relations*. This book is dated 1970 and on page 38 there is a table showing the number of stoppages in the respective countries for each 100,000 employees. This table is as follows:

Country	Number of stoppages
United Kingdom . . . . .	16.8
Australia . . . . .	63.8
Belgium . . . . .	7.0
Canada . . . . .	15.8
Finland . . . . .	10.8
France . . . . .	21.8
Italy . . . . .	32.9
The Netherlands . . . . .	2.2
New Zealand . . . . .	26.8
United States of America . . . . .	13.2

Australia, with 63.8, has a clear lead, and these figures are up to date.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Give us South Australian figures. You're a member of the South Australian Parliament.

Mr. MATHWIN: I would have thought the Minister was the only member here, the way he has been going on. I do not know whether I should bow or cross myself when I see him. In South Australia we have a fair indication of what is to come if we do not act on this matter. In my district we have a good bus service, Worthley's Bus Service. I have known Mr. Tom Barnes, the proprietor, for a long time. He is not a bloated capitalist. He started work as a bus driver and built up the company, which he now owns. He conducts the business as a union shop. He has always employed union labour, and a report in last Thursday's *Advertiser* states:

Bus companies employing union labour had been hardest hit by the transport workers strike, the manager of R. Worthley and Sons Pty. Ltd. (Mr. T. A. Barnes) said yesterday. His company, which had particularly 100 per cent union membership, had not been able to operate for the past two days while non-union companies were still running their services.

What kind of position is this? These are members of the union and have families to keep. The union said to them, "You have to go on strike," yet their counterparts in other companies were running the buses. These men were not allowed—

Mr. Wright: Don't tell lies in the House. You're telling lies in this House. The union didn't tell them: they voted on it.

Mr. Harrison: Mr. Barnes was a member of the Bus Proprietors Association and could have exercised his rights. Did he?

Mr. MATHWIN: I have good reports of the first meeting that was held, and what I have been told does not bear repeating.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Why don't you object to being called a liar?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: The report in the *Advertiser* also states:

Mr. Barnes said the situation was farcical and employees of his company had told him that they were sick and tired of being told by their union what they should do. The 12 buses had been idle since the strike, resulting in about 1,000 students having to find alternative means of transport. All passenger bus services in Adelaide and suburbs, with the exception of R. Worthley and Sons, are reported to be maintaining normal or near-normal services.

What kind of situation is that? The position in this State is so good that we have the report that Mr. Shannon, the Secretary of the South

Australian Trades and Labor Council, yesterday warned militants that it had been proved that militant union action alone would not bring results. The new Industrial Relations Bill in the United Kingdom has brought in provision for agency shops. I see that Mr. Noel Hawken in London says this. I will read it because, if honourable members care to listen to it, I think they will find it interesting. He says:

The law will say that "every individual should have a right to join a trade union . . . and an equal right not to do so." No one will be prevented from taking a job, or staying in it, because he refuses to join a union. No union may strike because of any kind of "blackleg" worker. While closed shops will be forbidden, there is provision for "agency" shops. With an "agency" shop system "a registered trade union represents all the employees in a particular undertaking or establishment or part of it, and is supported financially by all of them." An "agency" shop can exist wherever a majority of union members involved agrees on it.

It is wherever the majority of union members agree to it, so there is nothing underhanded about it. He continues:

If the employer, or a quarter of the union members, call for it however, a ballot must be held on whether the "agency" shop is to come into being, or continue. Where an "agency" shop exists, no worker is compelled to join the union or unions involved. But if he does not, he has to make a payment to the union equal to no more than regular union dues.

This is quite a good effort. The article continues:

Or, if he wishes, make a similar payment to an approved charity instead. The non-member, however, relinquishes rights to "all benefits of membership of the trade union." In brief, any worker can refuse to join a union, make his own pay deal with the boss, and be within the law.

It would be as well for members opposite to think about that, because I think that idea has some merit. I was interested to read in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of July 16 of this year about the unions in Italy. The member for Whyalla has mentioned the number of unions we have in this country. This newspaper states:

For two years now there has been much debate on the issue of the creation of a single national union of Italian workers. The process of uniting the unions has unquestionably gone forward. One of the essential conditions, if not the primary condition, for the success of the unification plan is the gradual separation of the confederations from the political parties with which they now have strong ties. The first step on the road to independence from the political parties was taken in

1968 with the resignation of union leaders from any Parliamentary or party office. No union official today is a member of Parliament or a party official even though there are still ties of a political, cultural, and ideological nature which create disagreements among, and within, the three confederations.

This matter may interest the member for Whyalla, who complained about the number of unions in Australia. Page 209 of *Australia Trade Unions* names the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of Australia, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (South Australia), the Australian Timber Workers Union, and the Bridge, Wharf and Engineering Construction Carpenters Union of Australia. These are four unions of an allied trade. In the industrial group there is a membership of 98 different unions, and, of course, there are many other unions. This matter should be considered by the Government. The Premier has often quoted Abraham Lincoln: I quote Lincoln's ten "cannots", as follows:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

You cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich.

You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.

You cannot further the brotherhood of many by inciting class hatred.

You cannot establish security on borrowed money.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

In his speech the member for Unley was kind enough to tell me (I was away for the weekend and had not read the newspapers) that his Party had a candidate ready to take me on in Glenelg, and he said that he would doorknock for the Labor Party candidate in that district. I suggest that, if the honourable member visits that area, he does not wear his double-blue tie, because he will not obtain much support if he talks about Sturt. At the last election the Minister of Education did me the honour of going into what was to be my district and canvassing for the then endorsed Labor candidate.

The candidate was a member of the Liberal Party before being endorsed by the Labor Party, and the present Minister of Education

assisted him. We know the result: my majority is much larger than is the majority of the Minister of Education, so that if the member for Unley comes down to help his Party's candidate, his majority may slip. Now, of course, the tables have turned. Now that I have a larger majority than has the Minister of Education, I might be able to go into his district and do a little work for a candidate. The member for Mawson appealed to members on this side to join the march that will take place shortly in the streets of Adelaide. He said that it was a form of freedom to do so and to express opposition to all types of war. I spent 6½ years of my life fighting aggression, and if the member for Mawson thinks that I will march behind people who carry a Red flag or a Viet Cong flag (and do not let me hear him say that there will not be one there, for in every march that has taken place so far, and on the front steps of this building, there have been Red and Viet Cong flags)—

Mr. Langley: What about the farmers' march? Did they have a Red flag there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Unley is the rudest man I have met.

The SPEAKER: There are too many interjections. The *Hansard* reporters are required to report speeches, including the speech of the member for Glenelg, and interjections must cease.

Mr. MATHWIN: As I was saying, in every march of this nature there have been people with Red and Viet Cong flags, and the member for Mawson cannot deny it. If he expects me to march behind someone carrying such a flag, I tell him now that I will not do it. As my eldest son was fighting in Vietnam, I would have more first-hand information than the member for Mawson would ever have.

Mr. Slater: Whose side was he on?

Mr. MATHWIN: He was on our side. If the member for Gilles is talking about sides, obviously he supports the Viet Cong. My son, who was in Vietnam in the first Anzac battalion formed since the First World War, has told me and many others about the conditions there and what it is all about. If Government members wish to support the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese, they can do so, but they cannot expect me to give such support, because I will not. The member for Mawson said:

. . . I appeal to members opposite and to the Liberal Party to become involved in the July march. I am willing to give the Liberal Party and members opposite the benefit of the

doubt: I believe they are good people and are now ashamed of what their Government has done . . .

Those of us who fought for this country and against aggression are proud of the fact and, if similar circumstances arise, I shall be willing, as old as I am, to do my bit. If any member opposite expects me to walk behind people who behave as those who marched a few weeks ago and a few months ago behaved, marching with closed fists raised, behind the Red star and the Communist flag, as well as the flag of the Viet Cong, he has another think coming. I will not do that in any circumstances, and, if the member for Mawson intends to do it, good luck to him: it shows where his sympathies lie.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I feel humbly that I am inadequate to follow the member for Glenelg. Every time he speaks about trade unions he uses the word "Hersey". If that word were taken out of his vocabulary he would be dumb, as would the members for Eyre and Rocky River if the words "primary producer" were taken out of their vocabulary. I do not know what the member for Glenelg meant when he said that Harold Wilson would not want anyone to impinge on anyone's integrity. I have not heard his pronunciation of the word "impinge" before. In any case, Harold Wilson never at any stage of his career said that he wanted Britain, under any terms, to join the Common Market.

Mr. Hopgood: You don't think the honourable member made that up?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, he does not have an imagination of that kind. I am beginning to think that, when the colleagues of this valiant ex-trade unionist gave him two minutes silence before he left England, they must have looked at him from the shoulders up and thought he was dead. I support the motion with great pleasure. The Governor's Speech modestly relates some of the outstanding achievements of the Government and foreshadows with confidence the path the Government intends to take this session. First, I must draw attention to the most melancholy part of the Speech: that which refers to the death of four of our Parliamentary colleagues. I knew all of them well except for Mr. John Cowan, whom I knew only briefly. Sir Collier Cudmore and Mr. Rowe were gentlemen with whom I had little in common, but they undoubtedly were good servants of their Party and the causes they espoused.

I do not think I could possibly allow the death of Mr. Lawn to be passed over in a

couple of brief sentences. Sam Lawn was a character the like of whom we may never see again. He loved his friends and, in a peculiar kind of way, he even loved his enemies. He was a man of great singleness of purpose that manifested itself most prominently in his opposition to the gerrymander. In many years of excellent speeches he was always able to intrude the gerrymander into his speeches, irrespective of the subject before the Chair. He had the same obsession about the gerrymander as Mr. Dick, in *David Copperfield*, had about King Charles's head. Some of us have said that if Sam was proposing the toast to the bride and the bridegroom he would somewhere or other include a reference to the gerrymander.

Another member now appears to be developing an obsession like that connected with King Charles's head, with regard to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd. Mr. Lawn did not have much formal education but he never ceased learning: that important characteristic, coupled with his high intelligence, made him a debater who could go straight to the kernel of the matter, and he destroyed false arguments with devastating effect. He was an outstandingly good Chairman of Committees, as all of us can attest. He was a Labor man who suffered tremendously because of his views. During the depression he was more often out of work than in work not because of the quality of his work but because of his union activities.

He would complain that the ice put in his cordial here was hot and that the lights in the dining room made him sneeze. He put a bungler behind the Speaker's Chair on Guy Fawkes' Night. He did it so skilfully that no-one would have found out that he was the one who did it, but his honesty forced him to admit within a few days that he was the culprit. He was a devoted family man and, beneath a rugged exterior, he was a very gentle man. I shall never forget him and shall always have very happy memories of our long association.

I come now to happier things. I congratulate the member for Price on his election to the position of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. His elevation to that position is a great loss to the Public Works Committee, but we are fortunate that the member for Mount Gambier has been elected to the elite of this Parliament on that committee. I also congratulate the member for Albert Park on his election to the Land Settle-

ment Committee. The honourable member has outstanding qualifications for that position, and he will be an acquisition to the committee. I asked him today what his qualifications were, but he told me he would tell me later. He has not told me yet, but no doubt he will do so.

I congratulate the new member for Adelaide on his election. Most of us who have known him for a long time were looking forward to the day when he took his place in Parliament as a Labor representative. I, with many of my colleagues, went to the declaration of the poll. Naturally, we were in good spirits. Only one thing there caused me considerable sadness, and that was to see that poor girl who had been duped by the Liberal and Country League to stand for a seat of that nature. She had worked hard, but she was left there like a "shagess" on a rock, with no-one else from the L.C.L. there to give her any moral support. I have noticed this frequently. Many Liberal candidates have opposed me in the past, and some of them have been excellent candidates, according to Liberal standards. I have pointed out to them at poll declarations in a kindly fashion that if they thought that standing for a tough seat would put them in line for a safe or a marginal seat in the future they had better not get too confident, because when a safe or marginal seat comes up they have to be in the "in" set, and there are very peculiar "out" people opposite who are "in" people. Not one of those candidates has ever been given the chance in a different type of seat. I prophesy that exactly the same thing will apply to Mrs. Finch.

The entry of the member for Adelaide into the House was probably unique. He was declared elected on a Monday, sworn in on Tuesday, and on Wednesday he made his maiden speech on an abortive no-confidence motion. Later on the same day he moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is astonishing not that he did this so well but that he could do it at all. In some respects, but not many, the honourable member reminds me of Bernadette Devlin. I am told that when she was sworn in she said, "Well, now, when can I make a speech?" As many members of the House of Commons do not speak for years, if at all, she was advised to get the feeling of the House and to come back in a couple of months when she felt she was confident enough to make a speech, at which she mouthed a few Irish epithets and rushed up to the Speaker. The result was that a brief time after she was sworn in she made her maiden

speech. Of course, she will never be able to make another one! To show that her speech was not a prepared one, she spent the first half of it taking to pieces the member who had just preceded her. I do not think I should take this rather unlikely analogy very much further, because Bernadette Devlin has now shown that she can do things that the member for Adelaide is biologically incapable of doing.

I also congratulate the member for Florey on his excellent speech in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. We are used to the high standard of that member's speeches. I was disappointed that he had a cold at the time. I shall not continue to deal with each speaker individually to any great extent. Suffice it to say, as my guide, friend and mentor has said (and I am referring, of course, to the member for Elizabeth), that all Labor members have made excellent speeches and all Liberal members except one have made abysmally bad speeches, as is their wont. The member for Mallee was the exception. There is not the slightest doubt about that.

Mr. Clark: Don't put a nail in his coffin.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not trying to put nails in his coffin; I think he will soon struggle out of the coffin that his own colleagues are trying to put him in. I do not think the honourable member could have been heard in this House if the member for Alexandra had been present. He would have taken a point of order, as he did when my friend the member for Mitchell was speaking, and as a consequence we would not have heard the interesting speech made by the member for Mallee. Of course, the member for Alexandra would have prevented one of his own team from making the only intelligent speech that came from that side of the House.

There is one member opposite who, despite what I said a moment ago, always merits special consideration, and I cannot, in any circumstances, lump him in with all of his colleagues. I see that he is looking up in anticipation. I am speaking of the member for Heysen, who made a long and eloquent speech on a subject he did not name. I shall completely demolish all his arguments one by one. Now, having done that, I shall return to the general debate. It cannot be kept separate from the no-confidence motion and the urgency motion. No-one can doubt that it has been a wide-ranging debate, despite the member for Alexandra. The subject of compulsory unionism has been

bandied about everywhere, and we have had members speaking of the Premier, the cost of living and Price control, the Premier, Communist China (which we will soon be calling the Peoples Republic of China), the Premier, the plight of the primary producer, the Premier, Parliamentary procedures, profits, and what else do you think? We have even had the Moratorium Royal Commission mentioned. Unfortunately, not nearly enough has been said about the Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society, the Daughters of the Revolution, the League of Rights, or the Upper House.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Or the Liberal Party.

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, there is nothing to say about that. Compulsory unionism, someone unsophisticated would be inclined to believe, was the principal hate of members opposite at the moment. Of course, it is not; that is far from the truth. The pet hate of members opposite is not compulsory unionism. They do not mind compulsion: their great hate is unionism. They certainly do not mind compulsion, for they openly support compulsory military service. They believe that people should be forced to fight in wars they do not believe in, and they support forcing people to face possible or probable death in wars that are provoked for the most ignoble reasons.

Here they shelter under patriotism, that word that covers such a multitude of sins and gives living truth to the old saying that patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel. Compulsion is, indeed, something that the interests and people who support members opposite would like a lot more of and would get if it was not for the trade unions. We can easily imagine the way in which employees would be kicked around and directed by the employers if it was not for unionism. We never hear from members about the nefarious and social activities of employers. There is compulsion there from the employers to do this, that and the other—"Take that or else!" They do not complain about that compulsion.

Mr. Crimes: And employers can say, "Take a week's notice!"

Mr. JENNINGS: That is a favourite one, and it is only through awards gained by trade unions that even a week's notice is necessary now. Members opposite are not worried about this sort of compulsion. As I have said, it is unionism that they are worried about, because it largely prevents the worst form of compulsion that would otherwise be forced on the



working community. Many members have said peculiar things about unionism in this debate and have used peculiar arguments to camouflage their real hatred of unions, and none was more idiotic than that of the member for Hanson, who said that those people who were joining the shop assistants union were asked to pledge themselves to vote Labor at future elections. That is absolutely idiotic. We could be pardoned for being violently annoyed at that statement if it had emanated from another source, but in the circumstances we can just lump it together with his other claims about 13,000 abortions and the Glenelg tram and let his irresponsible statements sink together. We must remember that the member for Hanson is panicking, as well he may. He was narrowly elected at the last election, on the donkey vote, and he certainly has not endeared himself to his district by acting as a donkey ever since. He now realizes as time goes on that the next election is getting closer and closer and that his microscopic majority is beginning to look even slimmer. Hysteria is creeping in and, as a result, he is not improving his position; he is making it much worse. That is making it look much better for us on this side of the House, so we are not complaining unduly.

The honourable member commenced his speech, if we can so describe it, by saying that, if he walked up the Glenelg jetty at 3 o'clock in the morning in his underpants blowing a whistle, he would be arrested for offensive behaviour. Every honourable member of this House would be glad to go to court and testify that the honourable member was acting comparatively rationally. Another member of the Opposition who allowed his hatred of unions to overcome his reason was the member for Flinders, who spoke about unionists throwing bricks through windows. There has not been one instance of anything like that happening in this State. Not one person in a position of responsibility in any union, whether right, left, or centre, or any of those idiotic labels, would have considered tactics of this kind. To be charitable to the honourable member, we can only assume that he is becoming more and more under the spell of Eric Butler.

Mr. Clark: Who is Eric Butler?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think I have heard of him before. I have heard him mentioned by a member of another place.

Mr. Crimes: By two members.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am sorry, but I must contradict my friend the member for Spence. I have heard him mentioned by four members

of another place. He was spoken of favourably by three members and unfavourably by the new member for Southern. The member for Glenelg, when speaking in one of these censure or no-confidence motions, complained (but he is more naive than are his more knowledgeable colleagues) that his objection to the unions is that they pay affiliation fees to the Labor Party, but this does not worry his friends who know more about the game. They know that this could mean 1c we have to spend in the campaign compared to their \$1.

Mr. Harrison: Do you think he got out of his depth?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think he was in his depth to get out of it, but we know that, since he became a member, he has always been worried (he is an authority on unions, according to himself) about affiliation fees of unions going to the Labor Party. He speaks about supporters of other Parties giving money to help the Labor Party election campaign, but what he does not know is that, if a union secretary came along to the Secretary of the Labor Party and said, "I have 2,000 members and here are the affiliation fees for 2,000", but the Secretary of the Labor Party knew that there were 20 Communists, 20 D.L.P.'s and five Liberals (to keep it in its proper perspective), he would have to say, "I am sorry, I cannot take affiliation fees from these members." That is something that the member for Glenelg, the industrial expert, has not thought about, and it frequently happens.

The member for Bragg thought he had the answer to the Premier when the Premier said that shareholders have no say about what their companies donate to the Liberal Party for election campaigns, when he said, "You do not have to be a shareholder." Of course, the member for Spence easily saw through this, and it is not inappropriate for me to repeat that the profits that go to the companies to enable them to make donations to the Liberal Party come out of the price of a pound of butter or whatever it is that the average person has to buy: there is nothing voluntary about buying food or clothes.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You can't contract out.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course not.

Mr. Rodda: What about the donations they make to the A.L.P.?

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member can read about this in *Hansard*, because I will not go through it again for his benefit. As was pointed out by the member for Spence, many Labor supporters, and in fact voters of every

kind, directly make contributions to the Liberal Party, despite the fact that they would not voluntarily do it; they just have to do it. I cannot understand why a person should be entitled to share in the benefits gained for workers by their union, often at great expense, if he is not willing to contribute his fair share towards the expenses incurred by his brother workers in gaining those benefits. If he does not share that expense he is only a parasite. We have heard much from members opposite about conscience in these matters, but I do not think that conscience comes into it at all. I think that these people who would get benefits at the expense of their fellow workers have no conscience whatsoever.

Mr. Crimes: They are free riders.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. It is amazing how often the attitude of these parasites does not serve them very well in the long run. I do not know how many hundreds of times people have come to see me here about some industrial problem or accident; when I ask them what the union has done about it, they shamefacedly say, "We didn't even join," and then, of course, they realize that they have no protection. They are sorry, but it is too late. I was interested in the speech made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is usually a target for some members on this side (I thought the member for Elizabeth treated him rather harshly).

The member for Mitcham quoted *ad nauseam* from the transcript of the recent Royal Commission. I listened to him and, having read his speech in *Hansard* since, I am afraid that I cannot understand what he was trying to establish. Of course, we know that he was trying to have one of his usual shots at the Premier. The honourable member has, to say the least, a tremendous inferiority consciousness about the Premier. When I say "inferiority consciousness" I mean that, and not an inferiority complex; there is a difference. The member for Mitcham tried to denigrate the Premier, and if he had any more serious objection I think it would have been much more appropriate to refer to the findings of the Royal Commission, but he did not do that. I wonder whether members opposite noticed that; I am sure members on this side noticed it.

What interested me more was his slighting references to the lowering of the prestige of Parliament. I say unequivocally that no member has contributed more to this than has the member himself, and one of the worst examples of it that I have ever seen was on

the opening day while the Governor was reading his Speech: the member for Mitcham was sitting immediately opposite me, taking notes all the time. Why he had to be taking notes, I do not know because, as we know, the Speech was printed and he got a copy of it half an hour afterwards, anyway. I thought it was a shocking reflection on His Excellency that, while he was reading his Speech opening Parliament, the member for Mitcham was there writing out notes. I think this was setting a bad example to other members of the House, and it was certainly a bad example from a man who should set a good example.

I submit that no-one in this House has ever been more disrespectful to the Chair and more contemptuous of the Chair than the member for Mitcham has been. How many times have we seen him pulled up eventually after expending all his devious devices, only to add in a sarcastic way, "Well, I got it in, anyway"? He is always doing that. The honourable member is the last one who should complain about Parliamentary behaviour. He was not always this way. He has become so objectionable only since the advent of the Walsh Labor Government. He just cannot conceive that we have the right to sit on this side and to govern, even though his Party sat on this side for 32 years without any right at all. We must not condemn the honourable member too much, for he is having troubles too. He is Deputy Leader and knows that his Leader cannot lead a flock of homing pigeons, yet he knows he will never replace him. When the Leader is replaced (and that is bound to be soon), he will be replaced by someone more amenable to the extreme right, someone from the League of Rights or under the auspices of that body: one of the new Klu Klux Klansmen or John Birchmen (I do not think it will be one of the Daughters of the Revolution, but it might).

I believe the member from Mitcham was on firmer ground when he spoke about Parliamentary procedure. Although I am not sure I completely agree with him, I know that the forms of this House are often almost completely unintelligible to the average person. However, when I have had friends in the gallery they have told me afterwards that they have been impressed with the procedures which, after all, have been evolved over the centuries and which contain in them the history of the hard and tortuous path towards democracy, a goal which is still beckoning us and which we will perhaps always be aspiring to. On the

other hand, nothing just in itself has any intrinsic worth; we would probably be better off without some of the frills. Still, the member for Mitcham is a member of the Standing Orders Committee: I wonder whether he has ever taken the initiative there. The member for Mitcham also said that the Governor's Speech contained a lot of old things that had been dusted up for re-presentation. He said that he even recognized things that had been initiated when he was Attorney-General—those two inglorious years. He told us how he had started off so many things: he is always telling us about things he started off. Is it not strange that this gentleman, who started so much off, finished nothing? What about the long, Liberal Party dominated years? These were not just allowed to be covered by dust: they were completely submerged in dust.

Mr. Venning: They were the best years the State has known. You talk such rubbish and rot about it.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know what the honourable member is talking about. Perhaps we may hear him in this debate, but I think we will then have just as much difficulty understanding him as I have had in understanding his interjection. Let us look at dusting things up and not doing things that have been started. The "25 Years Ago" column of the *Advertiser* of July 20, 1971, states that Parliament opened on July 19 of that year. The article is as follows:

Legislation foreshadowed at the Opening of Parliament includes the ratification of an agreement on uniform gauge and the completion of the north-south railway.

That was an extract from the *Advertiser* of 25 years ago! The Premier has been widely criticized for his trip throughout Asia. I think it is a very good thing for South Australia and Australia that the Premier is making that trip. Let us remember that the Premier is not only a South Australian: he is an Australian. Furthermore, he is not only a great South Australian: he is a great Australian. In Asia any person in a prominent Government position from a State of Australia is a prominent Australian. Asians do not fully understand the federal system in this country, nor do people in Britain. The person who has done more for the general image of Australia throughout Asia than anyone else in this country is the Premier of this State. In Malaysia particularly it is just as well that we have someone who can counteract the feeling that they have there about Australia

as a result of some of Mr. Gorton's statements, because Mr. Gorton's name is stench in the nostrils of all Malaysians. What I have said about Mr. Gorton's name applies throughout Asia, but particularly to Malaysia. It applies in Australia, too—even in the Liberal Party. The Premier is doing a very good job for us. He will be back next week.

Mr. Rodda: Will he march?

Mr. JENNINGS: He will not be back until next Wednesday.

Mr. Hopgood: Perhaps the member for Victoria will replace him.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the member for Victoria will march anyway. Somehow or other the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has been referred to during this debate; I do not know why it has been referred to, but I do know by whom it was referred to. I wonder whether the member for Flinders, who spoke about a B.H.P. Company advertisement dealing with a 4 per cent profit, believes that he gets all-day protection from Gard. He may believe that, but I do not really think he is as unsophisticated as that. I wonder whether he believes that every soap powder that is advertised on television gives the whitest wash. I wonder whether he believes that every new car dealer and secondhand car dealer gives the best deal in town. If he believes these things, I can understand his believing those advertisements about the B.H.P. Company, according to which so many thousands of people are employed by the company in order to give them a job. Why not put it in its right perspective? The B.H.P. Company makes its profits out of the thousands of people who work for it. What about all the wealth that is created for the country by the company? Who produces the wealth? The workers—no-one else! I do not know who put the iron ore into the ground, but it was not the B.H.P. Company. However, I know who takes it out of the ground—the worker! Not one shareholder of the company has anything to do with that.

Mr. Rodda: That is a stupid statement.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is not a stupid statement. It is the kind of statement the member for Victoria cannot understand, but it is one that a reasonable person can understand. Every bit of wealth created by the B.H.P. Company or by any other company is created by labour; it cannot be created by any other means. The shareholders do not contribute anything.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish! "Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise."

Mr. JENNINGS: If the honourable member is going to use such quotations, he should use them correctly. The 4 per cent profit has been referred to and is quoted often in these advertisements, but anyone who knows anything about the history of the B.H.P. Company would know that, as a result of watering its shares and of the bonus shares that have been allocated, that 4 per cent would be at least 20 per cent.

Mr. Hopgood: Watered stock!

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, so it is not 4 per cent at all and it is not the result of the efforts of the B.H.P. Managing Director or the shareholders: it is the result of the company's management and of the other labourers, because management are labourers, too, in this sense.

Mr. Venning: What a wonderful legislator! No wonder we are where we are.

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Rocky River supports a Party which was in Government for 32 years and which did not get the State very far. He also supports a Party in the Commonwealth sphere that has been in power for 22 years, and the primary producers, about whom he is so worried, are in the worst position they have ever been in.

Mr. Venning: What are you doing about the primary producers in South Australia?

Mr. JENNINGS: There is not much we can do about them. But what is the Commonwealth Government doing about them? It does not know what to do. If Mr. Anthony uses a bit of elbow grease and pressure on the Prime Minister, he still cannot do very much to help the primary producers. That is so, even though the taxpayers of Australia are coming to the aid of the primary producers greatly, as, indeed, I believe—

Mr. Gunn: What trash! Tell the true story.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Eyre is so pre-judging me that he does not bother to listen to what I am going to say. I sympathize greatly with the primary producers of Australia, and of this State in particular.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You always have.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, I always have. I was one myself until I went broke. They do not realize that they have been robbed by woolbrokers and private bankers for years. Those people have not gone broke. They have taken the primary producers down for years, and the primary producers still think that the old wool expert or wool branch manager,

who goes up to see them wearing a big hat and has a yarn to them while sitting on his haunches, is a friend. He is no friend of theirs, I assure you. If the members for Eyre and Rocky River were political realists, they would be supporting the Labor Party, and they would have been doing so for years. If they did that, they would find that they were not in the parlous position they are in now. Surely, to people of limited intelligence (and I am not pointing any finger), it must be obvious that the Commonwealth Liberal-Country Party Government, which has been in office for 22 years, has not been anything but a disaster for the primary producers of this country.

I think the primary producers, particularly the woolgrowers, have themselves contributed largely to the position they are in. I remember studying wool theory until late every evening many years ago and reading in every lesson that synthetic fibres could never replace wool. Every woolgrower one would speak to would say, "We do not have to worry, because synthetic fibres can never touch wool." Woolgrowers have been brought up to think that, but they have not done much thinking about it for themselves and the consequence now is that, whilst they have been deluding themselves for years, synthetic fibres are competing more than favourably with wool.

Mr. Venning: And will continue to do so.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course, and it is a tragedy to Australia. There is not the slightest doubt about that. However, to go on always, when they are in this position, slinging off at the Labor Party and the people who have worked for them and who in many cases have built up their farms for them is not a very constructive way to solve the problem that the primary producers are in at present. I intended to say much more about things of that kind, but I am running out of time. I have been dealing with the proposals in the Governor's Speech. The many excellent proposals, when enacted, will be of great benefit to the people of this State.

Many members opposite, and many members on this side, asked me to speak in this debate about my experiences overseas. I refused to do that. I said, "I will do that when they print *Hansard* on asbestos". However, there is one thing in Britain that every senior member of the Labour Party, the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party (there are some Liberals left), whether in the House of Lords or in the House of Commons, insists on—that a Government has the right to govern. They

agree that an Opposition should harass the Government and try to overthrow it by all sorts of constitutional means but, whilst the Government is there, they believe that the people who put it there, and therefore the Government, should govern; so I hope that the Legislative Council will take a little notice of the mother of Parliaments and not reject any legislation put up to it by this democratically elected House.

We have very good proposals, as I have said, and I do not think the puerile prattlings of a Party with such a paucity of policy, which honoured us by speaking mostly of our policy instead of its own, will hurt us very much—and who would blame that Party for talking about our policy? It has not one of its own. Its policy is made up of clichés such as “A man is a dog’s best friend” and “Please adjust your dress before you leave”. I support the motion.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I join with other members in my expressions of condolence to the families of those members who have passed on. It is true, as the member for Ross Smith has said, that the Hon. Colin Rowe and Mr. Sam Lawn were our friends and respected members of this Parliament. They were friends of us all and we miss them in the precincts of their respective Chambers. I did not have the honour of knowing Sir Collier Cudmore or Mr. Cowan, but I extend my sympathies to their families.

I regret the retirement from another place of my colleague and neighbour, Sir Norman Jude. Sir Norman gave distinguished service to this Parliament for a period of 27 years, 10 or more of which he served as a Minister of the Crown. I have the highest regard for him as a member of Parliament, a citizen of the State and a member of the community in which I am privileged to live at Naracoorte. Although it was said that I would take his place, that has not happened: his successor is now firmly entrenched in another place. References have been made to that in the course of this debate.

I join in extending congratulations to my old friend the member for Price on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. Until the member for Ross Smith mentioned it, I did not know that my colleague from the South-East, the member for Mount Gambier, had been appointed to the Public Works Committee. I extend my congratulations to him on his appointment. We shall miss him on the Land Settlement Committee but I know from my experience of the honourable member that he

will be a worthy member of the Public Works Committee. There is a happy working arrangement in the South-East; no Party politics emerge down there when we discuss local affairs. The members representing the South-East have a harmonious working arrangement. Allan Burdon will make a valuable contribution to the working of the Public Works Committee. I suppose I must welcome Charlie Harrison—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a tendency for members to start referring to other honourable members by name. This is not in accordance with Standing Orders, and I ask honourable members to refer to honourable members in accordance with Standing Orders.

Mr. RODDA: Thank you, Sir, for that admonition. I refer to the member for Albert Park, who will have a warm welcome to this enterprising committee. He was lucky that he did not have to visit Bool Lagoon, because the weather was most inclement. I congratulate the new member for Adelaide, who I welcome here. We on this side do not share his politics, but we look forward to sharing his fellowship. He will find, despite what has been said about members on this side inside the Chamber, that outside the Chamber the hand of friendship will be extended to him. I was interested to hear the member for Ross Smith say, amongst his humour and invective, that members on this side were not interested in and did not believe in unions. I think this is a most unfair statement.

Mr. Payne: He said that you hated unions.

Mr. RODDA: I have been corrected: that is even worse. Individuals in their separate spheres can organize to sell sheep, produce, or their labour if they wish, and that is their right. I am sure that none of my colleagues would deny them that right.

Mr. Keneally: Do you think a working man should be in the appropriate union?

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member has heard what we have had to say about compulsory unionism.

Mr. Keneally: Do you believe that he should?

Mr. RODDA: If he wants to: we live in a free country.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you believe a wheatgrower should ship his wheat to another State?

Mr. RODDA: If he wants to. Under section 92 of the Constitution a primary producer can do so if he wishes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Wouldn't it be illegal under the wheat stabilization plan?

Mr. RODDA: It is not. As the Minister well knows, this action is being taken and is one of the things with which we have to live. It may have a somewhat unfortunate effect on orderly marketing and on the controlling of economic conditions, about which the member for Ross Smith was speaking.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you support action by the Wheat Board to eliminate it?

Mr. RODDA: As the Minister knows, there has to be a referendum to alter the Constitution.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There has to be complementary legislation in every State and the Commonwealth.

Mr. RODDA: If the Minister is forewarning me of something that is not in the Governor's Speech, I thank him for it. I have read the Speech—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am wondering how much you are in favour of compulsion on wheatgrowers.

Mr. RODDA: I am sure the members for Rocky River and Eyre will be pleased to hear more about this.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: So you would be in favour of compulsion?

Mr. RODDA: We will cross that bridge when the Minister brings it to us. The member for Florey introduced the subject of companies' making big profits. The member for Whyalla, even if he did in his own way castigate the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, made a good speech, if I may say so, and I was pleased to hear him say that there were too many unions.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He was talking about the Farmers' Union.

Mr. RODDA: I do not think he was. Certain members opposite were criticizing large profits and the member for Florey, taking the long handle to the B.H.P. Company and other companies, as reported at page 71 of *Hansard*, said:

The *Advertiser* of April 7 reported that the disclosed profits of General Motors-Holden's amounted to \$27,800,000. Not a bad chop, but they cannot afford to spend \$1,000,000 to allow the workers to get a raise! The profit for B.H.P. was \$68,459,000.

We have had a reference to this from the member for Ross Smith. Surely the making of profits is not immoral. Without profits, businesses will not flourish, and what would

we do with the work force that is so vital to the prosperity of the State?

Mr. Brown: What would the company do without the work force?

Mr. RODDA: The two must go hand in hand. I believe the profit motive is present in everyone, including the Minister of Education; I am sure it is present in the member for Whyalla, and I do not think it would be far beneath the tough hide of the member for Stuart. Every person strives to increase the rewards for his work, and there is nothing immoral about this: the desire of the individual to better his material position in the world is entirely praiseworthy. People do not wish to be bogged down by strikes or inconvenienced by the sort of industrial trouble that occurred last week, and Government members should constantly keep this in mind and see that the mainspring of our economy does not become unwound.

The member for Florey, and the member for Whyalla, as well as other Government members, growl about these huge profits but, on examining them, they will find that those profits are smaller than they imagine. I think that in all fairness Government members should look at the spread of the dividends before they make this great roar about profits, which they are examining in aggregate. They seem to imply that these huge sums of money were parcelled out to a few favourably endowed individuals, but actually the people earning the income benefit from company dividends. There are hundreds of thousands of shareholders in Australian industries, and, in addition, a great many others benefit from investment in shares by life insurance companies, superannuation and charitable organizations, and even religious funds.

Mr. Keneally: Are you concerned about how big they are getting?

Mr. RODDA: The bigger they get, the more that is ploughed back. The Government receives more, and this is helpful, seeing that I am asking the Minister of Education for more schools. Members are worrying about someone getting too much profit. Big and small companies employ people, so it ill becomes members opposite to be so critical of them and to engage in the invective we have heard in this debate. Much of the profit about which members opposite have complained is being used for reinvestment in further development, thereby providing much of the capital needed for expansion. All

history shows that living standards rise only as the productive equipment of the community is expanded.

Mr. Kencally: Are you concerned about the takeovers that are taking place?

Mr. RODDA: A profitable business undertaking is the main means by which this can be accomplished. The continued denigrating of business by members opposite and the sniping at profits slows up this process and acts against the best interests of the community as a whole. Australia is a wonderful country with unparalleled prospects for further development. The Premier seems to share this view, as he talks with entrepreneurs overseas, seeking to encourage them to invest in our State. We certainly do not provide any assistance when we start this tirade of abuse against making a profit. I would hope that we have a new attitude from Government members in this regard.

The rural industry is currently not a happy industry. As my colleagues have dealt extensively with this matter, I do not wish to worry the House with a further long bash on the issue. I was pleased to see at the annual meeting of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated held in Adelaide last week a committee of inquiry appointed to look into the whole matter currently facing the rural economy. The members of the committee are all men of the land who have had long experience. They include Mr. Roocke, the immediate past president of United Farmers and Graziers, Mr. Puckridge of the West Coast, Mr. Jack Trevor of Barmera, and Mr. Philbey of Lameroo. Also, there is Mr. Ronald Badman, who is a constituent of mine from Naracoorte. He is a Churchill Fellow who will bring valuable experience to the committee, and I am pleased to say that similar qualifications apply to other members. I particularly want to commend the rural producers' organizations for what they are doing in the rural industry in its present plight. In addition to Mr. Badman, Mr. Ray Wicks from my district is giving sterling service and much of his time as a member of the Australian Wool Industry Council and to the Australian Wool and Wheat Producers Federation. He and Mr. Badman are two of the leading farmers in my district. They are top quality farmers in their own right and, as they go about their task, they can speak with a background of eminent success in their own field. They are the sort of people who are working on behalf of the rural community

today, and it is heartening to see them serving farmers. The agenda of the rural committee included a reference to the cost structure of farms.

Mr. Venning: Did you see any Labor Party members at the conference?

Mr. RODDA: I saw one, I think the member for Chaffey. I did not see the member for Mitchell there; I thought he might be interested in wombats.

Mr. Payne: I was looking after some of the poor pensioners in my district.

Mr. RODDA: That conference and the committee will aid and abet the worthy actions of the honourable member. I am sure that, wherever he was, he was doing good work. The committee has been set an extensive task, and I am sure that something worthwhile will result from its deliberations. I hope the Government will give it any assistance it requires. All members know about the serious plight that faces primary producers as the result of increased costs. A farmer on a property of moderate size in my district runs 3,000 sheep and should cut 30,000lb. of wool. At current prices we would expect a wool cheque of \$10,000 to \$11,000. Shearing and selling the clip account for 20 per cent, and \$8,700 would be needed to live and to run the property. The return from surplus sheep at current prices is very meagre. Members must be wondering how these people are making ends meet under the stringent conditions. For a typical farmer living expenses are \$1,600; superphosphate costs are \$1,200 to \$1,500; mortgage payments are between \$1,000 and \$1,500; rates and taxes are between \$500 and \$600; repairs, maintenance and keeping the farm in order cost about \$1,000; and insurance costs \$200. These costs amount to a total of about \$6,600, leaving \$1,100 for other expenses involved in running a farm.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The farmers need Commonwealth assistance.

Mr. RODDA: We have heard much from the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition about this matter. After reading reports of the Launceston conference, one gathered that the Leader was in no doubt that there would be a Labor Government in Canberra after the next election. I think the Minister will agree with that. It had a bit of a jolt this week in Queensland. When Governments go to the people, no-one can be sure about the outcome. The man on the land would have real cause for concern if we had a Labor Government in Canberra.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Did you hear what Mr. Anthony had to say?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, and I heard what Dr. Patterson had to say.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What did Mr. Anthony have to say?

Mr. RODDA: A recent press report states:

The Labor spokesman on rural industry, Dr. Patterson, M.H.R., last night lashed out at the Party's Federal Conference and bitterly criticized a senior colleague. In an ABC-TV interview, he said: The conference—meeting this week in Launceston—had "few people who knew anything about rural matters".

That is a fair criticism of the Labor Party. It is interesting to see that a Mr. Chatterton, a candidate for the next election, has been thrown into one of the most industrial seats held by the Labor Party. I have been told that there will be a new Minister for Agriculture. I hope that he will receive more co-operation from this Parliament than Dr. Patterson received. The press report continues:

Labor's spokesman on welfare, Mr. Hayden, MHR, had shown "colossal ignorance, from a person who should know better." Decisions by the conference against rural subsidies would mean trouble in the Party's Federal Parliamentary caucus. Dr. Patterson said he found it incredible that Mr. Hayden could tell the conference on Monday that Labor lacked a comprehensive, integrated rural policy. "I read this in the paper—I find it incredible, and also untrue", Dr. Patterson said.

Mr. Hayden—an economist, and like Dr. Patterson, from Queensland—successfully moved an amendment to a report on rural reconstruction from the Party's rural committee, which includes Dr. Patterson. The amendment put a time limit on measures to assist rural industries and restricts them to helping industries able to become economically self-supporting. Dr. Patterson agreed that Mr. Hayden appeared to have the support of the conference.

"I find it very hard to believe except that perhaps very few members of the conference know anything about rural matters," he said.

A statement by Mr. Hayden—that the ALP could not continue to pour out subsidies "willy-nilly, like a madman in charge of a counterfeit press"—was dangerous.

"If this is followed in the caucus, as it should be, it means we will have to vote against the Wheat Stabilisation Bill, the dairy industry, the various wool commitments and the Australian Wool Commission," said Dr. Patterson. If the same criteria were used for tariffs, it would mean the "abolition of virtually all secondary industry in Australia." Canberra observers last night saw Dr. Patterson's outburst as providing grounds for disciplinary action by the party.

There the rural spokesman for the Labor Party in the Commonwealth sphere expressed real concern about his Party's attitude to the

primary producer, so it is little wonder that cold comfort comes from that side when we are looking as kindly as we can on his opposite numbers in this House.

Mr. Keneally: Surely you are not blaming Dr. Patterson or Bill Hayden for the problems of the rural industry in this State?

Mr. RODDA: The member for Stuart is a rural man and he has quite an extensive area. I am pleased he has interjected, because, as he well knows, more common resolve and initiative are being used in the rural sector of this State than are being used anywhere else. Let me assure the House that, wherever one goes in South Australia today, one finds an aged father carrying on a property with the assistance of a middle-aged son, provided they do their own shearing. Incidentally, the cost of shearing and selling the wool from a flock of sheep, whether he is a big farmer or a small one, takes about 20 per cent of the gross return. We are seeing the initiative and enterprise of the man on the land, who is helping himself. Indeed, this is the only way he will be able to keep going. The problem is not the fault of the farmer and, in fairness, let me say that it is not the fault of Mr. Hayden or Dr. Patterson. It is a system that goes across the board.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Have you an explanation of the system?

Mr. RODDA: I know the philosophies that the Minister espouses. When he was appointed to his exalted position, he said that he was a friend of the workers. That is the system that we are in. We have increased wages, and I am not saying that people are not entitled to them—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I don't want to put you off.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: The rural people are unable to pass on any of the costs and are carrying all the costs themselves. They have had to make economies and they are doing that with great credit to themselves. This is of great assistance to the State.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable member for Victoria is making his speech. Every other honourable member of the House gets the opportunity to speak. I hope honourable members on both sides of the Chamber will extend the courtesy that the member for Victoria deserves. The honourable member for Victoria.



Mr. RODDA: Speaking about Dr. Patterson reminds me that we have had this great visitation overseas by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition, who has been looking at, amongst other things, rural matters or the sale of rural products and making great play that we have this great customer, Red China. One would think that he almost had a tip that Mr. Nixon intended to have the forthcoming discussions with that country. I was interested to read what the Premier said overseas about migration. He is reported in the *Sunday Mail* as saying:

Racial bigots are still shuffled through Australia's corridors of power.

In this regard, he was talking about the small number of Asian migrants coming to this country. The article stated, *inter alia*, that he saw no reason why greater numbers of Asians would create racial difficulties. He is further reported as saying:

Australia now grants assisted passages to certain classes of Europeans or people from the Northern Hemisphere who have little or no ability to cope with the demands of an industrialized common law society.

How ungracious can the Premier be in making these odious comparisons when we have people of that type north of Adelaide in Elizabeth and south of Adelaide in the district represented by the member for Mawson. Our Premier represents those migrants as second-rate citizens! This will only be adding insult to injury in Elizabeth after denying these people the shopping hours they wanted. They will not be pleased to hear this said by the Premier who is reported also as saying:

In the meantime in Asia, the Pacific, Africa and North America there are highly skilled or highly competent and learned or appropriately socially educated people who would add desirably diverse qualities to the Australian nation.

Mr. Keneally: You agree with that?

Mr. RODDA: The Premier is denigrating the good people we have here.

The Hon. L. J. King: Do you agree with the latter part of that article?

Mr. RODDA: There is nothing wrong with it when we compare it with the denigration by the Premier of migrants already here. To the many migrants who have supported this Government it is a base injustice. I imagine those people will not be very pleased to have this statement drawn to their attention.

The Hon. L. J. King: They have had this distorted version drawn to their attention.

Mr. RODDA: The Attorney-General wants to try some learned stuff on me. Of course,

I am only a poor simple farmer. He is trying to knock me down but I do not think the people I am speaking about would be very impressed. Notwithstanding the reaction in this State to what I have to say I was a little disappointed in reading this rather elusive character "Onlooker". He may have been making an educated guess.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You have to be careful about that.

Mr. RODDA: He is anonymous, is he not? I had difficulty in determining exactly what he meant. Members on this side seem to be getting a bit of a knock from him, so we were heartened to read last week about the pressure being put on Government members with descriptions of the extreme leftists and the middle-of-the-roaders. Our hard heart softened towards Onlooker whoever he may be. However, if he shares the honours, and gives kicks and praise to both sides, we will not be upset about it. I am drawing his attention to the fact that we on this side considered that we were on the wrong side of his ledger balance, but we were interested to see the manner in which he has lined up the Government extremists.

I look forward to this session. Obviously, the Government has settled down, with the backbenchers in all their glory, and although one does not agree with everything that has been said in this debate, it has been said in a good spirit and with much fire. Even the member for Spence has come out of his shell. I think this debate will set the stage for an interesting session, and I support the motion.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): I, too, support the motion, and offer my condolences to the families of the four members of Parliament who have passed away recently. Although I did not know three of them, I was well acquainted with the former member for Adelaide, Mr. Sammy Lawn. Sammy Lawn rose from the ranks of the working class: he joined the trade union movement at an early age and graduated to this House. He served his fellow man very well and, to my knowledge, he was a worthy representative of this Parliament. I congratulate the new member of the Legislative Council, Mr. Martin Cameron, and the new member for Adelaide in this Chamber, Mr. Jack Wright.

I have known the member for Adelaide for many years: I knew him as a shearer and I worked with him in the trade union movement. I have great respect for his ability, and I know that he will be a worthy member of the Government. In recent months I have

been concerned about pollution in Australia, and I was more concerned when I read a newspaper report about this matter that appeared on July 22. The report by officers of the Health Department disclosed that the township of Salisbury, in my district, suffered the highest air pollution fall-out in the State, with about 40 tons of solid pollutants a square mile raining down on sections of the town. Salisbury has the worst record, and it is interesting to note what some members of the community have had to say. The Mayor of Salisbury is as concerned as I am about the amount of fall-out.

Mr. McRae: Would it be unusual that you both agree?

Mr. GROTH: Yes. The report on pollution in the Salisbury area is as follows:

The people of Salisbury are stunned. They are learning today that their city is the worst pollution area in South Australia. Even the Mayor (Mr. H. L. Bowey), aware of the problems of dust and smog hanging menacingly over his city, is shocked. He knew the problem was bad. But not as bad as the figures in the Health Department report released today. Forty tons of solid pollutants fell on each square mile of Salisbury each month of the year, the report said. Mr. Bowey, quick to defend his city, said: "I find it very hard to believe our pollution level is really that high—especially with the rain we have had this year." With a hint of irritation in his voice, he added: "It should be pointed out that the pollution tests were taken in Yorke Terrace—right next to the railway station. I hardly consider this fair and it would be interesting to know where tests in other centres were made.

Despite his criticism, Mr. Bowey acknowledged pollution was an exceptionally serious problem in Salisbury. He blames the smog and dust that often blankets the city on:

Tremendous industrial and housing development in recent years. More than 1,300 houses are built in Salisbury each year. New industries are bringing new life to the city—choking it with dust when erected—and smog when manufacturing.

Heavy road traffic in the mornings and afternoons when cars and trucks travel bumper to bumper along the Main North road, coughing fumes from exhausts as they go to and from work.

Mr. Bowey also blames prevailing winds that blow filth-laden air from the Port Adelaide area over Salisbury. Other outside influences were industries in Elizabeth polluting the Little Para River.

Rural land surrounding the city, dry and dusty in summertime, the dust often blowing over the city.

Mr. Bowey said there was little that could be done to stop the city outgrowing its environment. But he was confident a balance would continue in the future. Townspeople were amazed to find their city had the highest pollution level.

Mrs. Daphne McPhee, of Foley street, said: "I would have thought Adelaide would be much worse, let alone Port Adelaide and suburbs in that area which have so many factories. But, until we had our roads sealed, it was pretty bad and sometimes I could not see more than a few hundred yards outside our home because of dust." Other housewives said the problem was acute in summer time when they often were forced to wash clothes a second time after hanging them on the line and finding them covered in dust.

These reports prompted me to examine the question of pollution generally in Australia. I came up with a book called *The Effluent Society* written by Don Whittington, a journalist who reports mainly on national politics. When he attended a meeting of the Innisfail branch of the Queensland Littoral Society, he was so horrified at the reports given that he decided to investigate the question of pollution, and this resulted in his book. When one reads the book one becomes more horrified, because each and every one of us is contributing greatly towards the destruction of mankind. Pollution is a problem for both State and Commonwealth Governments. Although State Governments have some laws dealing with air pollution, they are not uniform, and the Commonwealth Government has no legislation at all.

Most Australians contribute to their own destruction and the destruction of generations to come by apathy, ignorance, laziness, avarice, procrastination, personal and professional jealousy and criminal negligence. The biggest threats to our existence are pollution of air and water. The industrialist who permits unnecessary emission of fumes from his chimney stacks or allows industrial waste to flow into a creek or river contributes to pollution, as does the householder who burns rubbish in his backyard and the politician who opposes legislative action. Let me quote what the Victorian policy is in relation to pollution. The official attitude appears to be confirmed by a statement made by the Premier of Victoria (Sir Henry Bolte) in March, 1970, as follows:

We care about water pollution, but it is not more important than a \$100,000,000 industry.

So we can see what the Victorian Liberal Government thinks about pollution. The ship-owner or master who emits waste into the harbour and the motor car owner who fails to control exhaust fumes from his car also contribute towards pollution. It is interesting to note what Don Whittington had to say about exhaust fumes, as follows:

New South Wales showed that 78 per cent of motor vehicles tested were emitting carbon monoxide in excess of 8 per cent at idling speeds. In 90 per cent of these cases the carbon monoxide emission was reduced to below 1 per cent by a simple adjustment of the carburettor. The highest emission after adjustment was 2 per cent. But there is no compulsion on motorists in New South Wales or anywhere else to have carburettors adjusted, no penalties for unnecessary emission of carbon monoxide. In California exhaust pipe devices to control carbon monoxide emission are standard equipment on all motor vehicles. Nothing similar is standard in Australia. There are a number of recognized devices for controlling and minimizing carbon monoxide emissions from motor vehicles. There is a flame afterburner, which costs about \$45 to install. It is claimed to reduce carbon monoxide emission by nearly 70 per cent and hydrocarbons by 80 per cent.

There are several other arrestors dealing with fumes, but none of them is very successful. Most Australians contribute to the problem simply because they are unwilling to do something about arresting the most poisonous fumes that pollute the air—those from motor vehicles. The biggest culprit is the man in the street, who cares so little that he takes no action. The problem affects not only Australia but also Great Britain and America. In London and Los Angeles the dangers have been greatly reduced, but Australia has not learnt from the experience of those cities. At Largs North the South Australian Housing Trust built houses along the boundary of Sulphuric Acid Pty. Ltd. That company's factory adjoins a residential area, but there is no buffer to stop pollution entering the houses. There is evidence that air pollution alone could be costing Australia about \$360,000,000 a year through damage to the motor car bodies, damage to the paintwork of motor cars, houses and other buildings, and through corrosion of roofs and damage to clothing.

**THE SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much audible conversation. The honourable member for Salisbury is making his speech and I request that the other honourable members cease their conversations.

**MR. GROTH:** The costs involved in the damage I have mentioned have not been properly assessed; in America such costs are estimated at about \$30 per capita. The Commonwealth Department of Supply is concerned about the extent of air pollution, yet that department has no programme relating to air pollution. The following is an extract from Mr. Whittington's book "The Effluent Society":

In the Sydney suburb of Waterloo the Air Pollution Advisory Committee gave permission

for an industry to erect a chimney stack 100ft. high to protect surrounding houses, none of which at that time exceeded 60ft. in height. No sooner was the decision made than the company in question discovered that another Government department was erecting multi-storey flats on the northern side of it and only 500yds. from the chimney stack. As the building was to be 160ft. high the fate of those occupying top-floor flats can be imagined.

That shows what the Liberal Government in New South Wales is doing in regard to pollution. The Senate Select Committee on Pollution was told in July, 1968, by the President of the Clean Air Society (Mr. J. G. Schroeder) that there had been only one prosecution under the Clean Air Act in New South Wales in the last 50 years. Victoria has no Government policy to prosecute. These two Governments refuse to prosecute because of their jealousy and lack of uniformity. If any State had a firmer policy on air pollution it would be in danger of losing its existing industries and of attracting new industries. This is something that must be overcome. There must be uniform laws on all types of pollution. It is interesting to note what Whittington had to say about Port Pirie:

The Port Pirie Trades and Labour Council alleges that the Broken Hill smelters, which is a major cause of pollution in the town, is evading its responsibilities, in that the company claims that pollution from sulphur dioxide has no ill effect on human health. The company claims it is doing everything in its power to minimize the nuisance. The council admits it has no scientific evidence to support its claims because it has no money for the necessary research and receives no financial assistance to enable it to prove its case. Yet the council says it knows chemists employed at the smelters who have tested the arsenic content of their rainwater tanks and have found it so high that they won't allow their families to use the water for cooking or drinking.

That shows what big business thinks of pollution. As long as big business can squeeze as much profit as it can out of its industry, it seems to me that it is not prepared to put anything back to minimize one of the biggest dangers to our existence. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

**MR. GUNN (Eyre):** In supporting the motion, I pay a tribute to those former members of Parliament who have recently died. I congratulate the member for Adelaide on his election to this House. The Opening Speech is typical of what we have seen of the present Government during its 13 or 14 months in office. It told us little and was typical of the Socialist doctrine. The members for Florey and Mawson were in their usual form when they

attacked private enterprise, particularly the member for Florey in his attack on the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. I wonder what the member for Florey would describe as a fair and reasonable profit. I intended to refer to Abraham Lincoln's 10 "cannots" but, as the member for Glenelg has already quoted Lincoln, I will not go over that again. I think the member for Hanson answered those honourable members well in his remarks. Much has been said in this House about pollution and conservation.

Mr. Clark: So it should be.

Mr. GUNN: I agree. I consider that all citizens and members of Parliament should be concerned about the pollution of our environment and the protection of our wild life. The member for Mawson gave us one of his typical orations on pollution and conservation. Any legislation or action in this field must have regard to the practical side of the subject. I should like to mention one or two matters in this regard. The first is the system by which permits are issued for the slaughter of kangaroos. This scheme which has been quite impracticable did not take into consideration the problems that primary producers are facing in this connection.

In my district kangaroos are causing many primary producers considerable trouble. Further, if any honourable member has had the misfortune to hit a kangaroo when driving his motor car, he knows what a problem kangaroos cause along our roads. The permit system has proved unsatisfactory. It does not prevent people from killing kangaroos and it has been quite farcical. It only wastes the time of the inspectors from the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department. I understand that the department will introduce a system whereby a kangaroo must weigh 36 lb. partially dressed before it can be sold.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What does it put on when it gets dressed?

Mr. GUNN: I will ignore the Minister of Roads and Transport now, as I intend to deal with him later. The new system that will be introduced will only prevent people from making a livelihood. In my district a few people are professional kangaroo shooters. They have other part-time work and they do most of the shooting of kangaroos on the stations in the area in which I live. This system would prevent those people from making a reasonable living. Who can tell, from 200 yards away, whether a kangaroo weighs 20 lb. or 30 lb.? I consider that a

far better system could be evolved if people would consider the subject a little more.

Mr. Harrison: You surprise me. I understand they migrated from your area.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Albert Park knows nothing about my district. Otherwise, he would not make such a ridiculous interjection. Much has been said about wombats and, until the member for Mitchell interfered in the affairs of my district by raising the matter in the House recently, I did not intend to speak about wombats. It is obvious that he had nothing to occupy his attention; he had nothing else to keep him going. He is not interested in his own constituents and has to interfere with affairs in my district.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: The member for Mitchell endeavours to prevent people from protecting their livelihood. That is his aim. There is one other form of pollution I must mention—the most serious of all, the pollution of men's minds. There is a force of evil operating in our world today that aims to destroy in people their belief in, and respect for, those values which for long have been associated with civilized standards. If you can break down a man's moral fibre and get him to deviate from his accepted code of ethics, what could be easier than to follow this up by presenting to him a new code, which fits in with his behaviour pattern, thus soothing his conscience and removing any feeling of guilt. In fact, under the permissive society there is no code of ethics, no standard of decency. Whatever you may do, no matter how despicable or evil, it is perfectly all right, provided that you say so. What an insidious wicked appeal this presents, especially to our younger people during their formative years! The more people's minds can be mixed up, the more drugs can be infused into the system, the more chaos and confusion can be created, the more fertile are the conditions under which the forces of evil operate. Undermine the youth of a nation and the battle is won. This is one of the great dictums of Communism. It was not only the young who were susceptible to these forces. Leading members of some countries, indeed whole Governments, have been "bamboozled". We have had examples in this State of this type of behaviour—for instance, Professor Medlin at Flinders University who is teaching subjects that are, in my opinion, a deliberate attempt to pollute the minds of our young people. Even the

Premier agrees with what I have said. He is quoted in the *Advertiser* as doing so.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall not be continually calling honourable members to order. Interjections must cease. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is quoted as being critical of Professor Medlin. When we examine what he is teaching at Flinders University, it is no wonder the Premier is critical of him. We know that the Premier loves to use people for his own aims, but as soon as they become too hot to handle politically he drops them and moves to the next line. He does anything to serve his purposes. I will now say what subjects Professor Medlin is teaching. They are: Applied Philosophy (in Philosophy I); Marxism-Leninism I; Marxism-Leninism II; Applied Philosophy; Vietnam, Imperialism and the Nature of Man (in Philosophy III); and the intended discussion of United States and Australian involvement in Vietnam in the light of neo-Bolshevik revolutionary doctrines. No wonder the Premier was critical of this person, but that is the person with whom the Premier stood on the same platform on another well-known occasion. If we go on a little further we see the action that the Premier and others took in regard to these demonstrators, who do not believe in law and order.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about the farmers' demonstration? They also supported that.

Mr. GUNN: That was an orderly demonstration.

[Midnight]

The farmers did not deliberately set out to interfere with the rights of the citizens of Adelaide and did not try to take over a street. It was an orderly march, for which permission had been granted, not like a group of people deliberately setting out to take over an intersection in Adelaide and interfering with the rights of the citizens of this State. The most serious aspect of this situation was the action of the Government in not supporting the Commissioner of Police when he was trying to carry out his responsibility. It was fortunate for the people of this State that we had a responsible Commissioner and Police Force, of which we can be proud. We cannot say the same about the Premier, because he was quite irresponsible and so was his Government. He forfeited the rights of the office of Premier, and

I am sure that most people in South Australia have the same opinion as I do about this matter. I congratulate the Queensland Government on its stand on law and order.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And its stand on apartheid as well: do that, too.

Mr. GUNN: It was pleasing to note that the people of Queensland supported the Premier of that State on his stand. The Labor Party should reconsider its attitude in this matter. I do not believe in apartheid.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You said you supported it.

Mr. GUNN: I did not say anything of the kind, and the Minister knows that. I believe that the action of this Government in trying to humiliate the South African rugby team did nothing to alter the opinion of the South African Government. All it will do is make that Government far harsher in its attitude. When people support a person like Peter Hain, we would not be surprised at whatever they support or at anything they would do.

Mr. Payne: Mr. Peter Hain is a Conservative.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I now refer to some Government departments that have been causing me some concern. Much has been said about the inefficiency of the rural industry, but the first thing we should look at are Government departments that should become far more efficient. If we are not careful we, as taxpayers, will be supporting a large inefficient bureaucracy that will be of no benefit to the community. Everywhere I travel in my district I am constantly approached by parents and other about the actions and activities of the Public Buildings Department. This department should be inspected by an efficiency expert. At every police station or school I have visited (and this is no reflection on the Minister), schoolteachers and others have complained.

This department lets some work to private contractors, one of whom told me recently that the department owed him \$1,800 for work that he had done at a school. Of this amount, \$1,000 was spent to purchase the material with which to carry out the contract. Subsequently, he was asked by the department to do further repairs on its behalf. He told the department that he could not afford to tender for this work, because he had not been paid for the first contract. He was told, "It is coming." So is Christmas! Several small private contractors living in my district have had the same problem. Also, I believe that

the Public Buildings Department should pay some attention to its contractors. Recently, I visited the Coorabie school. The Minister probably does not even know where this school is situated, but it is about 100 miles west of Ceduna. A private contractor, who had carried out repairs at this school, had left the newly-erected toilet block in an unsafe condition. Although he had not completed certain jobs, he had been paid for the work. On inquiring, I was informed that there were no penalty clauses in the Public Buildings Department contract.

When the Australian Labor Party delegation's visit to China was first suggested, it was said that Dr. Rex Patterson would be sent to see why we were not selling wheat to that country. We have not heard much since that delegation returned. If we analyse the situation concerning the sale of our wheat, it is interesting to note the following statement made on this matter by the President of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation:

The Australian Wheat Industry has often been on the political chopping block, but events of the past few weeks must shock even the most experienced industry leaders. Our industry has become a pawn in the game of party politics, to the extent that these political parties must be charged with national irresponsibility. Dealings in wheat with the People's Republic of China has always been the responsibility of the Australian Wheat Board, and this trade would have continued in the future if politicians had allowed it to stay with the board, without the public statements of recent times.

Also of concern to the wheat industry is the amount of unfavourable press reports that have appeared in the mass circulation newspapers. Space seems to be provided to almost every academic that has a theory on "how the wheat industry should be run", and I have yet to read any that displayed a sound basic understanding of what they are writing about. We read constantly of the cost to the taxpayer "most of which is in error", and rarely, if ever, anything of the contribution the industry has made to the welfare of Australia, and its massive earnings of foreign exchange.

This is not the first time that the A.L.P. has interfered in the wheat industry; indeed, I believe that it should be thoroughly ashamed of its actions, because it has now placed the board in the position where it will not be able to sell wheat to China.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a load of garbage.

Mr. GUNN: The man from the London School of Economics should do his homework on the subject. What I have quoted is the opinion of wheatgrowers to whom I have spoken. When the Australian Wheat Board

first negotiated to sell wheat to China, it never inserted big advertisements in the newspapers saying, "We are going to China to sell wheat."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why did they fail to sell wheat last year, and why did Canada succeed?

Mr. GUNN: Canada has always sold wheat to China, for a number of reasons. If the Minister cared to do his homework, he could tell us why. Only a few months ago, the last shipload of wheat under our previous contract went to China, and China has just had a record year in respect of rice production. That was one reason.

Mr. Burdon: Where did you get that information?

Mr. GUNN: It is true. Also, China buys the type of wheat that it requires. I should like to refer to the previous actions of the A.L.P. regarding its dealings in the wheat industry.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What you're trying to do is to make counter charges to cover up the previous charges—

The SPEAKER: Order! There can only be one speech at a time. Interjections must stop.

Mr. GUNN: I remind honourable members of what the Commonwealth Labor Government did when it was last in office. It sold wheat to New Zealand at 5s. 9d. a bushel when the wheat price was 18s. 6d. a bushel and more. As a result of that Government's mismanagement, the Australian taxpayer had to pay \$7,000,000. That Government went over the head of the Australian Wheat Board, which is the organization properly charged with the responsibility of selling wheat. I compliment the present grower members of that board; I think that under difficult conditions they have done an excellent job. In the last six months there has been a record shipment of wheat from Australia. Dr. Callaghan states:

Since December 1, 1970, when the new crop year was examined, 4,472,000 tons of wheat has been shipped. This is an increase of 500,000 tons on the previous record shipping rate for the same period.

That record was set in 1966-67. I know that wheat quotas have caused great problems in primary producing areas, but I do not think they have the same effect on the industry as has the low wool price. I strongly support the plan of the present Commonwealth Government to bring in a price support scheme. I do not like subsidies, for I do not believe that they are the answer to the problem. However, this is a most difficult situation and,

with so many people being faced with this problem, if something is not done quickly the whole industry will be jeopardized. Various so-called academics have set themselves up as advisors to the wool industry and have criticized it. Dr. Schapper is a well-known critic of the industry. I believe that the actions of these people are irresponsible. They have the wool industry marked for extinction; they want to be rid of it. Stewart Cockburn and other people speak about the assistance the Commonwealth Government will provide.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Did you know that Stewart Cockburn was formerly the press secretary to Sir Robert Menzies?

Mr. GUNN: I do not care about that. If a scheme of this nature is not brought in, the rural reconstruction scheme that is now being put into operation will not be successful for, under the terms of reference of that scheme, I do not believe people will still be able to carry on and repay the loan that they will receive. Regarding the price support scheme for the rural industry, it is interesting to note what has happened to the average price of wool in the last 12 months. At the May sale for 1971, the opening price was 25.81c a lb. or \$82.72 a bale, whereas at the same time last year the average price for wool was 32.05c a lb. or \$102 a bale, so that there has been a drastic reduction in price and this at a time when costs, such as wages and so on, have been rising. Of course, Mr. Hawke has not assisted in this.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You don't believe in unions.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister attacks the Opposition for being against trade unions, but I do not think any Opposition member is against them.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You could have fooled me.

Mr. GUNN: We do not believe that unionism should be compulsory. Although I have been a member of a trade union, I do not believe in compelling people to join organizations. Some very good primary producers organizations like the United Farmers and Graziers and the Stockowners Association are open to everyone, but membership is not compulsory. I was pleased to see in His Excellency's Speech that the Government would introduce legislation for a statutory oat marketing board. I hope that this very good scheme will be working for the next harvest. Many people in my district grow large quantities of oats, and any action that will assist

those growers is worth supporting. I hope that the right of growers to trade freely between themselves will be retained and that the board will be grower-controlled.

It was also pleasing to see in His Excellency's Speech that the Government has decided to review the unrealistic land tax assessment. The Government failed to take the advice of Opposition members when that assessment was introduced. It is not hard to understand why the Government was so vehement in its support of that unrealistic assessment. I wish to quote from the Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Your copy is out of date. You should spend another 50c and get a new one.

Mr. GUNN: The first item under the heading "Finance and Taxation" is "Progressive taxation on unimproved land values". Now we know why the Socialist Government was so intent on retaining the unrealistic valuation: it wanted to further its socialistic aims. On the back of a document handed around during the last election campaign were the words "A better deal for the man on the land". However, the man on the land has received absolutely no assistance from the Government. I sincerely hope that, when the revaluation is carried out, many of the unrealistic anomalies in the assessment will be ironed out. This was one of the greatest bones of contention in the rural industry. I wholeheartedly support my Party's policy of abolishing rural land tax, for any policy that is unrelated to productivity is unrealistic and unfair.

The sealing of the Eyre Highway has probably caused more controversy in the last few months than has any other highway in South Australia. I hope that in the very near future the whole section between Penong and the West Australian border will be sealed. I believe that the Commonwealth Government has a definite responsibility to provide most of the funds for the sealing of this road, as it is a national highway linking South Australia with Western Australia. It is more in the national interest than in South Australia's interests to have the unsealed section completed. Our responsibility as a State finishes after we have provided a sealed road for our settlers. If the South Australian Government is prepared to seal our section to the Nundroo area or just beyond, we will have completed our obligation. Many people have said that

Western Australia has done its part towards the sealing of this road. True, but it was in its own interests to do so, and that State has been assisted by the Commonwealth Government to carry out its part of the project.

In the second schedule, under the amounts for principal grants to be extended on urban arterial roads, Western Australia received \$62,500,000 and South Australia received \$59,500,000. In the third schedule of amounts of principal grants to be extended on rural arterial roads, South Australia received \$13,500,000 and Western Australia received about \$24,000,000. In the amounts of principal grants to be expended on rural roads, other than arterial roads, South Australia received \$45,000,000 and Western Australia received nearly \$71,000,000. In the sixth schedule, provision of supplementary grants amongst the States, South Australia received \$9,000,000 and Western Australia received over \$40,000,000.

In the seventh schedule, which is the base amounts, Western Australia received just over \$11,000,000 and we received about \$13,000,000. Regarding the beef roads allocations, Queensland was authorized a grant of \$51,500,000 and a loan of \$8,500,000. Western Australia received a grant of nearly \$18,000,000 and South Australia received \$1,000,000. This in itself means that the Commonwealth Government has a responsibility to provide funds for this important project. The State Government must play its part, because the people who live in these areas and pay taxes to South Australia are entitled to be provided with the same services as people in other parts of the State. It is interesting to note that these people do not have the services which many other people take for granted, such as reticulated water, reasonable radio and television reception, educational facilities, electricity, etc. Because of this, we have our responsibility to the South Australian taxpayers and voters in this area. However, this does not exempt the Commonwealth Government from its obligations. I have approached the Commonwealth Government several times on this matter.

Another item that causes me concern is the Flinders Highway. Earlier this week, in a reply to me, the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) implied that the people of Streaky Bay were wet. That was a disgraceful statement by a Minister of the Crown. I do

not mind what he says about me, but I take exception to his insulting my constituents. Mr. Broomhill said:

Does it ever rain over there?

The Minister of Roads and Transport said:

I do not know whether it rains, but there are some wet characters over there.

To whom was the Minister referring?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: To you.

Mr. GUNN: I am concerned because the Minister stands in this place and deliberately insults my constituents. We know the attitude of the Minister of Roads and Transport. On many occasions he has made insulting attacks on members on this side. He has implied that members should shut their mouths, and it is a disgraceful state of affairs when the people of Streaky Bay, a town with a population of more than 1,500, are insulted by the Minister of Roads and Transport. The Government, by its poor management, has failed to provide sufficient funds to seal the Flinders Highway. The Minister said that no work had been done on that highway. Obviously, he does not know where Talia or Streaky Bay is. He has probably not been there, and we know his attitude to country people. I think it is poor that this work is not being done, when the people were promised that the Flinders Highway would be sealed. When the Labor Government was elected to office in 1965, it deliberately penalized country people by mishandling State funds. I should like to speak now about daylight saving.

Mr. Clark: This will be good.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that. Daylight saving will probably have a more adverse effect on the people in my district, particularly those in the western part, than anywhere else in the State. If honourable members opposite think that that is humorous, I and my constituents do not. I have received a telegram from the Lock Area School Committee stating that the majority of people on school bus routes oppose daylight saving.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I hope you tell them that this can be adjusted.

Mr. GUNN: I want to raise this matter, because I consider it important to bring to the Government's attention that many children have to catch school buses before 7.45 a.m. and travel a long distance. Daylight saving will have a serious effect on these people and I hope that the Minister and the Government will consider this matter seriously. We know what the Minister has said. He says so much in this House that we wonder what he will



say next. During the period of the Walsh Administration, the then member for Glenelg was referred to as the Premier's financial genius. However, in view of the financial mess that the Government got into, I would not like to take any of his advice.

When the Government, during its austerity period, introduced revenue measures it inflicted on small organizations, such as the Country Women's Association, much harm by amending the Lottery and Gaming Act to force each small C.W.A. branch to pay a registration fee of \$5. This costs the association in the State about \$1,700. This is a small organization whose main function is to provide social amenities in country areas voluntarily. It is a non-profit organization and cannot afford to carry this penalty. In most places there are only small numbers of people in each branch. I understand there is a proposal to make the total amount to be collected only \$700, and that only the headquarters of the C.W.A. should be registered, as is the case with the Red Cross Society. I sincerely hope that the Government will review this matter and remove the existing anomalies.

The Government saw fit to increase rail freight rates in this State. This to the rural industries was a blow from the Party that claimed to support the farmers. This action will have a detrimental effect on railway finances because already the Railways Commissioner is complaining about the people not using the railways. It has been uneconomical to do so because of freight differentials in carting to the silos. The rail freight rate to the silos has been increased, and the silos will be serviced in future by road transport. In this way the Railways Department will be losing revenue, so the Government did a very bad thing for railway finances by increasing the freight rate on wheat.

The first thing the Railways Department could do is to become more efficient and better organized. I have had a number of complaints during the year about the failure of the Railways Department to deliver superphosphate in a condition suitable for use in combines. I understand that in many cases full truckloads of superphosphate had to be returned because the bags were split and should have been replaced with new ones. This was a cost to the Railways Department. We cannot blame the farmers for going to carriers instead of using the railways. They know their superphosphate will then be delivered in reasonably good condition.

I refer now to the Poldo-Kimba main. I know something about it. I do not know whether the Minister knows about it: I doubt it judging by his interjections.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I have known about it for the last 13 years.

Mr. GUNN: That may be so. During the period of the last Labor Government the commencement of this project was delayed and this was detrimental to the people of Kimba. I sincerely hope that in this coming financial year the Government will provide far more funds for it than it has provided in the last financial year. It is ridiculous that only 20 people should be put on to the construction of this vital project when it must be costing the Government a considerable amount of money to continue carting water. During the unfortunate dry period in that district many farmers have had to cart water during the whole winter for their stock. I hope the Government will treat this matter as one of high priority.

It is interesting to look at the last edition of the *West Coast Sentinel*, a very good paper in which appears an article headed "Water problem again serious". The article quotes people from the Engineering and Water Supply Department as saying that Kimba already faces a serious water shortage problem and that the coming summer would put Kimba's water supply in an extremely critical position. I believe that if the Government spent much more money to complete this project it would be more economical for it in the long run. I now refer to succession duties which seem to be a brainchild of the Minister of Education. I believe that succession duties are working at cross purposes with the rural reconstruction scheme. One part of that scheme plans to have a farm build-up in which a father and son can buy an adjoining property in order to make the project more economical and so obtain a living. However if something happens to one of them not only succession duties but also estate duties have to be paid. This type of tax should be abolished by both the Commonwealth and the State Governments. As a first step the Commonwealth Government should relinquish its estate duty tax. An article in the *Taxpayer*, under the heading "Remove all death duties", states:

This is not as unrealistic as it may appear as businesses would not be destroyed on the death of an owner, families could plan finances on a long-term basis, and few would object to the slight lift in say income tax that may be needed.

A Canadian Royal Commission recommended abolishing all death duties in a family unit, and this would be a good place in which to start. Anyone who has had experience of taxation will realize what a great problem it causes to families and to rural industry particularly, which is unable to pass on any taxation costs. Also, we should consider executor companies because in many cases these companies do not act in the best interests of

the people whose affairs they handle, although I know that some members do not agree with me on this point. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 12.40 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 28, at 2 p.m.