

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 25, 1972

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

PETITION: SEX SHOPS

Mr. FERGUSON presented a petition signed by 21 persons who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of sex shops on the community at large, and prayed that the law be so amended, if necessary, as to put these shops out of business. The petitioners also prayed that there be a restriction on the availability of sex aids until such time as it might be shown that fears regarding these undesirable consequences were unfounded.

Petition received.

PETITION: ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY presented a petition signed by 115 persons who, as members and supporters of the Right to Life Association (South Australia Division), sought to promote its policy on abortion. The petitioners prayed that the present abortion laws be repealed and that legislation be introduced by which the right to life of the unborn child and of the mother would be safeguarded.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PARK LANDS PARKING

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 15,093 persons, stating that the Adelaide City Council, by its by-law increasing fees for car parking in park lands and by increasing areas available for car parking in the park lands, had shown that its conservation attitudes were unsuccessful. The petitioners prayed that by-law 73 made on May 8, 1972, in respect of stands for vehicles be disallowed and that a trust of salaried professional administrators be set up to protect the Adelaide park lands, thus removing them from the control of the council.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 10,333 persons.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS**OIL DISPUTE**

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Premier, as a leader in the Australian Labor Party, using his own good offices as a result of the close personal contact that we know he has with the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. Hawke) in urging a settlement

of the current oil dispute in terms in accordance with normally acceptable industrial and conciliation procedures? All Australians are concerned at the rapidly deteriorating situation with regard to the present oil dispute. Already many petrol stations around Adelaide (and, from reports, one would think this applies elsewhere) are short of supplies and therefore unable to provide for the community. It is suggested that mass stand-downs in industry are a distinct possibility. With all this happening, it is ironic that the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions is receiving wide publicity for his suggestion that 44,000,000 gall. of crude oil be processed for emergency services, when the one gesture that would probably end the dispute is not made, namely, the suggestion of a return to work by the strikers.

Members interjecting:

Dr. EASTICK: A return to work could in fact—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is commenting.

Dr. EASTICK: I notice in this afternoon's newspaper a report that the Premier has sent a telegram to the Prime Minister suggesting that the Prime Minister use his good offices to bring about the resolution of this dispute. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether he is using his good offices with a person in the Labor movement with whom he is closely allied, as this would be pertinent to the situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course I am.

Dr. Eastick: With what effect?

Mr. Venning: Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called on the honourable Premier to answer the question, and the honourable member for Rocky River is out of order in interjecting. The honourable Leader of the Opposition having asked the honourable Premier a question, the House is entitled to hear the reply in silence, with the utmost courtesy being shown. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The attitude of this Government in relation to any industrial dispute (and this has been the attitude throughout the course of this Government) has been to get the parties back to the conference table in order to see that the issues concerned can be effectively talked out. While the parties refuse to confer, it is unlikely that there will be a resolution of a dispute. I may point out that in the recent matter that came before this House the whole action of the Government was designed to ensure that the parties got

back to the conference table. We did that outside the terms of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act; in fact, that was a dispute to which the Commonwealth Act applied. The Commonwealth Government did nothing to get people to confer, but we took action. Certainly I have consulted with Mr. Hawke, who has been endeavouring to get the parties to the conference table. The disastrous situation facing us in government in Australia is that the Commonwealth Government is urging one side in the dispute not to go to the conference table.

Mr. Becker: That's not true, and you know it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service has urged the oil companies not to go to the conference table. That is a disgrace. This dispute needs to be settled: the parties ought to confer, and every opportunity should be taken by government at every level to see that the parties do confer. We have been doing our bit; we wish the Commonwealth Government were doing its bit.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier say whether he is arranging for emergency supplies of fuel in case supplies become extremely short? If he is doing that, will he consider having emergency supplies available for milk tankers? I understand that people on dairies can hold their milk for two days but that beyond that period these people will suffer substantial losses. I think supplies should be arranged in this case if possible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the honourable member's question.

BONDING

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Education say what action has been taken by his department with regard to the unsatisfactory position in respect of the bonding of teachers and students? The Auditor-General in his report for the year ended June 30, 1971, drew the attention of the Minister and his department and of Parliament to this position and, amongst other things, said:

Amounts due by ex-teachers and students under breached agreements amounted to \$1,253,522 in respect of 949 bonds at June 30, 1971. This was an increase of \$350,290 over the previous year, involving 178 more bonds. Will the Minister say what action has been taken by his department since then and what is the current policy of the department in regard to bonding generally, not only of students but also of teachers? Where a student or teacher fails to repay whole or part

of the bond and the Commonwealth Government subsequently pays for those concerned to undertake further study, will the Minister say whether there is any liaison between his department and the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The total amount owing on bonds is inflated because the breaching of bonding agreements involves students who have a higher level of indebtedness than would have been the case some few years ago. This has arisen because the average length of training is longer and the average allowance is greater. My department is assiduous in its efforts to try to ensure that sums owing are repaid. Concerning the instance mentioned by the honourable member at the end of his question, I need more specific details, although I would say that we do not have any reciprocal arrangements with the Commonwealth Government, so the same procedure would apply there as applies when a student resigns from the State Education Department, incurs a bond liability, and then goes to some other State, or when a student gets another scholarship from another body to undertake further training in another area. The bond would still be enforced in those circumstances, just as it would have been enforced by the honourable member when he was Minister. I should imagine that, with the development of the Commonwealth Teaching Service, the reciprocal agreement for the working out of the period of bonding that we have with other State Education Departments will apply also in relation to the Commonwealth Department of Education and Science, but that reciprocal agreement would relate only to service given in the teaching service of the Commonwealth Government and not training in order to gain some other kind of skill. The position on the general policy of bonding is that we have decided already to increase the number of unbonded scholarships that will be available next year. These unbonded scholarships will relate only to internal teachers college courses and will not apply to Education Department scholarship holders who are to undertake a university course. The reason for this is fairly obvious. If a person undertakes a university course, such a course of training may lead into the teaching service but can also lead into another area of activity, whereas the teachers college course provides a qualification specifically related to teaching. I do not believe we will be able to get rid of bonding completely until there is a generalized scholarship scheme for all tertiary students. If all

university students were under a scholarship arrangement, it would then be possible to eliminate all bonds in relation to Education Department scholarship holders. Until such a generalized scheme of paying allowances is introduced it is not possible to avoid the bonding of students who have Education Department scholarships and who undertake university courses.

ABORIGINES

Mr. CRIMES: Will the Premier say whether the Government will consider indicating its intention to co-operate in any investigation by the United Nations into the plight of Aborigines in Australia in the event of the world organization's acceding to Ralph Nader's call for such an investigation, which would also include an investigation into the treatment of Indians in South America? In view of Ralph Nader's world-wide standing it is possible that the United Nations will accede to his call. In this event, a lead in support from this State could result in encouraging a similar move by the Commonwealth Government and other State Governments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, our Government will co-operate in any inquiry. In fact, the needs of Aboriginal people and the necessity for immediately spending large sums to assist them are matters that ought to be brought home not only to the rest of the world but to the Australian people. At the last Premiers' Conference the Premier of Western Australia listed, as an urgent matter for discussion, the question of housing for Aborigines. South Australia was able to say that the immediate need in this State for housing for Aborigines would involve spending about \$6,000,000 merely to meet basic needs at the outset, let alone long-term requirements, but the Prime Minister swept aside the whole question of whether there should be some special grants for Aboriginal housing or other provisions for Aboriginal welfare. He made clear that he considered that the sums being spent at present for Aborigines were more than proportionate to their needs and number in Australia.

NATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether an extension of service by a National Service trainee jeopardizes his chances of being re-employed by the South Australian Railways? A constituent (Mr. Hodges, of Crafers) approached me recently. While in Vietnam serving on

National Service, he served for an additional six months. He signed on to stay serving in Vietnam for that additional time. He was injured and had to undergo rehabilitation treatment upon returning and I am led to believe that, on approaching the Railways Department, he was told that, as he had extended his service as a National Service trainee to more than two years, his chance of re-employment automatically was jeopardized. I ask the Minister whether this is the normal practice with employees who, being on National Service, may decide to extend their service, and I ask whether the position is the same throughout State Government Departments. I am particularly concerned about the case of the South Australian Railways, because this person has been affected.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should be grateful if the honourable member would give me the name of the person who told his constituent that the constituent's position would be jeopardized.

Mr. Evans: Hodges is his name.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Hodges is the man who told the honourable member's constituent that the constituent's position had been jeopardized?

Mr. Evans: No, he is the one who had his position jeopardized.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Who told Hodges his position had been jeopardized?

Mr. Evans: A person in the Railways Department.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member is going to adopt that sort of attitude, I cannot examine the matter. However, if he is prepared to be honest with me and give me the information I will investigate the matter thoroughly and bring down a report, but I will not waste my time, the time of this House, or the time of the railways officers with a hypothetical case that may or may not be accurate.

MOUNT TORRENS ROAD JUNCTION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when the junction of the Lobethal to Mount Torrens Road and the Charleston to Mount Torrens Road will be made safer? Many months ago I received a complaint from a constituent who had been almost involved in an accident at this junction. I believe that there has been one fatal collision there and that there have been many near misses at the junction. Some months ago, on approaching the officer of the Highways Department who I believe is responsible for the planning and execution of such

roadworks, I was told that the work would probably be done during the financial year that has just closed. However, on inquiring, I have not been able to get any further indication of when this work will be done. I appreciate that there are many other priorities regarding the upgrading of unsafe intersections and junctions, but I think anyone familiar with this junction knows how unsafe it is. Can the Minister say when this work will be started or, even better, when it will be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information.

NURSES MEMORIAL CENTRE

Dr. TONKIN: My question to the Premier follows a series of questions I asked last week. If nurses are prepared to co-operate in overall site planning of an area of the Kent Town redevelopment, why is it necessary for the Government to acquire their land which has been set aside for a nurses memorial centre? During one of his replies last week the Premier said it was necessary for the Government to acquire the land to sell to a developer because of the total planning requirements of the area, and he suggested that nurses might or might not be allowed to participate in the development. He could not say one way or the other, but nurses believe that it will depend on whether the developer wants their memorial centre incorporated in the development. The nurses have been offered, during discussions, the possibility of a strata title to that part of the development: for example, three floors of one building to be allotted for their use, if this is allowed. They cannot understand why they should be forced to sell their land to the Government and then have to buy back, on a strata title, part of the development from the developers. Why can they not proceed on their own property, in conformity with the overall development plan, as they are prepared to do?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I see no difficulty in that, and we are prepared to discuss it with the nurses. I suggested that, as there would be additional development on that site beyond that which I had been told the nurses themselves would wish to undertake, the best way of securing them in possession would be the possession of a strata title. There would be no question of their buying it back, and the whole negotiation would be done in one go. Concerning their wanting to be incorporated in the total plan and involved in developing the whole site, we are perfectly prepared to discuss that with them.

Dr. TONKIN: Is the Premier now saying that the Government is prepared to discuss development of the nurses memorial site within the total plan of the Kent Town area without acquisition of land? The preliminary plans show that three 12-storey apartment towers, overlooking the park lands and the Prince Alfred College grounds, are planned, the most westerly of these facing on to Dequetteville Terrace, on the land presently owned or required by the Nurses Memorial Centre Committee. Is the Premier now saying that this tower will be resited further back from the Dequetteville Terrace frontage away from the nurses' land, or is he, in offering discussion on the proposal that nurses proceed with their own building on their own land, relying on the fact that they will not be able to build a 12-storey apartment tower as presently planned and will thus be obliged to agree to Government acquisition and to seek an alternative site?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Neither. In response to the nurses' suggestion I have said that we are prepared to discuss with the nurses the non-acquisition of their site and their involvement in the consortium which will be developing the total of the sites.

Dr. Tonkin: The non-acquisition?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I pointed out to them, in my original discussion with them, that in order to provide the basis of finance for the development of their site titles would have to be available so that mortgages could be arranged. If, in fact, they like to retain the ground title, becoming part of the developing consortium, and do their part of the development which will ensure them what they need while allowing the rest of the development to proceed, that can be done by indenture through their having the title. Regarding this, I have pointed out to the nurses from the outset that the Government is trying to be perfectly flexible. We are simply trying to get a workable proposition.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether alternative sites have been offered to any other person or body whose land has been acquired for development by the Government, and how many of the alternative sites suggested by the Premier for the Nurses Memorial Centre are, themselves, likely to be required for or involved in other redevelopment plans? I understand that only two of the sites suggested by the Premier are at present owned by the Government, and the owners of the other sites have been unaware of the Government's suggestions regarding

their future. At least one, and possibly two, of the other sites discussed with the nurses are likely to be involved in the East Adelaide development proposals and will thus themselves become liable to acquisition. It seems that this is a mounting snowball, acquisition following acquisition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a mounting snowball at all. In fact, in relation to Kent Town redevelopment, there have not been any acquisitions for relocation. In relation to the Hackney redevelopment scheme, there have been many acquisitions for redevelopment, but these have not been compulsory acquisitions: they have been acquisitions by treaty which, in fact, have markedly improved the living conditions of the people who have been relocated. We have sheaves of letters from the people concerned thanking the Government for the assistance it has given them.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has plans to develop known reserves of water on Eyre Peninsula to replace water from the Tod reservoir? As the Minister will know, there are several sources on Eyre Peninsula for the supply of water, namely, the Lincoln and Uley Basins, the Tod reservoir and the recently developed Polda Basin. Apart from the Tod reservoir, these sources provide good water, but water from the Tod reservoir is barely suitable for stock and certainly not good enough for gardens. However, large areas of Eyre Peninsula have to rely exclusively on Tod water for their supplies, and Cummins is one example. As I believe that there are several known large sources of good quality water on Eyre Peninsula, I ask the Minister whether his department has any plans to develop these sources and to phase out the supply from the Tod reservoir.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that from time to time deputations have approached not only me but also some of my predecessors concerning this matter, and on the last occasion in question I informed the deputation that investigations had taken place to establish not only the suitability or acceptability of the water quality but also the quantities involved, and, more important, reference was made to the finance involved in developing the resources concerned. The honourable member will also know that constantly throughout this State demands are being made on the depart-

ment for extensions to services that it provides, and it is a matter of priorities concerning whether, or when, these extensions can be provided. The answer to the honourable member's question largely revolves around the availability of finance, and at this stage it does not seem that finance will be available for these projects unless a real emergency might occur. I will ascertain from the department exactly what investigations have taken place and, if I can, I will also ascertain the findings of those investigations and let the honourable member know. I will try to indicate to him the sort of programme we are expecting to undertake.

MODBURY LAND

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain for me whether two parcels of land no longer required for freeway purposes (one parcel lying between Meadowvale Road and Loch Lomond Drive, Modbury, and the other lying between Corroboree Road and Alexander Avenue, Modbury North) have been disposed of (and under what conditions) in favour of the City of Tea Tree Gully? I last asked a question about this matter in Parliament on November 25 last, and the Minister's records will show that he replied to me by correspondence on December 24, 1971, at which time the matter had not been finalized.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information.

FREE TRANSPORT

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether he has considered providing free public transport in and out of the city? Recently, when I visited Rome, I noted a scheme whereby—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How did you get out of the place?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. MATHWIN.: At this stage, a system of free transport is operating in Rome (I understand it is operating quite well) for the benefit of people entering the city of Rome between the early hours of the morning and 7 p.m. on week days, but not on weekends. The scheme is apparently designed to stop the heavy flow of traffic into the city and, just as important, to reduce pollution as well. Will the Minister consider this matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am interested to hear the honourable member's explanation because the report I had on the experiment of

free transport in Rome was that it operated for a few weeks and that the system then reverted to the normal one. This was because many people who normally travelled by public transport decided that, as free public transport was being provided, many more motorists would probably use it and there would be more room on the roads. However, it did not work out that way: the roads were jammed to an even worse extent. I was informed that, owing to the local economy, many people in Rome normally walked from their homes to work but, because free transport was available, they gave up walking and public transport became overloaded; in fact, the roads were jammed to the extent that traffic just was not moving. I understood that the experiment had stopped at that point, but, as the honourable member says that that is not the case, I will certainly seek further information on the matter and see whether the experiment has resumed and, if it has, along what lines. I will try to ascertain whether there is anything else for us to learn. As the honourable member knows, we are advocating the use of public transport to the greatest possible extent and, if the Rome experiment can help Adelaide, we will certainly consider it seriously.

CAR SAFETY

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether in fact he has agreed to the watering down of car safety regulations, so that cars now manufactured in Australia do not comply with Australian design rule (ADR) 13, recommended by an advisory committee, and adopted by the Australian Transport Advisory Council in 1967? As a consequence, is it a fact that cars now being sold in Australia are lacking safety features, because of the Minister's action? I refer to a report on Friday, July 7 of this year, carried in the *Financial Review*, and headed "Car Safety Watered Down". The report states:

The Australian car industry has successfully exerted pressure on Federal and State Governments to block and water down safety regulations recommended by the Government sponsored car design safety committee. Two recommended safety features, covering the driver's forward field of view and rear-vision mirrors, have been put on ice, following submissions by the industry. Others, covering reversing lamps, door latches, seat anchorages and glare reduction have been modified to be less stringent than originally proposed.

The report goes on to state that there are no consumer representatives on the advisory committee concerned with safety and vehicle design, although the Australian Automobile Associa-

tion (the Commonwealth organization of State motoring bodies) has requested membership of the advisory committee. The provision to which I refer is Australian design rule (ADR) 13 recommended by the advisory committee and adopted by the Australian Transport Advisory Council in 1967, which dealt with the driver's forward field of view, eliminating obstructions, and narrowing front pillars. This rule was reconsidered in February, 1970, and has not been heard of since. Because of the increasing severity of road accidents, I ask the Minister on what grounds he apparently agreed to the elimination of this provision and whether he will ensure that it is now reintroduced and becomes law.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In reply to the honourable member's last question (whether I will see to it that the provision is reintroduced) the answer is "No", because it is not necessary, and it is only in the honourable member's imagination that the safety features in question have been watered down; that is completely untrue. The article appeared in the *Financial Review* on July 7, the very day on which the Australian Transport Advisory Council was assembling at Broadbeach, Queensland, for its bi-annual meeting. The Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport, who was a colleague of the honourable member (if the honourable member now has any colleagues in the Liberal and Country Party), made a statement similar to the one I am making now that that newspaper report was completely false. It does little credit to the ex-Leader to repeat such furrphies. What was reported was completely untrue.

Mr. HALL: My question follows the non-selective and abusive answer I have received. Will the Minister be somewhat selective in giving me some of the details which he neglected to give me in his first reply? Will he say whether there has been a watering down of provisions concerning reversing lamps, door latches, seat anchorages and glare reduction to an extent that they have been modified below the stringent regulations proposed? Will he further say whether Australian design rule (ADR) 13 now applies to vehicle construction in South Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what design rule (ADR) 13 is, because it is not listed in the regulations as such.

Mr. Hall: Why did you refuse to answer in the first place?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I repeat that I do not know what Australian design rule (ADR) 13 is, because it is not contained in

the regulations under the Road Traffic Act. If the honourable member would like me to go through the regulations and provide him with information because he is not able to do so, I shall be happy to do so for him and bring down the information he seeks.

CARRIBIE BASIN

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Works say whether there has been any further assessment whether the Carribie water basin could be economically developed and used for water reticulation? In 1969, when I asked about this matter, the then Minister of Works replied that the Carribie Basin had not been adequately assessed, because the pluviometer survey necessary to evaluate the re-charge of the aquifer had not been started as the equipment had not been available from the Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology. Can the Minister say whether that equipment has been made available and whether the possibilities of this water basin have been assessed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I cannot reply to the honourable member offhand, I will obtain a report, and let him have it.

OVERSEA VISIT

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Headmaster of the Norwood High School (Mr. Coward) is going overseas on education business, and, if he is, will the Minister say what that business is? I understand that Mr. Coward is going overseas on Education Department business. Mr. Coward is well known to many members, as he was in Port Pirie at one stage and in the South-East on another occasion. I have great respect for what he has done in uplifting the standard of schools wherever he has been.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Coward has gone overseas to examine systems of school budgeting, because the department is greatly interested in this matter. In the process of giving schools greater autonomy, we hope that ultimately we shall be able to put each school on its own budget when it will be able to decide how to allocate the funds it has available among the various responsibilities it has to meet. The honourable member will appreciate that, as Mr. Coward has a degree in economics or commerce, it is appropriate that he be involved in this investigation. In addition, while overseas he will look at general problems of school organization. In this connection, the department hopes that we will be able to provide occasions for senior officers of the

department, senior headmasters, and others senior in the service to be given a period of leave to enable them to study overseas. I suppose this is similar to the sabbatical leave that applies in tertiary institutions, although within the Education Department the extent of this leave is never likely to be as great as that which applies at university level. The Karmel report, for example, recommends that teachers should have one term off every five years for refresher purposes. We hope that progressively over a period we shall be able to provide this type of opportunity for more and more of our teachers.

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to ensure that district councils that are receiving rural relief payments honour the conditions of the Municipal and District Council Construction and Maintenance Award in South Australia, especially in respect of clause 34, which relates to preference to unionists? It has come to my notice that Mr. Peter McKee, who was working for the Wallaroo council, was recently discharged. He was a financial member of the union, while non-unionists were kept in employment. This happened even though the District Clerk had been told about the position by the union secretary. The District Clerk said that this man had been dismissed not because he was a unionist but because he was married. As I think this matter bears investigation, I ask the Minister to raise it with his colleague.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly do that. As I understand the situation, and as the honourable member knows, the Commonwealth Government makes relief money available to the States to deal with rural unemployment. The States are responsible for disbursing this money to various district councils, which are responsible for employing people under the scheme. In that role, I should imagine they should be subject to the Australian Workers Union Commonwealth award which contains the clause relating to preference to unionists that the honourable member has referred to. It is as simple as this: if two people applied for employment, one being a unionist and the other a non-unionist, as I understand the position the council would be compelled under the award to employ the unionist. I will certainly ask my colleague to contact the council to which the honourable member has referred to see whether the problem can be solved.

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works take appropriate action to see that people who register for employment under the rural aid scheme are not pressured to join a union? Last financial year some of my constituents living in the northern part of the State who had registered for employment under grant aid had pressure put on them to join a union. I should be interested in the comment—

The SPEAKER: The comment is out of order. The honourable member must ask a question.

Mr. VENNING: I should be interested in the number of enrolments, and I wonder how many have had to join a union.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Farmers Union?

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister ensure that these people in the northern parts of the State, who are mainly primary producers, are not required to join a union when they are working for councils?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will give no such assurance. First, I am not the Minister responsible for the scheme and, secondly, the Minister of Lands does not tell a council what it should do when the council employs people under this scheme. I have stated in my reply to the member for Adelaide that the council is responsible for employing people under the scheme. The State Government's responsibility amounts only to disbursing to councils money given by the Commonwealth Government for expenditure by councils on work under this scheme. Employment is a matter for the council, and the council must consider the award under which it employs these people. There is a provision in that award giving preference to unionists. I do not consider that I or any other Minister can give such an assurance to the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry consider the temporary nature of this employment and, when these people are—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But the Commonwealth award makes the provision.

Mr. RODDA: Regardless of whether it is Commonwealth, these people are working in South Australia and paying their way here. They are poor farmers: I was going to say that they were on the bone of their tail.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not allowed to comment. He may explain the question.

Mr. RODDA: Many people in my district, the same as people in many other districts, have been asked to pay a union fee. Perhaps there is not anything wrong with that, but they have to pay the full fee. I think the Australian Workers Union is the union concerned. Many young people find this an imposition for work of a temporary kind. Most of the people in my district are not receiving rural aid at present and are fully qualified unionists. I raise the matter with the Minister and ask him to take it up.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Your Party is in office in Canberra.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, but you are in office here. The position is difficult and is an imposition on people who appreciate this type of employment to supplement their meagre incomes.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I hope the honourable member is not asking the State to contravene the Federal Pastoral Award. He will also know that the people who are employed on these jobs are being paid the Commonwealth award rate, which is the result of the efforts of the Australian Workers' Union, and that in itself should encourage them to be members of the union if they receive an award as paid to the other members of the A.W.U. As has been adequately pointed out by the Minister of Works, the preference clause in the award has nothing to do with the Government: it is a matter between the councils that employ these people and the A.W.U.

GAWLER BY-PASS

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Gawler by-pass will be duplicated? I ask this question with the knowledge and co-operation of the Leader of the Opposition in whose district this by-pass is located. The Minister is aware that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan provided for this duplication to be carried out, and additional land has been purchased and fenced. Motorists from the North of the State have repeatedly drawn my attention to the difficulties experienced on this road during busy periods. Visibility on the road is restricted when a driver is attempting to overtake, with the result that sometimes it is necessary to follow a heavy transport vehicle over the total length of the by-pass, which is about three miles. Some motorists find that in busy periods it is quicker to go through the town of Gawler than to use the by-pass road. No doubt the Minister is aware that several fatal

accidents have occurred on this road in the short time that it has been open?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report.

HERD TESTING

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works find out from the Minister of Agriculture what is the Government's policy regarding the testing of cattle for tuberculosis in cases where it is found, when cattle are slaughtered at a killing works, that animals from a certain property have proved to be tuberculosis reactors? A constituent of mine has an extensive cattle property on which he runs about 2,000 breeding cows. This man purchased a draft of store steers at the Naracoorte saleyards. He turned them off as fats only to find amongst them tuberculosis reactors. He is now obliged to have his whole herd tested for tuberculosis at 50c a head a test. He will be involved in testing for tuberculosis, with the stock going to and from his property at his own expense, until the mater is cleared up. I shall be pleased if the Minister will obtain a reply from his colleague.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, I will do that.

PORT HASLAM JETTY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Marine say when his department will be prepared to carry out its part of the demolition of the Port Haslam jetty and whether it has considered further the wishes of the Port Haslam Progress Association?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Tenders have been called and a contract has been let to a contractor to demolish the outer end of the Port Haslam jetty. Although I am not certain when demolition is to take place or whether a time limit has been placed on the contract I understand that it is in the hands of the contractor. The honourable member asked me whether I had taken into account the wishes of the Port Haslam Progress Association. My attitude towards the association in this matter is no different from my attitude towards the Tumby Bay Progress Association. I have had representations from the Streaky Bay District Council, the body responsible for the Port Haslam area. The Chairman of the council put the views of his council to me and I told him that I could not accede to the request of the council and that the demolition of the jetty would proceed as had been planned. The honourable member well knows the reasons for this because I have given them to him many times. I do not mean to be offensive to either the

Tumby Bay or the Port Haslam Progress Association, but the only reason why I have refused to deal with those associations is that they are not properly constituted corporate bodies, whereas the district council is. I have suggested to the associations that, if they have representations to make, such representations should be made through the appropriate district council. I believe that I have taken the proper course in this matter, because I can deal only with the district council if I am to lease the jetty to it. In fact, the Streaky Bay District Council does lease the jetty from my department. I mean no offence at all to the progress associations, but the honourable member will agree that it would be improper for me to deal with them.

WATERWORKS REGULATION

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works indicate whether Cabinet has considered the deteriorating financial circumstances of persons whose properties are adversely affected by regulations recently gazetted under the Waterworks Act? When this House last sat, regulations relating to the Waterworks Act were tabled and an attempt was made to have them disallowed, especially those concerning zone 1 and zone 2 determinations. Following the gazettal of those regulations and their subsequent implementation, many persons have found that their properties, which they have farmed in a certain way since the 1840's, are required to be brought into line with those regulations. The extension of dairies is prohibited as are other practices that are part and parcel of their normal running. The *Sunday Mail* of July 22 reported extensively a meeting held at Williamstown one evening last week which the Government Valuer-General and Mr. K. Lewis of the Engineering and Water Supply Department attended. At that meeting several people indicated that the regulations, which prevent the subdivision of land in lots of less than 20 acres, have brought about an escalation in the ratable value of their properties, to a point where the valuation bears no relation to productivity of those properties. I realize that there cannot be a sudden variation in valuation over three or six months, but I believe that, with the 20-acre subdivision being the minimum, there has been an increase in the number of such subdivisions and the purchase of such blocks by city people who are prepared to pay a higher price for the land. This has affected the valuation of a property and the subsequent rating.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No submission has been made to Cabinet on this matter. I am interested in the Leader's comments about the increased valuations, and I take it that he believes that they are the result of the desire of people who live in the metropolitan area to enjoy the luxury of owning a 20-acre site on which they may surround themselves in isolation in a tree setting with their residence built in the centre. Does the Leader advocate that the Government should now introduce regulations to prevent 20-acre subdivisions? I thought that the Leader might be interested in such regulations as a means of solving the problem to which he has referred. Although I have seen the same report in the *Sunday Mail*, I have not yet had a report from my representative, Mr. Lewis, who attended that meeting, but I will call for a report and certainly investigate the matter because of what was said at that meeting and because the Leader has raised this matter. The Leader must appreciate the difficulties involved and I would welcome any suggestion he might have as to how the Government should compensate people in such a situation and his idea of what results such action could have. I will look at the matter, although it has not yet been placed before Cabinet.

THEBARTON INFANTS SCHOOL

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Education consider making permanent the present temporary arrangement whereby senior primary grades are accommodated at the Thebarton Infants School? Will the Minister create a full primary school at Hayward Avenue, Torrensville, and another at the present site of the Thebarton Primary School to provide convenient schooling for children in my district and in that of the member for Adelaide? About half a century ago, when I started school, I lived in Victoria Street, Mile End, in an area now ably represented by my colleague the member for Adelaide. I then had to walk half a mile to attend infants classes at the Thebarton Primary School. Now, almost 50 years later, the Education Department has progressed to the extent that children living in that area must still walk half a mile and then travel one mile each way by bus, at a cost of 10c a day, to attend the infants school at Torrensville. At the same time, children who live in my district half a mile farther west of the Torrensville school and who are in grades 3 to 7 at the Thebarton Primary School, must travel about a mile and a half. This arrangement is obviously inconvenient to

parents and children in a wide area of my district and in the District of Adelaide. In addition, this position has a serious sociological weakness that I am willing to discuss with the Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am disappointed that the honourable member was not willing to discuss in the House the sociological weakness to which he referred. I am willing to consider the matter that he has raised but I doubt very much that it will be possible at this stage to do as he suggests. He will appreciate that the Thebarton Primary School is at present being rebuilt, and doubtless the plans for that school were worked out in terms of its continuing the function it has carried out in the past years. Therefore, the possibility that the honourable member canvasses, which I take to be a separate primary school covering both primary and infants grades at Torrensville, may not be practicable. However, I will certainly consider the matter and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

TRAMWAYS TRUST BUSES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport find out how many Leyland Tiger Mark II buses owned by the Municipal Tramways Trust are now out of service? I understand that many of these buses are lying idle, awaiting sale.

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

SCHOOL INCINERATORS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the use of school incinerators on air pollution potential alert days causes any problem, and whether his department has considered this matter?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member and some other honourable members did draw my attention, early in the period of operation of air pollution potential alerts, to problems being caused by accumulating lunch wrappers and food scraps, in that it was necessary for some schools to burn material in incinerators on air pollution potential alert days and, with the pollution-conscious attitudes of children attending the schools, some problems were arising. However, I am pleased to tell the honourable member that I am grateful for the co-operation of the Minister of Education, who has told all headmasters that they should consider the matter of using incinerators on air pollution potential alert days to be as important as their use on days when there is a total fire ban, and he has told

headmasters that incinerators should not be lit. Arrangements have been made with councils to dispose of accumulated rubbish from schools if we have a period of weather that requires these alerts to be issued on several consecutive days.

TRAVEL COMPANY

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Premier, in the absence of the Attorney-General, say what was the paid up capital of Travel House of Australia Proprietary Limited? This organization recently failed, with losses which, according to press reports, could be more than \$500,000. The only reference I have seen to the company's capital was a report that it had an authorized capital of \$10,000. Obviously, this would place creditors in a most vulnerable position when the company was involved in transactions of the magnitude referred to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get the information for the honourable member.

DUKES HIGHWAY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Minister of Roads and Transport aware of proposals for the Highways Department to re-route the Dukes Highway south of Tailem Bend, I presume on the western side of the railway line as opposed to the present route on the eastern side of the railway line? Can he say whether this is being considered as an alternative to the original proposal for a railway over-pass south of Tailem Bend and east of Cooke Plains? If this is correct, how far is it intended to extend the new route and will it ultimately follow the western side of the railway line all the way or will it cross the line to the eastern side at a point other than the Tailem Bend crossing, as originally considered?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will seek the information.

ILLEGAL STRIKES

Mr. McANANEY: Does the Minister of Labour and Industry intend to legislate this session to make strikes in certain perishable goods industries illegal? I understand that the industries involved have asked the Minister not to make strikes completely illegal but to have them confined to a short duration. In the milk industry a strike of 24 hours or 48 hours would not cause the producers a great loss, whereas a strike of a longer duration in the milk and fruitgrowing industries could cause terrific losses. I therefore think this is a reasonable request on behalf of the industries involved.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: No.

DRUG PENALTIES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier review the effect of sentences imposed on people concerned with drugs, particularly drug pedlars? Many people who believe that the sentences on drug pedlars are far too light and should be increased have seen me about this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member must be aware that the law was amended only a short time ago to increase penalties in this area. The actual imposition of the penalties thereafter is a matter for the courts and they have to look at individual cases. Naturally enough, they take into account the maximum penalties prescribed under the law when they express a view on the seriousness with which the community regards various offences.

Mr. Mathwin: The penalties are not very high.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not so in most of the cases I have come across. If the honourable member has a suggestion as to increases in penalties and can cite cases in which they have been inadequate, I shall be willing to look at them.

PORT NEILL SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Education have the paintwork at the Port Neill Primary School examined with a view to having it renewed? When visiting the school recently, I noticed that the paint was peeling badly on some of the wooden buildings, particularly around the windows. The Headmaster informed me that the work was done three years ago, but it is fairly obvious that it was a poor job, as it has deteriorated to such an extent. I know that there is a normal cycle in regard to repainting wooden buildings and that it probably involves a period in excess of three years. However, I think that from the department's point of view it is necessary that its assets be properly maintained. I ask whether, in this case, the Minister will examine the matter and, although I realize it may be difficult, I also ask whether it is possible to ensure that a better standard of work is performed so that this sort of thing does not occur again.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into the matters raised by the honourable member.

LOXTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education ascertain for me whether or not the paving of the Loxton High School ground is the

subject of a present group tender? Looking at the *Gazette*, I believe that it is not and that it has been omitted, and, in view of the present state of the paving at the school, I should like the Minister to ascertain why this work has been overlooked and whether it can even now be included in the programme.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into that matter also.

SAND RESERVES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the recent off-shore sand source survey was successful in locating sufficient quantities of sand to replenish our depleted metropolitan beaches?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Members will recall that during last year we asked a Queensland firm to undertake a survey of our off-shore sand reserves. That survey indicates that we have substantial off-shore sand reserves that can be used to replenish the beaches, and those reserves are situated at various points along the coast. Some additional work will have to be done in relation to these deposits to ensure that the grains of sand compare with those existing on our beaches so that there will be no complication in that regard. Following that, a decision will have to be made on the most effective way of placing the sand on our beaches (several alternatives are open to the Government). However, before that decision is made, we believe that the Executive Engineer, who will advise the recently established foreshore authority, should be appointed so that his opinion can be sought regarding the methods to be used in placing sand on the beaches. The important factor associated with the survey is that we were able to establish substantial off-shore reserves.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government has decided to introduce daylight saving this year? In view of the strong opposition in country areas last year to introducing daylight saving, and bearing in mind representations made by members to the Minister regarding this matter, I ask him whether the views of country people will be considered adequately before a decision is made.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: True, representations have been made to the Government on this matter. I assure the honourable member that the Government has

considered the points of view of all sections of the community interested in the matter, and I expect that an announcement will be made within a week or two.

BUDGET INCREASE

Mr. McANANEY: The Financial Statement for the last financial year indicates that the largest increase above the Budget concerns the Legislature and administration not included elsewhere, the sum having risen from about \$18,300,000 to about \$19,400,000. Will the Treasurer obtain details of the main increases that occurred in respect of the various items which led to the total increase above the budgetary figure?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain full details for the honourable member.

BLACKWOOD LAND

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture, ascertain for what purpose the property of the Blackwood Experimental Orchard is to be used in the future? I believe that this property could be used for two purposes: first, the nursery at the National Park could be transferred to this property; and, secondly, I believe there is sufficient land for a second secondary school in the area. I ask the Minister whether this property is to be used specifically for anything other than the purposes to which I have referred.

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

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. How much of the total land required for the Hackney redevelopment project has been purchased?

2. How far has planning for this redevelopment proceeded?

3. Has there been an adequate sociological study of the effect of purchase and redevelopment on the individuals already in the area or to be placed there?

4. Have any private developers been involved in any way with this proposed redevelopment scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. About 70 per cent of residential land has been purchased.

2. A supplementary development plan has been displayed incorporating a conceptual design. Written representations concerning this

plan have been received and are being considered.

3. Yes, particularly with respect to existing residents where officers of the Housing Trust have made frequent and detailed individual social contact. I may add that our officers have been asked to go to Victoria to advise the Government there on the processes to be used in this matter.

4. If and as soon as the supplementary development plan has been authorized, part of the area will be offered for private development in accordance with the plan.

Dr. Eastick, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government regarding the payment of the removal expenses of persons whose properties are acquired:

(a) for the purposes of the Hackney redevelopment project; and

(b) for other purposes?

2. If the policy be not the same for each category what is the reason for the difference?

3. When were the respective policies adopted?

4. How much has been paid by the Government for the removal expenses of persons affected by the Hackney redevelopment project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) As explained in answer to an earlier Question on Notice and in *Hansard* on page 4429 of March 29, 1972, Government policy is that, in the Hackney redevelopment project, the basis of valuation will be re-location cost, including expenses, rather than on-site valuation.

(b) The above statement refers to the Hackney project.

2. The Hackney area is the only redevelopment area subject to a supplementary development plan. When there are other such areas the same basis of valuation will be used.

3. See announcement in *Hansard* at page 4429.

4. Removal expenses in most cases were included with the purchase price of the house because of the valuation policy referred to above.

Dr. Eastick, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What properties have been purchased at Hackney for the purposes of the Hackney redevelopment project?

2. What is the valuation by the Valuation Department of each property?

3. What amount was paid for each such property or for the purchase of an alternative property for the former owner or occupier?

4. What amounts have been paid for disturbance in respect of each property and how were such amounts determined?

5. What is the authority for reinstatement, rather than acquisition under the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, in those cases in which reinstatement has been agreed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Of the 66 residential properties in the area, 48 have been purchased.

2. Because of Government policy that relocation value, rather than on-site value was to be used, valuations were not obtained from the Valuation Department.

3. The total amount paid for the 48 properties purchased amounted to \$329,184.28.

4. Disturbance was included in the amount paid for the properties according to the valuation principles set out in 2 above.

5. Government policy as stated on March 29, 1972, and reported in *Hansard* at page 4429.

ABSCONDERS

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. How many abscondings have occurred in each of the last three years, at McNally, Brookway Park and Vaughan House respectively?

2. How many individual instances of injury inflicted by inmates to members of the staff have occurred in each of those years at these institutions?

3. Is the Minister aware that, as a result of these abscondings and injuries, the morale of staff is at a low ebb?

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

	McNally Training Centre	Brookway Park	Vaughan House
1969-70 . . .	91	47	74
1970-71 . . .	165	181	125
1971-72 . . .	243	314	82

2. (a) Minor injuries sustained whilst retaining boys and girls.

	McNally Training Centre	Brookway Park	Vaughan House
1969-70 . . .	—	—	7
1970-71 . . .	—	—	13
1971-72 . . .	3	—	14

(b) Minor injuries resulting from direct action by boys and girls.

	McNally Training Centre	Brookway Park	Vaughan House
1969-70 . . .	—	—	2
1970-71 . . .	1	—	4
1971-72 . . .	—	—	—

(c) More serious injury resulting from direct action by boys or girls.

	McNally Training Centre	Brookway Park	Vaughan House
1969-70 . . .	—	—	—
1970-71 . . .	1	—	—
1971-72 . . .	2	—	3

3. No.

GOVERNMENT PRESS SECRETARY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Did a Government press secretary contribute articles to the weekly paper *Review* under *nomis de plume*, such as "by our Adelaide correspondent", "by an Adelaide correspondent", and "by the Adelaide correspondent"?

2. If so, did he receive remuneration for such articles?

3. By contributing such articles and receiving remuneration, did he contravene his terms of employment as a Government press secretary?

4. Under what terms and conditions are Government press secretaries employed?

5. Are they required to comply with the Public Service Act? If not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. If a press secretary has written for publication in Australia or elsewhere under a *nom de plume* it has not been with the knowledge or authority of the Government.

2. See answer to 1.

3. If articles have been contributed and remuneration received, that does not contravene the terms of employment of press secretaries by the Government.

4. Press secretaries are Ministerial appointments outside the Public Service.

5. No. See answer to 4.

AIR-CONDITIONING

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government let a contract for \$25,000 for the replacement or modification of the air-conditioning system in the State administration centre because of difficulties being experienced with the present air-conditioning system?

2. Does the present air-conditioning system in this building cause people wearing contact lenses to complain that their lenses become fogged up?

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

1. No.

2. The department is not aware of any complaints about the fogging of contact lenses.

SPEEDING CONVICTIONS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many convictions for speeding on the Princes and Dukes Highways, between Adelaide and the Victorian border, have been recorded during the three months ended June 30, 1972, and during the corresponding period in 1971?

2. How many convictions involved road transport vehicles, and how many involved motor cars?

3. What speeds were involved in the offences recorded in respect of road transport vehicles?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Traffic statistics are not kept for offences committed on specific roads, but there is a division of metropolitan and country prosecutions. The following table shows the speed prosecutions for the whole State broken down to these divisions:

JUNE QUARTER, 1971 AND 1972

	Metropolitan		Country	
	1971	1972	1971	1972
1. Excessive speed sec. 49 (1) (a) Road Traffic Act	5,193	5,199	740	764
2. Speed (exceed 60 m.p.h.) sec. 48, R.T.A.	7	0	15	0
3. Speed (in Zone) sec. 50, R.T.A.	564	552	261	240
4. Speed (commercial) sec. 53, R.T.A.	663	573	363	268
Totals	6,427	6,324	1,379	1,272

The figures for metropolitan and country areas do not necessarily reflect the number of offences committed in the respective areas because some offences detected in the country are charged in city courts, particularly those detected by highway and radar patrols.

2. Categories 1, 2 and 3 would refer almost wholly to vehicles other than commercial vehicles because speed offences in commercial vehicles are nearly always charged under section 53 (category 4).

3. No record is kept of the speeds involved in any speed offences, but a sampling of reports submitted by highway patrol personnel, who report the majority of the offences involving commercial vehicles, shows that the speeds in these offences range from 40 m.p.h. to 75 m.p.h. with about 75 per cent of offences involving a speed in excess of 50 m.p.h. One 75 m.p.h. offence involved a vehicle with a gross load of 30 tons. Highway patrols operate mainly on the Princes and Dukes Highways between Adelaide and Bordertown, the Sturt Highway from Adelaide to Renmark and the Adelaide to Port Pirie and Port Augusta roads. The Princes and Dukes Highways run, which is the area mentioned in the question, receives most attention and, in the opinion of the officer-in-charge, highway patrol, about 50 per cent of the prosecutions involving commercial vehicles would result from offences detected on this road.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): What is the present storage position of the metropolitan Adelaide water supply system?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The present storage holdings in million gallons in the metropolitan reservoirs are as follows:

	Capacity	Storage
Mount Bold	10,440	5,591
Happy Valley	2,804	2,045
Clarendon Weir	72	71
Myponga	5,905	4,170
Millbrook	3,647	1,117
Kangaroo Creek	5,370	1,108
Hope Valley	765	533
Thorndon Park	142	111
Barossa	993	852
South Para	11,300	7,646
Total	41,438	23,244

SCHOOL INSURANCE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Is the following property at State schools covered by any insurance in the event of fire:
 (a) stock in canteens;

- (b) plant, fixtures and fittings and all moveable utensils in canteens;
- (c) schoolgrounds equipment, that is, tractors, hoses, lawn mowers, sprinklers and working tools;
- (d) television sets;
- (e) film projectors;
- (f) library books;
- (g) trophies; and
- (h) works of art and the like provided by school committees?

2. Is cover provided against losses resulting from:

- (a) flooding;
- (b) rainwater;
- (c) smoke damage;
- (d) water damage;
- (e) impact by vehicles;
- (f) explosion;
- (g) earthquake;
- (h) aircraft;
- (i) riots;
- (j) malicious damage; and
- (k) accidental damage?

3. What is the basis for compensation arising from any such losses?

4. Is fusion or burning out of motors of plant and equipment covered?

5. Is any breakdown of plant or equipment covered?

6. Is any consequential loss (that is, hiring of equipment pending settlement of a claim) covered?

7. Is any of the property recorded above covered for:

- (a) theft;
- (b) burglary by forcible entry; and
- (c) damage by burglars?

8. Is damage to buildings by burglars the school committee's responsibility?

9. Does cover for fire risk include goods in the open air and at a repairer's (for example, tractors and lawn mowers)?

10. What cover is provided when the school tractor has need to travel on a public road for repairs?

- 11. Is loss of cash covered:
 - (a) in transit to and from the bank or business premises of others;
 - (b) in any school building; and/or
 - (c) whilst in a locked safe,

because of theft or actual forcible entry and including embezzlement by staff or voluntary helpers?

12. Are workers engaged by any school committee covered by the department under the Workmen's Compensation Act (for example, canteen workers, gardeners, etc.)?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answers to the honourable member's compendious questions are as follows:

1. (a) No. The canteen stock is considered the property of the school committee.

(b) These items are covered by the Government insurance fund.

(c) to (h) No. This property is vested in the Minister of Education and will be replaced in the event of its loss or destruction provided that reasonable precautions for its protection have been taken.

2. (a) to (k) No. However, necessary replacement or repair is performed by either the Education Department or the Public Buildings Department provided that reasonable precautions have been taken.

3. With the exception of canteen stock the Education Department arranges for replacement of the property.

4. No. Repairs for replacements up to \$120 are treated as urgent minor repairs, and are arranged by the headmaster. Repairs in excess of \$120 require prior departmental approval.

5. No insurance cover is provided for breakdown of plant or equipment. Again, repairs for replacement of such equipment up to \$120 are treated as urgent minor repairs.

6. No. Necessary hiring within the urgent minor repair range would receive favourable consideration.

7. No. Canteen stock remains the responsibility of the committee. All other items are replaced upon request by the school and, after approval by the Minister of Education, at departmental expense.

8. No. The Public Buildings Department repairs any such damage.

9. No. Equipment at a repairer's would automatically come under any insurance cover the repairer may hold.

10. Registration and insurance of tractors is effected by the transport officer upon request by the school. Consequently, third party insurance would be available.

11. (a) A cash-in-transit policy covers the movement of cash from the insured's premises to the bank and from the bank to the insured's premises.

(b) The policy applies only to cash kept in "locked safe or locked strongroom" and would not cover moneys that may be stolen from a filing cabinet whether it be locked or otherwise.

(c) The policy is extended to provide cover during non-business hours for moneys that

may be kept in the locked safe or locked strongroom in the insured's premises. Embezzlement by staff or voluntary helpers is not covered by insurance. Recovery of embezzled cash would depend upon any legal action which may be taken.

12. Yes. The department carries a further special policy covering authorized voluntary persons under 70 years of age.

WAITING ROOM

Dr. Eastick, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have alterations to Parliament House recently been made to provide a waiting room for the Premier's visitors?

2. If so:

(1) Who is occupying such room?

(2) What other changes in rooms for members and staff have been made necessary by the provision of this room?

(3) What other alterations to Parliament House have been made as a result?

(4) Who requested such alterations to be made?

(5) What is the cost so far of each of these alterations?

(6) What is the estimated total cost?

(7) What further alterations are proposed for Parliament House soon?

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

1. Alterations were carried out to provide additional accommodation for the staff of the Department of the Premier and of Development, and to provide a waiting room facility.

2. (1) The room will be occupied by the staff of the Department of the Premier and of Development, as required.

(2) The room formerly occupied by the member for Mitcham was converted for the use of the Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms. A room is being provided for the member for Mitcham.

(3) Nil.

(4) The Speaker.

(5) It is not possible, at this stage, to separate costs for the individual works. The majority of the cost was to provide suitable permanent accommodation of appropriate standard for the Clerk Assistant.

(6) \$11,800.

(7) Nil.

HIGH COURT

Mr. Ferguson, for the Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN:

1. Have any citizens of South Australia been appointed as judges of the High Court of Australia?

2. Is the Government concerned to see that South Australians are considered for these positions?

3. If so, will the Government make representations to the Commonwealth Government towards this end?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Yes.

3. The Attorney-General will ask the Commonwealth Attorney-General to bear in mind, when filling the present vacancy on the High Court bench, the very high quality of the legal profession in South Australia, and the fact that no South Australian has ever been appointed a justice of the High Court.

TEACHER RESIGNATIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): How many resignations of teachers from the Education Department occurred in each of the years, 1970, 1971, and 1972 to date?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The following resignations of primary and secondary teachers have occurred during the last three years: January 1, 1970, to January 31, 1971, 1,525; February, 1971, to January 31, 1972, 1,231; and February 1, 1972, to June 30, 1972, 309. The first set of figures relates to a period of 13 months owing to changed resignation regulations introduced in 1970.

CATTLE

Mr. Ferguson, for the Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (on notice):

1. What is the cattle population of South Australia?

2. What is the estimated annual turn-off of cattle for slaughter from South Australian properties?

3. What is the estimated annual turn-off of beef cattle, offered for sale in South Australia, from:

- (a) the Northern Territory;
- (b) South-West Queensland; and
- (b) New South Wales?

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

1. 1,503,000 at March 31, 1972.
2. Records of the area from which cattle are delivered for slaughter are not maintained.

3. (a) 91,300.
- (b) 1,000.
- (c) 9,050.

ABATTOIRS

Mr. Rodda, for the Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (on notice): How many cattle are estimated to be slaughtered annually at:

- (a) the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs at Gepps Cross; and
- (b) other abattoirs in South Australia;

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

- (a) 174,000 (year ended June 30, 1972).
- (b) 100,000 (year ended March 31, 1972).

FORESTS

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What area of land is clear-felled annually in this State's soft-wood forests?

2. What acreage is being planted to pinus annually?

3. Of this latter area, what is the acreage of new land and second plantings, respectively?

4. How many acres of land were purchased for afforestation purposes last year in the South-East of this State and also in other parts of South Australia?

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

1. 330 acres (average).
2. 6,463 acres (average).
3. 6,158 acres and 305 acres, respectively.
4. South-East, 1,897½ acres; and elsewhere, 847 acres.

DROUGHT SUBSIDIES

Mr. FERGUSON (on notice):

1. What numbers of stock transported for drought reasons have come under the subsidy system initiated by the Government?

2. What tonnage of fodder has been transported under this scheme?

3. What is the total cost of subsidies paid?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although a number of inquiries have been received, no claims for rebates on the cost of carrying fodder to drought-affected areas or on the cost of transporting sheep and cattle away for agistment have yet been lodged with the Lands Department.

ELECTORAL ROLL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many 18 to 20 year olds have enrolled as voters in each State electorate in South Australia?

2. What is the rate of enrolment each week to date?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1.

ENROLMENT OF 18 TO 20 YEAR OLD PERSONS
AS HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ELECTORS SINCE
JUNE 30, 1972.

House of Assembly District	First Week	Second Week	Third Week	Total
Adelaide	6	27	54	87
Albert Park	6	45	44	95
Florey	11	41	47	99
Gilles	5	28	36	69
Hanson	12	42	37	91
Henley Beach	4	29	44	77
Peake	8	29	46	83
Price	6	30	38	74
Ross Smith	20	36	41	97
Semaphore	11	37	32	80
Spence	8	37	36	81
Torrens	31	34	43	108
Ascot Park	7	37	46	90
Bragg	13	26	31	70
Brighton	16	49	36	101
Coles	13	29	47	89
Davenport	11	35	41	87
Glenelg	9	42	21	72
Miticham	12	26	48	86
Mitchell	10	35	40	85
Norwood	8	24	56	88
Unley	8	28	31	67
Alexandra	1	26	24	51
Fisher	6	37	45	88
Heysen	8	20	15	43
Mallee	1	15	11	27
Mawson	10	35	25	70
Millicent	2	16	13	31
Mount Gambier	2	22	24	48
Murray	7	11	29	47
Victoria	2	13	18	33
Elizabeth	9	23	40	72
Gouger	12	16	22	50
Goyder	14	29	21	64
Kavel	5	27	20	52
Light	4	17	27	48
Playford	16	38	42	96
Salisbury	13	18	16	47
Tea Tree Gully	5	24	32	61
Chaffey	8	14	15	37
Eyre	2	10	10	22
Flinders	2	20	20	42
Frome	4	23	15	42
Pirie	4	13	19	36
Rocky River	6	18	27	51
Stuart	2	16	16	34
Whyalla	10	17	23	50
Total	390	1,264	1,464	3,118

2. First week, 390; second week, 1,264; and third week, 1,464.

PENSIONER SUBSIDIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Does the Government propose to introduce a scheme offering pensioners a 50 per cent subsidy up to an amount of \$80 on council rates, as introduced by the New South Wales Government on July 1, 1972? If not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A committee appointed to investigate payment of rates and taxes by pensioners recently submitted its report to the Government. One of the matters considered was the scheme operating in New South Wales. No decision has yet been reached on any aspects in the report.

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a scheme offering pensioners a subsidy of up to a maximum of \$40 each for water and for sewerage rates respectively, as adopted by the New South Wales Government? If not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A report has been received by the Government from a committee appointed to inquire into giving relief from rates and taxes to persons in necessitous circumstances. The committee considered the scheme operating in New South Wales in compiling its report. The Government is currently considering the committee's recommendations.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. CARNIE (on notice):

1. How many applications have been received under the rural reconstruction scheme for the following:

- (a) debt reconstruction;
- (b) farm build-up; and
- (c) assistance to re-establish outside the rural industry?

2. How many of these applications have been granted?

3. How many such applications are pending?

4. What is the average length of time from when an application is received to when a decision is made on it?

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

1. (a) debt reconstruction 680
- (b) farm build-up 80
- (c) re-establishment loans 8
2. (a) debt reconstruction 219
- (b) farm build-up 11
- (c) re-establishment loans 8
3. (a) debt reconstruction 159
- (b) farm build-up 42
- (c) re-establishment loans Nil

4. In order to comply with the conditions of the rural reconstruction scheme each application must be thoroughly investigated before a decision can be reached. All negotiations with creditors are carried out by the rural reconstruction authority. The length of time taken on an individual application, therefore, depends to a large extent on the complexity of the case so that some variation must be

expected. The average length of time in South Australia would be about three months and this compares favourably with other States. Every effort is made to arrive at a decision within the minimum possible time.

INQUESTS

Mr. CARNIE (on notice):

1. How many road accidents involving loss of life occurred during the period July 1, 1971, to June 30, 1972?

2. How many of these accidents were the subject of inquests?

3. How many inquests concerning these accidents are pending?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. 278.

*2. 120 (an estimate).

3. 25.

* Inquests held during this period do not relate to deaths during same period, as inquests are held two to three months after death. The estimate is a fairly accurate one.

COURT COSTS

Dr. Eastick, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Upon what principle or principles did the Government act in deciding to make payment of the costs of the plaintiff, Mr. B. H. Woolley, on behalf of the defendant, Mr. J. E. Dunford in Supreme Court action No. 1579 of 1971?

2. Under what authority did the Government make this payment?

3. Does the Government propose to pay any damages awarded against the defendant in the said action?

4. Did Mr. J. E. Dunford, or anyone on his behalf, make a request to the Government that the Government should make any payment? If so, who?

5. Has Mr. Dunford given any indication to the Government, since the payment was made, that he welcomed the payment?

6. If not, has he given any indication of his reaction?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government's decision to make payment of the costs was made in the best interests of the public of South Australia as a whole to ensure a satisfactory settlement of the dispute and to avoid grave damage to the State, and in accordance with precedent.

2. The financial authority for the payment derives from section 32a of the Public Finance Act, 1936-1970, which provides for excess

expenditure beyond that appropriated by Parliament. Subsection (2) of that section provides that "the Governor in any financial year may by warrant appropriate to the Public Service within the State . . . if . . . Appropriation Act has at the time of issue of the warrant been enacted, not more than an amount equal to one per centum of the total of moneys . . . appropriated for expenditure during the last preceding financial year, and of such amount not more than one-third shall be appropriated for purposes other than previously authorized purposes". The payment was authorized by the Minister of Labour and Industry and, as the purpose was not a "previously authorized purpose", an excess warrant was issued known as Form 3, which relates to authority for such expenditure signed by the Minister of Labour and Industry and approved by the Acting Treasurer. The payment is recorded in a special line in the appropriation records and will be shown separately in the Estimates to be presented to Parliament in due course.

3. No damages have been awarded.

4. No. Payment of Mr. Woolley's costs was demanded by farmer representatives at short notice as an absolute precondition of any later consultation to settle the dispute.

5 and 6. Mr. Dunford has not given any indication to the Government of his reaction.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption. (Continued from July 20. Page 147.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion. I express my appreciation of the way the Governor performed the opening ceremony. He performed this duty with a graciousness we have come to expect of the Queen's representative. We are grateful to Sir Mark as the Queen's representative, because he is the figurehead who is above politics in this State and who gives us a link with the Crown.

Regarding the Government's decision to abolish the traditional recommendation for Queen's Honours, I believe that that decision will tend to weaken the link between the Crown and the people of this State. For this reason, I was indeed pleased to see in the New Year's Honours List that my predecessor in this House (Hon. B. H. Teusner) was to receive an honour bestowed on him by Her Majesty. It is a pity that in the future the Government does not intend to recognize the outstanding achievements of citizens in this State in this way. Indeed, it is my view that

a State honour will not carry with it the same recognition or the prestige as an honour bestowed by Her Majesty, and that must weaken the link with the Crown.

I also express my personal sympathy to the families of those members who served in this Parliament and who have died since last we met. Of those members I knew best the Hon. Mr. Robinson; indeed, I had known him some years. I was shocked to learn of his untimely death, as well as the deaths of the other members to whom I have referred.

I appreciated that the Governor made early reference in his remarks to the rural economy of this State. In his Speech the Governor paid due regard to the rural economy, and I hope that that is indicative of the growing awareness by this Government of the real problems that have faced this sector of the South Australian economy. I believe that recognition of such problems has been somewhat scant. This Government refused to follow the lead of other States in respect of land tax on rural properties and there have been other areas where the Government's lack of appreciation and knowledge of the problems confronting our rural sector in this State have been shown.

Reference was made by His Excellency to the way rural producers are making every effort to move into a field of production that will prove more economic and more profitable than their activities have been in the past.

If members look at the table of statistics that has been given to them, they will find from the livestock table what happened to the sheep population between 1966 and 1971. There was a marginal increase only in the total number of sheep in South Australia but there has been a large increase in the number of cattle in the State. Our cattle numbers increased from 689,992 in 1966 to 1,196,404 in 1971. This shows a tremendous attempt by the farmers and graziers to convert to cattle raising and there seem to be long-term prospects of improving markets, particularly those in the United States.

This work has not been done without considerable cost being incurred by the farming community. No-one, not even the member for Stuart, really knows what sort of finance is required to convert, and many farmers had to take on heavy debts and overdrafts to enter this type of production. As is stated in His Excellency's Speech, these people are making a valiant effort to remain productive and to keep their operations profitable.

Marketing is a major problem. The price that primary producers receive for their pro-

ducts is also a major problem, and farmers do not have the protection that is given to other sections of the community. The people at large and members of this House should realize that the economy of the State is still based on primary industry, and our oversea export earnings are almost entirely based on one kind of primary production or another. I did not realize the extent to which we depended on primary production for oversea earnings until I saw the statistical table of South Australia's export earnings from both primary and secondary industries. Primary producers do not have protected markets such as many secondary industries have. Let no-one think that any section of the State can get along without having due regard to all other sections, including primary and secondary industries.

Mr. Venning: The primary producers do not receive just rewards for their labour.

Mr. Payne: They do get Commonwealth subsidies, don't they?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have heard members opposite attacking the payment of Commonwealth Government subsidies. Regardless of whether we call it subsidy or tariff protection, it is a form of protection for one part of our economy.

Mr. Keneally: All we ask is that you admit that they get this subsidy,

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No-one would be so stupid as to deny that the rural producers get subsidies, and I am proud that members opposite are gracious enough to include me as a primary producer. I am trying to make the point that each section of our economy depends on the other.

Mr. Payne: They get subsidy this year, but the working man gets nothing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Tariff protection gives protection from direct oversea competition, and one only has to consider Japan to realize that. Without that protection, many thousands of people in this country would not have employment, so I believe in tariff protection, but primary producers sell on an open market where this protection does not exist. The costs to primary producers are increased considerably. On the other side of the coin, subsidies are paid, and these are more than amply justified.

Mr. Payne: On the other side again, primary producers are allowed special tax concessions, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know whether the honourable member wants to open

up a debate on whether primary producers are over-protected.

Mr. Payne: I'm suggesting that you ought to be fair, that's all.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am trying to be fair, and I do not think I could be fairer than I have been in saying that we in this country all depend on one another. I ask for recognition of that in this House and elsewhere. Everyone depends as much on the primary producer for well-being as on other sections of the community.

During the last session the argument was raised in this House that certain sections of the community do not get a just share of the national cake. I remember that the member for Florey, a respected political opponent in whom many members have the greatest confidence, made a point with which I disagreed. He considered that one section of the community was not getting a fair share, and he was referring to the trade unions.

I wish to quote some remarks made yesterday by Mr. John Kerin (State President of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated) in his opening address to the Annual State Conference of that organization. An excellent address, it sums up fairly the position of all of us in this community.

Mr. Payne: Are you going to give us something from Grant Andrews as well?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have never previously quoted Mr. Andrews in this House but, in response to the honourable member's request, I will do that, too. I did not intend to do so, but the Secretary of the organization is also important. Mr. Kerin said:

The problem in Australia today is to divide up the economic cake justly and fairly among all sectors of the community.

Mr. Clark: Hear, hear!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pleased to hear the agreement of members opposite. Mr. Kerin also said:

What must be appreciated is that for this cake to go further, we must improve our income earning capacity . . .

In other words, we must make a bigger cake if we want more to go around.

Mr. Keneally: The cake is a bit spongy at present.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that members opposite do not stick the knife into it as they did in the case of the Kangaroo Island dispute. That was a shocking exhibition. After the words of approbation from the Government benches, I will continue with the quotation of Mr. Kerin's remarks:

. . . and for every resident in South Australia to recognize this cannot be done unless we pull together as a community, recognizing each other's problems and difficulties.

Mr. Bruce Guerin was the economic writer for the *Advertiser* until some months ago, and I think he has now gone overseas. He wrote an interesting article, which appeared in the magazine section of the *Advertiser* on October 16 last year, and which summed up the dilemma of any Government in an economic climate such as that existing at present.

Mr. Payne: Some people now out of work would agree with what Mr. Guerin had to say.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall point out later that I would not have confidence in some of the economic spokesmen of the Labor Government if they were to handle the financial arrangements of this country.

Mr. Kerin spoke about making demands and footing the bill: in other words, demands made on Governments and how they are to be met. He said:

Yet at bottom it may be an expression of some of the root causes of our present difficulties. We want more and better schools, better roads, more realistic welfare provisions, more relevant legislation .

Mr. Payne: More subsidies, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: And members on the other side will ask for more tariff protection, no doubt.

Mr. Evans: Yes, 40 per cent on motor vehicles.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There is no point in denying that the motor industry would be wrecked if we were in competition with overseas motor firms. I shall continue with the quotation:

We want the better services without really wanting to pay for them . . .

Because our expressed priorities and our willingness to pay are askew, we are building inflation into the system—in effect wanting to keep private expenditure as high as ever and growing steadily, and demanding public expenditure to expand even faster, without the increased productivity which could pay for it.

Much the same as wanting to have a 35-hour week on 40-hour pay, without working harder or more efficiently to make up the leeway.

Moralistic as it may seem, there is no real alternative to each section of the community's concentrating on pulling its own weight, with less attention paid to the illusory exercise of jealously guarding relative positions in that community.

In the end, the old saying is true—you don't get anything you don't pay for, or work for. In my view, that is an honest comment, but pressures are being applied by this Government and by Labor spokesmen throughout the whole country. Continuing pressures are

being placed on the Commonwealth Government, not insignificantly, to make available huge sums for governmental spending. We see that, in every field of Government activity (in South Australia from the Government of the day and in Canberra from the Labor Opposition), demands are being made for tremendous increases in Government expenditure.

Yet in the same breath the Government is exhorted to reduce taxation, even though spending in the private and in the public sector must, of course, be increased! I remember the 12-point plan of the Premier of South Australia, intended to stimulate the economy. Mr. Guerin hits the nail on the head when he says we cannot have it both ways: we cannot control inflation by reducing taxation and significantly increasing Government spending, at the same time increasing expenditure in the private sector.

The activities of the South Australian Government have contributed significantly to the disabilities affecting spending in the private sector in this State. We have the Premier exhorting the Commonwealth Government to reduce taxation, with a hue and cry about the possibility of increased sales tax on motor vehicles, which he said were the lifeblood of this State. In the last State Budget the stamp duty on the sale of motor vehicles was increased very severely.

Mr. Venning: When things are different they are not the same!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Members opposite are speaking not with two voices but with a multitude of voices, though not in any responsible fashion. The Labor Government increased very markedly the stamp duty on the sale of motor vehicles, and in all other transactions involving not only the "tall poppies", as the Premier calls them, but also indeed the average citizen.

If huge sums are to be raised by way of taxation in this country, these measures must of necessity be aimed at the average citizen. I defy any member of the other side to show how the type of spending to be financed by the Government's proposal here and by those of the Opposition in Canberra could be carried out without markedly increasing taxation aimed at the average wage-earner. It cannot be done by taxing the so-called "tall poppies". The Premier, in putting across these emotional arguments, knows very well that sufficiently large sums could not be raised, even if he took all the income from the so-called "wealthy", to finance such lavish Government spending.

In this matter the Government has been acting in an entirely irresponsible fashion. The Governor's Speech refers to increased expenditure on rural scholarships for students in out-back areas. Much has been said about the equality of educational opportunity, and it is a principle to which I think members on this side would subscribe wholeheartedly. We believe there should be equality of opportunity in education, but in my view this equality does not exist for many children in rural and out-back areas. Many travel long distances by school bus. It is time-consuming for them. An appreciable number in the farther outback areas cannot be transported even in this way. Some students must attend schools at which the courses they wish to follow are not offered. They are disadvantaged if they wish to undertake tertiary studies. It should be possible for students to attend schools at which the courses they wish to study are in fact offered. The Government should make these opportunities available.

I heard in the Norwood Town Hall at the meeting called by the South Australian Institute of Teachers the comments of the Minister of Education on the so-called wealthy independent schools in this State. The Minister no doubt will recall saying that he would be satisfied when standards in South Australian Government schools came up to those obtaining in the wealthy independent schools. It is interesting to note that the Government intends now to make a grant to the so-called wealthy independent schools. I take it the Minister there refers to the independent schools of the type attended by the Premier. I do not wish to be personal or to name the schools, but I imagine these are the institutions referred to. The Government is making the minimum grant, but nevertheless it is a grant, and there is recognition by the Minister and by the Government that the independent schools in South Australia are in need. Perhaps the Minister realizes, as does the committee set up to investigate needs, that even these schools are in considerable difficulty. I should like now to quote from the report of the Needs Committee that has been supplied to members of the House. It states:

While the committee recognizes that capital assets such as spacious grounds and buildings provide an enriching environment for education, it was decided to ignore this variable in the final ranking of schools. It was argued that, even though large assets give schools a large borrowing potential, the general problem

remains—that it is increasingly difficult to service such debts, even in the case of the most affluent schools.

So we have here a recognition that all of our independent schools are having great difficulty in meeting recurring expenses, and the fact that they have a large borrowing potential in no way solves this problem, which is not easy of solution. It is obvious then that all schools are experiencing the same major difficulties in carrying on due to the escalation in recurring expenses. This view is re-enforced by the parent organizations both at the State and Commonwealth level. In referring to the aid for independent primary schools it is clear that the State Government has accepted the principle of aid for independent schools but that its efforts fall far short of that in most of the other States. After considerable internecine warfare with some of its colleagues in the past (I refer to the not too distant past), the Government has at last accepted this principle.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Labor Party accepted it before you did in this State. What are you talking about?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government that in the past provided aid for independent schools in this State was the Liberal and Country League Government; it introduced aid to independent schools.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Following the policy of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will take the Minister's mind back to the internecine warfare at a meeting in Broken Hill where some of his Commonwealth colleagues, particularly the member for Hindmarsh, gave their views on aid to independent schools. From memory, I think the words of the member for Hindmarsh were that the Labor Party should not be subsidizing the Catholic Church. I think that is what the member for Hindmarsh was reported as saying on that occasion. As regards aid for independent primary schools, it is clear that the Government has accepted this principle but on a lesser scale than in the other States.

The maximum primary school grant under the State Government Needs Scheme is \$34 per student, whereas in New South Wales per capita grants to independent primary schools are \$50 a year, in Queensland \$45, and Victoria \$40. The Government is hiding behind this needs scheme, a scheme which is not supported by the Association of Independent Schools of South Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But the committee of the Independent Schools Association supported the needs principle at its last meeting. You had better ask the association about it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was in conversation with the President of that association as late as this morning, and I suggest that the Minister telephone him and upgrade his policy. In this regard the President of the association assures me that its policy is that, although what the Government is offering is better than nothing, the committee prefers the per capita grant scheme advocated by the Commonwealth Government; but the committee will not look a gift horse in the mouth. So the State Government is hiding behind this needs scheme to cover the fact that it is making less effort than most of the other State Governments are making. I am pleased that the Government does recognize, on the recommendation of the Needs Committee, that all independent schools are in considerable financial difficulty. I do not like the Minister advancing this emotional argument about the so-called "wealthy" schools in this community. To refer to "wealthy" schools within our society is an emotional argument.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't you represent the wealthy?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would not mind swapping my salary for that of the Minister. I would ask the Minister the same question.

The Association of Independent Schools of South Australia does not subscribe to the needs basis but believes that the per capita grants as operative in the other States and as advocated by the Commonwealth are the fairest way of giving aid to independent schools. The aid in this way is a direct subsidy to the parents, the needs of whom it is very difficult to assess. A continuation of this State Government's policy will mean that some of the independent schools will become more and more exclusive as more and more parents will be precluded from sending their children to these schools as fees are increased. The Australian Parents Council which has affiliation with the States also adopt a similar principle, and I quote "All constituent bodies endorse and have restated their support for the per capita system of payment at their annual conference". It is apparent then that the State Government offer in this field leaves a great deal to be desired. That is in comparison with the effort made by most Australian States. I draw the attention of the House to the motions moved last session

by the Opposition during private members' time. Although I think the Government has subsequently seen fit to accept one of these recommendations (in regard to the transport of handicapped children), it is unfortunate that it did not see fit to accept it when the Opposition first moved the motion.

Other things are mentioned in the Governor's speech, one being the acquisition of land at Chain of Ponds, which is in my electoral district. Everyone in the community realizes the need to protect our watersheds; there is no argument about that. If metropolitan Adelaide has any future at all, it will depend on an adequate, safe and somewhat more attractive water supply than it has at present. The Government has adopted a policy enunciated by the previous L.C.L. Government, that we should have a filtered water scheme. I am glad that, here again, this Government has had the wisdom to accept an idea initiated by the L.C.L. Government. The producers in the watershed areas are experiencing difficulty and consternation as a result of the zoning by-law passed in this House last session. In zone 1 of the watershed areas, there is a complete restriction on the activities in which the primary producers can engage; there is a complete blanket on the erection of stockyards, poultry sheds, and the like. It appears to me, from my first-hand knowledge of some of these areas at all events and from my contact with the people in that district, that many cases should be treated on their individual merits.

There are some activities that could not, by any stretch of the imagination, introduce pollution into the water catchments in those areas, but the disturbing thing about these by-laws is that there is no appeal provision. In other words, there is a complete blanket on the activities of those people in the watershed areas. That must downgrade the value of those properties and in the future may well prove to be a hardship for those people. This was readily apparent at a well-attended meeting at which I was present at Williamstown last week.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: There were more there than the number of your colleagues listening to you now.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am a little disturbed by the mumblings of the Minister of Labour and Industry, but I am indeed grateful that he is listening to me. Obviously, the Minister and some of his colleagues have confidence in what I am saying. I have been disturbed by the approaches made to me by people living in the Chain of Ponds area

about the acquisition of land. I believe that far more diplomacy could be shown, particularly by the officer who has to negotiate with the landholders in this area. Many complaints have been made to me about unjust treatment and I have passed these complaints on to the Minister concerned. It would be far more logical and satisfactory if all valuation was undertaken by the Valuation Department. The Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Highways Department have their own valuers, but they have to go to the Valuation Department to get details of previous sales in order to value the properties. If all the work were done by the Valuation Department I believe this would produce efficiency, and I put the suggestion forward for consideration.

The Governor's Speech also refers to other legislation to be introduced by the Government. It is intended to reintroduce a Bill to give full adult franchise for the Legislative Council. Members of the Government are aware that members on this side will subscribe to a principle of full adult franchise if some sensible provisions are incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. Keneally: What would be a sensible provision?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe it would be sensible to have voluntary voting in this State, and this would apply to the Legislative Council.

Mr. Brown: Similar to the local government provisions, where we get a 9 per cent vote?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest the honourable member look at the voting patterns in the United Kingdom and elsewhere in most of the democratic countries where voluntary voting is in vogue. I do not see how members opposite can subscribe in the name of democracy to any other system than one which involves citizens in a voluntary choice in regard to franchise. If people do not value their vote they will not exercise it, but, if they do value their vote, if they are responsible citizens, and if they want to have a say in the running of the State and the election of its Government, they will exercise their right to vote. I do not see any advantage in the attitude of a Government which forces people to the polling booths. Members on this side would be happy to go along with full adult franchise for the Legislative Council if they could be assured that voting would be voluntary and that the Upper House remained a House of Review. As we have a Government intent on abolishing the Upper House, it will not matter

to it in the long term what happens to the franchise.

On this side of the House we subscribe to the view that successful democracies throughout the world have a two-House system and we wish to retain it. So, I look forward to the Government's reaction to the sensible amendments that will undoubtedly be moved from this side, and I look forward to the Government's attempts to discredit those amendments. Further, I look forward to the Bill regarding rights of privacy; that Bill is one that could be welcomed, but I cannot say whether I shall support it until I have examined its provisions in detail. The Government intends to introduce a Bill relating to secondhand and marine store dealers. Last session the Opposition successfully moved an amendment on that matter, and the Opposition was pleased that the Government accepted the amendment.

As usual, the Governor's Speech refers to Commonwealth-State financial arrangements and to the substantially increased financial aid that has been forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government to the State Treasury. Everyone knows full well that the Treasurer and other Government members would not like to see the Commonwealth Government relinquish the major taxing powers, particularly regarding income tax, although some State Treasurers advocated that those powers should be relinquished. The first reason why the Treasurer would not like that to be done is simply that South Australia would be infinitely worse off if it were done. Because we receive more per capita from the Commonwealth Government than do the larger and wealthier Eastern States, our operations are subsidized by the taxes levied in those States, and rightly so. While we have a Liberal and Country Party Government in office in Canberra the Treasurer and his Ministers have a second advantage, in that they can castigate the Commonwealth Government at every opportunity. The Governor's Speech refers to increased grants, yet the State Government wants the Commonwealth Government to reduce taxes. His Excellency's Speech says:

Fortunately, as a result mainly of increased financial assistance from the Commonwealth (arising directly from a greater increase in the "average wages" factor in the statutory formula), a fairly consistent series of modest increases in the flow of State revenues and some significant savings in requirements for water pumping, the Revenue Account improved so far as to show a deficit of only \$1,066,000. So, the Government acknowledges that the result is mainly due to the increased assistance

from the Commonwealth Government. However, near the end of the Speech there is an uncommonly churlish reference; it claims that the additional funds referred to in no way contributed to the improved financial result that the State secured for 1971-72. This is a strangely contradictory reference, but I am open to correction if I have overlooked a point. His Excellency's Speech says:

These additional funds in no way contributed to the improved financial result the State has secured for 1971-72 since my Government ensured that not only these amounts but even greater sums were disbursed during the following months to stimulate employment.

In the light of my earlier quote from the Speech, I find that a strangely contradictory and churlish statement. When I was in New South Wales recently I heard a speech by Sir Robert Askin. I do not think I was in that State for as long as the Premier was; he seems to spend holidays in other States frequently. They are working holidays, because the Premier is working for the Labor Party when he goes to other States. In referring to the Premiers' Conference, Sir Robert Askin said he was fully appreciative of the Prime Minister's attitude to the needs of the States. Sir Robert Askin said that, of all the Prime Ministers with whom he had had contact since he had been Premier of New South Wales, the present Prime Minister showed the greatest grasp of the details of the needs of the States and the greatest willingness to assist the States.

Mr. Payne: I thought Sir Henry Bolte said that he believed that Sir Robert Menzies was the best Prime Minister.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have given Sir Robert Askin's view. Government members must be extremely naive if they believe that the Commonwealth Government can meet every request that the Premiers make at their meetings with the Commonwealth Government regarding the financial position of the States. Sir Robert Askin said that he believed that the Prime Minister had done his utmost to see that the States got a fair deal. It is churlish of the Treasurer to make the comments he has been making. Yet he has the hide to go to New South Wales and tell the Government there how to run its affairs. Many people in this State wonder just what they are paying the Treasurer for. Are they paying him to run the affairs of this State, particularly the financial affairs, or are they paying him to run around the country on behalf of the Labor Party?

Mr. Payne: That is not correct. When you talk like that it is clear why your Party is split down the middle.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps the honourable member's contact with his constituents is not as close as it should be, but many people have asked me, "What is the Premier doing, messing around in other States for the Labor Party?"

Mr. Payne: I move in different circles from those in which you move.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That must be so, because people have told me that they think the Premier should be here when major matters are being discussed. He was absent in another State when the decision was made to pay the costs awarded against a union official in the Kangaroo Island dispute, and he was also absent during the moratorium fiasco. The people wonder what he is doing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has only 13 minutes in which to confine himself to the Address in Reply.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall be able to complete my remarks with ease during those 13 minutes if I am given the opportunity by Government members, who have been persisting in interjecting. I shall attempt to continue my speech, despite the harassment from the Government benches. I am not unduly disturbed by what emanates from the Government benches, whatever may be the nature of the interjection. There are many references in the Governor's Speech to legislation to come before this House. Reference is made to the Juvenile Courts and Community Welfare Acts. I hope that this session we will not see the disgraceful suppression of information such as that which occurred last session when we were denied an opportunity to peruse the Juvenile Court Report, which had previously for many years been made available for the perusal of this House.

I had an opportunity recently to hear Ralph Nader. The only drawback on that occasion was that the meeting at which he spoke was chaired by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Whitlam) but, nevertheless, I was interested in what Mr. Nader had to say. One thing he said was that people should have access to Government information, and I could not agree more. This Government should realize that the information in question should be open not only to the public gaze but also to the gaze of members of this House. I refer especially to the Juvenile Court Report, which we were denied an opportunity of studying.

His Excellency said that the Modbury Hospital was to open soon, and no doubt this is a source of pleasure to the member for Tea Tree Gully. I think the election promise made in this regard was one of the factors that led to her election to this House. As I believe she has been here almost long enough now to be entitled to a pension, the announcement must be a source of pleasure to her, as it is no doubt to many residents. Of course, the view that it will be a free hospital is open to conjecture because, as we all know, local councils, through their ratepayers, are required to subsidize the operations of these so-called free hospitals. The idea that we get something free in this community is part of the delusion that the Government tends to create among the citizens and taxpayers of this country.

The growing railways deficit must be a source of concern to Government, and we hope that there can be an improvement in the efficiency of railway operations. It is obvious from a perusal of the Governor's Speech that we are in for a fairly heavy legislative programme. Some of the legislation, including the industrial matters that are to be the subject of legislation, will obviously be contentious. We have heard the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition say that it is not the province of the Government to interfere in industrial matters. Questioned about the introduction of a 35-hour week, he said that this should not be a matter of Government policy. We note that this Government apparently did not subscribe to that view when it intended to provide conditions and hours of work in relation to late-night shopping, so it will be interesting to see what the Government introduces in this respect.

Likewise, it will be interesting to see whether the Government does as it is instructed and legislates to preclude citizens from taking any grievance to the Supreme Court when they believe that some injustice has been done as a result of the activities of the trade union movement. This involves a right, and if that right is removed I believe considerable resentment will be generated throughout the community. I repeat that it is apparent that we are in for a heavy legislative programme, and I hope that members on this side will be afforded an opportunity to study the legislation so that sufficient information can be gathered and so that an informed debate can take place. We do not wish to be confronted with the ludicrous situation that arose last session when Bills were being introduced and debate was taking place at

all hours of the night, as well as into the small hours of the morning.

Bills were being introduced at short notice, and there was little opportunity for members on this side to find out what people were thinking about those measures and to give an informed view and vote on the matters in question. That was an unsatisfactory situation, and we hope that this session the Government will see fit to allow proper consideration of the measures it intends to introduce. The Government rushed legislation through the House last session, and that legislation would have been unsatisfactory if it were not for the action of the Legislative Council, which made many amendments to measures. Those amendments, which were readily accepted by the Government, vastly improved the respective measures. This session will not be satisfactory if an opportunity is not afforded to members on this side to study the relevant legislation. I support the motion.

Mr. BROWN (Whyalla): First, I refer back to last Tuesday afternoon, when His Excellency Sir Mark Oliphant delivered his Speech opening this session of Parliament. I was honoured and privileged to sit in another place listening to such a fine gentleman. Indeed, we should bear in mind what happened about a month ago when this humanitarian and leader in science, etc., called members of the press in this State into conference at Government House and deplored the holding of the proposed French nuclear tests. At that time, His Excellency said:

If I were a younger man and the State Government would let me, I would go into the French nuclear test area and attempt to stop detonation of the bomb.

He described the French as being "like a bandit with a sawn-off shotgun holding the rest of the world to ransom" and went on to say:

The news that the French have detonated a nuclear device in the eastern Pacific horrifies me. As a human being I am depressed and upset that a nation as great and as civilized as France should believe herself justified in making further tests of nuclear weapons against the opinion and opposition of the majority of people in the world, including informed French citizens.

That statement came from a humane person, who has led the rest of the world in his own field. I was appalled at the speech made by the member for Mitcham in this House last week when he was referring to law and order. I believe that certain nations, including the United States of America, are obviously

provoking people to break the law, or the so-called law, and that certain people in responsible political positions in the world are deliberately making laws that are inhumane, immoral and obviously provocative. If we as responsible people agree with the member for Mitcham's views on law and order, I question where we are going. The administration of the law obviously involves a humane attitude: everyone believes in the law and believes that it should be obeyed.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROWN: For the sake of the member for Rocky River, I point out that I believe those who make the law should have some responsibility for seeing that it is a moral law. When the law is not a moral law, ordinary citizens have at least the moral right to protest against that law.

Mr. Venning: How would they do that?

Mr. BROWN: By breaking the law, if necessary. I take this opportunity to pass on my condolences to the widow of the late Mr. Lin Riches. Since I have been a member, each year at the opening of Parliament I have had to do what I am doing now. Last year we regretted the passing of the former member for Adelaide (the late Mr. Sam Lawn), and this year the former member of this Party to have died is Mr. Riches. For some years before I became a member I knew Mr. Riches and, with all sincerity, I can say that he was one man who, having gone into public life, still retained his position among the people. For many years he represented the people of Port Augusta who, I am sure, were proud of him. I am sorry he has passed away. I have seen in newspaper reports the announcement of the retirement from politics, as from the end of this Parliament, of three Opposition members.

Mr. Jennings: Not voluntarily.

Mr. BROWN: That may be so; I will not talk about why they are retiring. Perhaps the member for Rocky River can tell us.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He might be retiring, too.

Mr. BROWN: If he was going to retire, I would not be saying what I am saying: I would be congratulating him.

Mr. Venning: You—

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member for Rocky River does not stop interjecting, he will be retiring from the House for a short time.

Mr. Venning: Why do you always refer to the member for Rocky River in these cases?

Mr. BROWN: I was saying that three Opposition members would retire at the end of this Parliament. I could never agree with these members politically; I could not even agree with them morally. Nevertheless, I appreciate that at least they were elected by a majority of the people they represent, and in a democracy we must abide by that principle, recognizing that they were elected by a majority.

Mr. Payne: Elected by a compulsory vote, too, and they accepted it.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, and that is democracy. I do not know the three members very well personally, although I have got to know the member for Alexandra more than I know the others. I believe that, in his retirement, he will reflect on the bad situation that developed in this House during the last few years he was here. I wish the three members who are retiring at least a long and happy retirement. I was most interested in the speech of the member for Elizabeth, in moving that the Address-in-Reply be adopted. Since I have been a member I have got to know the honourable member very well, and I have found him a happy man to know.

Mr. Jennings: And learned.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, as the honourable member says. I was interested in the remarks of the member for Elizabeth. Having been in the House for such a long time, he was able to go through the recent history of the place. As he will retire at the end of this Parliament, I take this opportunity of wishing him and his good wife a long and happy retirement.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROWN: The member for Rocky River will not be supporting what I say much longer, as I am coming to the problems that Opposition members have in this House. Having studied the matter deliberately, I have now worked out that there are actually four Parties in Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do they all have the same Deputy Leader?

Mr. BROWN: The Minister is really provoking me now. When I first came into this House, I understood that the Liberal and Country League was the Opposition, but later I found that there was a Liberal Movement as well as the Liberal and Country League. I have now been told that the Country Party is represented in the Opposition. Therefore, I thought that there were three Opposition Parties, but now during the weekend I have read that the League of Rights is also represented.

Mr. Mathwin: Did the Fabian Society tell you this?

Mr. BROWN: If the honourable member had read the weekend newspaper, he would know about this situation. I am perturbed about this, as I believe that the Opposition is breaking the rules set out in the constitution of the House. Like the member for Mitcham, I believe in law and order, and the Opposition is not obeying the law. I give Opposition members, including the member for Rocky River, fair warning that I will ask the Clerk of the House whether our constitution is not being broken, for I believe there should be four Leaders of the Opposition and four Deputy Leaders.

Mr. Mathwin: If we get fined, the Premier will pay the fines for us.

Mr. BROWN: That may be so, and I would not mind in the case of the member for Glenelg, as it would be money well spent. The member for Mitcham is Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I believe that a man should not hold two jobs.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: He has three now; he is before the High Court today.

Mr. BROWN: The Minister is provoking me. In the trade union movement, from which I came and of which I am proud, the situation was always one man for one job.

Mr. Venning: What about the Governor's Speech?

Mr. BROWN: Never mind that; I am telling the honourable member the situation in his own Party. The position with regard to the Opposition in this House is bad enough, but now I want to deal with the Opposition in another place, whose situation is even worse. I think that Government members will recall that great piece of reporting by, I think, a leading reporter in the *Sunday Mail* of March 18. The article was in fact a sort of nice little talk between the Leader of the Opposition in the other place (Hon. Ren DeGaris) and this reporter. I shall quote two parts of the report because I believe it is a good report that outlines the real problem of the Opposition in the other place. The report, in question and answer form, states:

Q. You concede you might not win the plebiscite?

A. No, no. Not at all. But I do think it is a pity we should have to get involved in this politicking at all. That's for the Assembly. We shouldn't be in it. You see, we have very little to do with the Assembly people. They should do their work and we should do ours. I do not believe that Party politics should intrude into the Council. I believe a Councillor should be independent. I don't see the

Council as 16 L.C.L. members and four A.L.P. I see it as four A.L.P. and 16 independents.

Mr. Jennings: They vote against the Labor Party.

Mr. Clark: So there are five Parties.

Mr. BROWN: No, there are 20—16 in the other place and four in this Chamber. The article continues:

But, you see, I have learned to be non-partisan. When I first entered the Council I went to a Party meeting and said, "Well, how should I vote on this Bill?" and I was kicked from wall to wall. I was told, "You will do your homework and decide for yourself how you will vote. And you will vote for the best interests of the State."

You could have fooled me! If that is the case, apparently there is no policy for the "independent" members in the other place, nor is there any mandate; they have a divine right. If that is not enough, the article continues:

Q. How can you advocate putting so much power into the hands of people who have no responsibility to the voters. You just can't do that in a democracy!

A. Democracy! Pah!

In other words, there is no democracy. If members opposite have any problems in this House, Opposition members certainly have some in another place. I was literally in tears by the time I finished reading the *Sunday Mail* article.

I now come to a document (not that it is worth much) that is important to the country, but the submissions it contains are not worth the paper on which they are written. I refer to the Tariff Board's report. Here again the Commonwealth Government, through the agency of the Country Party, has played politics. I condemn the Country Party for this situation because it deliberately delayed the board's report. The report mentions the submissions made by Whyalla Shipbuilding and Engineering Works. The submissions are valid but they do not go far enough. One submission states:

A subsidy be granted on ships built in Australian shipyards for the local market, the subsidy to be on a flat rate, based on the Australian price rising from 10 per cent or 15 per cent for large non-propelled craft to 45 per cent for ore carriers and tankers. B.H.P. gave three examples.

I do not oppose this proposition, because it is a fair subsidy bearing in mind that shipyards throughout the world are subsidized and will continue to be subsidized. The second submission states:

If subsidy is to be assessed on the basis of comparative prices, these should not be

restricted to the United Kingdom, but should be based on the lowest world price.

That submission has merit, because if we are to base our subsidy on that in the United Kingdom, with due respect to the member for Glenelg, the United Kingdom shipyards do not lead the way in shipbuilding. In fact, if the United Kingdom does not put its house in order it will have no hope of leading the world in shipbuilding. Our subsidy should be based on that paid in Japan and Sweden, which lead the world in shipbuilding. If we did this, it would give the shipbuilder the incentive to aim to equal the ability of those two countries to build ships or to better them and, if we do not do this, we will defeat our own purpose. The third submission states:

A subsidy be granted for ships built in Australian shipyards for oversea owners. The builder should prepare a detailed study for each project which should include details of the level of subsidy required.

That is a fair submission, and I see no real wrong in it. The submission continues:

Shipowners to have the right to determine the period of time over which they claim taxation deductions for depreciation charges.

This is the only proposal with which I disagree, because I cannot line myself up with shipowners who require considerable time to decide depreciation. A shipowner should discontinue running a ship after a certain number of years. Another submission made states:

Low-interest loans with repayments spread over at least eight years be made available to both Australian and oversea owners buying locally-built ships, such concessional loans to be administered by the Commonwealth Government.

I do not see anything wrong with that submission, either. However, the submissions failed to come forward with any firm policy regarding Australia's oversea shipping needs.

Mr. Gunn: What about the subsidy? Will you tell us about that?

Mr. BROWN: I have dealt with the subsidy, but the member for Eyre cannot have been paying attention. Who owns oversea shipping lines is the real basis of the problems of shipbuilding because, without an oversea shipping line, Australia cannot possibly have a properly balanced shipbuilding programme. From memory, I think that Australia is about the fifth trading nation in the world, but it does not have an oversea shipping line. I have lost count of the number of times the Commonwealth Government has been told this, yet nothing has been done about such a proposal.

Mr. Mathwin: That happens with all Governments. We get it here.

Mr. BROWN: I do not agree with those remarks. It happened with the Commonwealth Government for 20 years. I assure the member for Glenelg that, when the Australian Labor Party is elected to Government at the end of this year, it will not have such a policy, yet he says it is the policy of all Governments.

Mr. Wells: The Commonwealth Government sold the lines.

Mr. Mathwin: I said it happened with all Governments (particularly this Government): they do not take notice of the people.

Mr. BROWN: The other point, for the benefit of the member for Glenelg, is that the submission to revitalize the shipbuilding industry requires what is done in most countries of the world; yet we find that Australia does not carry it out. The report states that we in Australia should have a policy similar to that operating in other countries, pursuant to which, for instance, 40 per cent of goods traded between Australia and another country could be carried by Australian flagships, another 40 per cent by the flagships of the country with which we are trading, and the final 20 per cent by the ships of other countries. This would be in line with the policies of other countries. In other words, if Australia was trading with Japan (a country with which we now trade) 40 per cent of the products would be transported in Australian flagships, 40 per cent in Japanese ships, and the remaining 20 per cent in the ships of other nations.

The other submission (which is an important one that I have received for so long, having been involved in a small way in shipbuilding) concerns the number of times that Governments or companies come out with the idea of building one or two, or even sometimes three ships of the same design. Instead of those three, ships all being built at the one yard (and in this respect one must remember that it costs as much to design one ship as it does three of the same design), many times one finds that two ships will be built at, say, Whyalla, and the other at another shipyard, which makes the proposition most uneconomic.

Mr. Harrison: Duplication.

Mr. BROWN: That is correct. A multiple of the same kinds of ship should be built in the same yard.

Mr. Wells: Whyalla.

Mr. BROWN: If necessary, yes. I will not be so narrow-minded as to suggest that they should be built in the one yard in South Australia. I do not think one yard should have to compete with another yard for the construction of the same type of ship.

For example, General Motors-Holden's and the Ford and Chrysler manufacturers would not produce their motor cars economically if they changed the designs of their cars every five, 10 or 15 minutes. They simply could not do it. The only reason these organizations make tremendous profits is that they mass produce their vehicles.

Mr. Harrison: The Volkswagen is a good example.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, a classic example. This is something that the Government and the Tariff Board should examine. They should bring out a properly balanced order book for similar types of ships for the one yard. I repeat that the matter of subsidies for the shipbuilding industry is looked upon within the industry as a bad sort of element. Everyone talks about subsidies and says that the industry is subsidized, but what does it mean? Shipbuilding industries all over the world are subsidized.

Mr. Gunn: Why do you complain about the assistance given to the rural industry? You're the one who complains about that!

Mr. BROWN: On the contrary, no-one is saying that the rural industry should not be subsidized. Let me make that quite clear. I am not saying that the shipbuilding industry should not be subsidized. However, that does not mean that I think that economies within the industry should not be examined. In other words, I am not saying that it ought to be subsidized because we do not care whether or not we make a go of it. The word "subsidized" is over-used in the shipbuilding industry. I was going to say, before the member for Eyre interjected, that I can remember some time ago when this country saw fit to buy a couple of warships from the United States of America, when the United States subsidy on shipbuilding was 45 per cent and when it was only 33 per cent in this country.

Mr. Harrison: By then they were outdated.

Mr. BROWN: That is so, but economically it could not be justified. The last point I want to make regarding shipbuilding is that I am amazed at the stand taken by the Whyalla shipyards and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. The submissions made by the board were three-quarters in line with what the Australian Labor Government will carry out when it gets into power at the end of this year. I would bet that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Gambling is not permitted in the House.

Mr. BROWN: I would take out many tickets with the Totalizator Agency Board that the

B.H.P. Company will spend millions of dollars on propaganda in the forthcoming Commonwealth election to defeat the A.L.P. and to put back into power the very Government that will not carry out its recommendations. It amazes me that it continues to do this and that it will not support a Party whose policy would ensure that its programme was carried out. I turn now to another important matter that should be examined: the arbitration system. I know honourable members opposite will be pleased that I am dealing with this subject, about which they know nothing.

Mr. Mathwin: Speak for yourself.

Mr. BROWN: I wish to refer to two aspects of the arbitration system, the first of which is the meagre, paltry, insignificant increase of \$2 a week that was given to the working-class people of this country under this system.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Shame!

Mr. BROWN: The Minister can certainly say that again. The second aspect to which I wish to refer is the oil dispute. It will interest Government members (although it probably will not interest honourable members opposite) to know that I have obtained a copy of a bulletin of the Combined Research Centre of the Amalgamated Engineering Union and the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society of Australia, in Sydney, which is indeed a good summing up of the decision to increase the living wage by \$2 a week.

Mr. Mathwin: How did you get that?

Mr. BROWN: If the honourable member thinks it will do him any good, he can have this copy. I am sure that if the honourable member read this summing up he would not understand what it was about.

Mr. Mathwin: That's kind of you.

Mr. BROWN: The honourable member is not paying attention. In this case the A.C.T.U. advocate said that a small increase would merely increase industrial unrest. I wonder today whether that small statement could not be said to be true. However, the commission did not consider that it should give the increase outside of economic capacity because there might be industrial unrest. The 6 per cent increase in 1970 did not for long prevent industrial pressure for further increases similar to those this year. I think the arbitration system in this country, by which we are supposed to abide, originally started in 1904. The member for Torrens can shake his head, but I take that to mean that I am correct. As the honourable member knows, the arbitration system was introduced to act as an unbiased

arbiter regarding the fixation of wages. The system was to provide an area where the employers and the employees could go after having fisticuffs with each other for an unbiased opinion. The arbitration system was to provide an arena where each side could put its case and obtain an unbiased opinion. However, even today, that it is not the case. It is incorrect to say that that system provides a fair and unbiased opinion. The basic wage case was originally designed to determine the minimum fair wage (the basic wage) that a man with a wife and two children should earn and on which they could live. The annual basic wage case each year was to take into consideration any changes in the cost of living and other relevant factors in the economy.

I well remember the 1970 wage increase of \$3 a week granted to a tradesman. At that time I carried out, as a trade union official, a feasibility study in my District of Whyalla to determine the food cost to a family of four to live prior to the \$3 a week increase and the food cost after the \$3 a week increase. This study concerned only the most necessary foodstuffs and was not concerned with hire-purchase costs, rent or electricity. I am sure that it is of interest to this House to know that the results of this study indicated that, of the \$3 a week increase, \$1.60 went in providing the family's foodstuffs. That glaringly brought home to me just where the arbitration system had failed; and it has failed miserably.

Mr. Harrison: When you take the tax out, it's worse still.

Mr. BROWN: Yes. I did not take into account any extra payments in relation to taxation or electricity, but just the basic food needs of a family. In the case to which I have referred, the wife was most perturbed about the situation, because over 50 per cent of that increase was taken by this basic food need. The opinion from the Sydney-based metal union to which I earlier referred states:

The \$2 increase is equivalent to about a 3 per cent increase for a fitter. This is well below the 10 per cent increase in prices that has occurred in the 18 months since the 1970 decision, and well below the unions' claim of \$12.30 as being the amount required to restore the real value of wages.

I emphasize that it is the policy of the Commonwealth Government to allow no curb whatsoever on the cost of living or the profit margin allowed to employers. Yet we continually curb the amount of wages on which we expect a normal citizen to live. On one side there is no curb at all while there

is a continuing curb on the other. To show this in greater depth I will now refer to the history of this matter. Quite clearly, an advocate before the Industrial Commission puts a case for the working class based on the increase in the cost of living. In one year the increase in the cost of living may be 5 per cent and that figure may be based on information that no-one can deny. The commission says that, because of the economic position of the country, it could not consider this and the increase will be only 2 per cent. Then, for that year, we are 3 per cent behind. The Industrial Commission will go down in history as an organization that has never agreed to the actual amount claimed by trade unions. Over all these years the working class people of this country have been deprived of a just and humane wage structure. The only answer to this is continual industrial unrest.

Mr. Gunn: Do you support industrial unrest?

Mr. BROWN: I do not support it. I am saying that this is the only answer. Surely the member for Eyre does not suggest that a union advocate or an advocate for the working class deliberately says, "We want industrial unrest." That is an absolute fabrication.

Mr. Mathwin: You know it happens.

Mr. BROWN: It does not happen, and no-one could convince me otherwise.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They have to convince their members. That's the point.

Mr. BROWN: Yes. We are not all as naive as the member for Glenelg. As a classic example of what this \$2 a week increase has meant to working class people, I point out that the \$4.70 increase in the minimum wage is equivalent to an increase of 10 per cent, which just compensates for the increase in prices since the previous fixation and makes the minimum wage in Melbourne \$51 a week. That is the total wage in Melbourne. The inadequacy of this is shown when it is compared to the poverty line of \$50.50 set out in the Melbourne University survey. In other words, the total wage in Melbourne is 50c more than the figure given in the survey on poverty.

We wonder why we have such a gigantic increase in financial problems. I am amazed at something that the press media always does. It always intrigues me that, when a decision of the Industrial Commission is handed down (and I repeat that the \$2 a week increase was a paltry decision), the press media comes out on every occasion with a

statement of how much it will cost the employer. On this occasion, the media stated that the increase would cost about \$464,000,000. However, no-one states that it increases the spending power of the working class people, and so boosts the economy. We do not hear a word about it. Nor does anyone mention the other side effect of this, that the Commonwealth Government got about \$60,000,000 out of it in tax alone. The report went on, in a rather interesting fashion, to mention the repercussions of the decision. I thought it quite good. It said:

The Government said that the decision was responsible and well balanced—

that refers to the \$2 a week increase—

but it is likely that it might have second thoughts when the implications of the big surprise in the decision sinks in.

Obviously it is not yet sinking in. The report states:

The big surprise was the admission by the commission that its main wage-fixing strategy had failed.

In other words, the arbitration people themselves agree that it is biased. The report goes on:

This could mean that the national wage cases would no longer be the medium for general award increases. Such a far-reaching admission probably explains why it took an unusually long time for the decision to be handed down after the end of the hearing.

One other reason why it took so long was that obviously the judges in the arbitration system had woken up to the fact that they were being used as a tool by the Commonwealth Government to get out of its commitments on wage problems in this country. To continue with the quotation:

The ominous aspect for the Federal Government is that for this year at least it now has the sole responsibility for dealing with inflation. Up to now it has been able to blame the commission because of the 6 per cent increase in 1970. But with this decision the commission has dropped the hot potato of inflation right in the Government's lap.

That is a fairly good summing up of the \$2 a week increase to the working people in this country. Before I leave the subject of the arbitration system I should like to bring to the attention of the member for Rocky River—

Mr. Venning: You wouldn't have an obsession, would you?

Mr. BROWN: Honourable members, especially the member for Rocky River, might be interested to know that each judge who sat on the wage case receives a salary of \$22,000 a year. The Senior Commissioner and the Public Service Arbitrator, who also sat on the

case, receive \$19,500 a year, yet they tell the working people of Australia that they can live on \$51 a week.

Mr. Mathwin: Your Government put the judges' wages up last year.

Mr. BROWN: If I had my way, I would not put up the wages, and I am certain I would have a few supporters. I can assure the member for Glenelg of that.

Mr. Mathwin: The member for Playford is looking at you.

Mr. BROWN: I do not wish to speak much longer. I promised the member for Ross Smith that I would not mention the B.H.P. Company, but I thought afterwards I would be doing my constituents a disservice if I did not do so.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BROWN: I do not know whether members in this House are aware of the profit that the company made this year.

Mr. Venning: No.

Mr. BROWN: It was \$76,000,000. After the announcement of that profit I read in the *Adelaide News* a few weeks ago an opinion expressed by Sir Ian McLennan, giving more details of the operations of his company in reaching the figure of \$76,000,000, and pointing out that in fact it nearly did not do so. I have not got the report with me, but if I remember correctly it said that because of the activity of the working-class people in the steel industry the company's profits in steelmaking were curtailed considerably. The position was only salvaged by the oil industry. We all know that the company has a few bob tucked away in that industry, and that is how the figure reached \$76,000,000. I thought that that in itself was an achievement.

I thought very seriously of "having a go" at the workers in the oil industry during the Address in Reply debate. We all know that those workers have probably read Sir Ian's statement by now, and they are working on it! The oil industry strike has caused differences of opinion but the main reason for the strike obviously is the failure of the arbitration system to give wage justice. Secondly, I repeat that no trade union official, no trade unionist, or no working man want to stay outside the gate indefinitely, receiving no wages at all. The reason is obvious when we look around.

I was interested to read today's editorial in the *Adelaide News*. For once in my life I might even agree with it. The editorial refers to the very thing mentioned by the Premier this afternoon in his reply to the Leader of the Opposition. Until the parties get back

to the conference table there will be no settlement of the oil dispute. That is obvious, and yet we find the typical attitude of members of the Liberal Government, particularly Willie McMahon, is that the unions will now be fined.

Mr. Jennings: Put them in gaol!

Mr. BROWN: Yes, put them in gaol! The Prime Minister, speaking in that way—

Mr. Venning: Oh!

Mr. BROWN: I do not know whether the member for Rocky River is having a fit, or just what he is doing. It is gaol for these people. If any such act is carried out I say in all sincerity that there will be no hope of settlement of this dispute. Whether the member for Rocky River believes it or not, I sincerely want a settlement.

Mr. Venning: The sooner we have a confrontation on some of these things the better.

Mr. BROWN: That was a brilliant interjection!

Mr. Venning: That is if you want confrontation; it cannot go on for ever like this.

Mr. BROWN: It was a brilliant interjection!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The interjection is out of order.

Mr. BROWN: Personally, I think the member for Rocky River is out of order. However, to return to the editorial in the *Adelaide News*, it is correct that until the parties return to the conference table there will be no settlement of the oil dispute. I have been rather intrigued by the B.H.P. Company's advertisement appearing on television. It is a gem.

Mr. Jennings: That is the bloke in the hard hat.

Mr. BROWN: He has a hard hat and a shovel and a hill in front of him, but, as usual, the company would give him a shovel to remove the hill, but he has not been supplied with a wheelbarrow to take away the raw materials. Typically, the working man has not been given any amenities at all. I support the adoption of the motion for the Address in Reply.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): May I offer my sympathy to those families of past members of this place who have suffered recent bereavements, and say that the members I knew (some not very well, but by reports from other people) did their jobs well and truly and carried out their duties, as I sincerely believe most members do in this place, to the best of their ability.

First, I should like to deal briefly with air pollution. I am given to understand that the

data available on this matter of motor vehicles and their contribution to this type of pollution are far from adequate. I have with me a report in the *Commonwealth Automotive Review*, which sets out the position simply. It is a recent issue (September, 1971) and states:

Studies made in Australia to determine the contribution made by the operation of motor vehicles to atmospheric pollution have been few and inadequate to date.

Later, the report states:

On a weight basis the motor vehicle is responsible for about 39 per cent . . . of total air pollution, the balance being mainly industrial—

that is, other than from motor vehicles. The report continues:

Of the automotive pollutants 70 per cent is carbon monoxide.

That is a great problem. If we read further, we see there is a paragraph alluding to diesel smoke. It states:

However, due to smoke and noxious odour, diesels must be considered as a local nuisance value. Diesel smoke and odour, in general, are very displeasing to a large proportion of the population.

Several times I have raised in this House by way of question of the Minister of Roads and Transport the matter of diesel trains in the metropolitan area but I have not yet received satisfactory answers to those questions; the Minister has put me off from time to time. However, the situation in many cities in Europe is desperate in this regard. For instance, Istanbul has a taxi service that the Minister of Roads and Transport would do well to go and study, because it is a type of dial-a-bus system where the buses do not exactly stop but move about and pick up passengers here and there; but the air pollution in Istanbul is terrible. This applies, too, to other big cities in Europe, and particularly London and Liverpool and the motorway in Britain known as the M1, which is heavily used by vehicles. There is a difference between us and Europe, in that in Europe there are laws designed to counteract this terrible problem of pollution, but the fact is that those laws are not policed. I suggest that this Government get the data to make laws and tackle this problem immediately, because we cannot allow it to go unchecked for much longer.

A pamphlet that I have here sets out what air pollution does. It states:

Air pollution affects your health. This is often obvious . . . nose, eye and throat irritations. Allergies, nausea. Some effects do not show up for years . . . bronchitis,

lung cancer, and asthma. Air pollution costs you money—discoloured and peeling paint . . .

This is a great problem. We do not have it here very badly at the moment but in other parts of the world it is a terrible problem. I ask that the Government do something about laws to have something fitted to vehicles and to lay it down that those vehicles not so fitted shall be taken off the roads forthwith. It is a world-wide problem, and we should do something about it here before it gets too bad.

While overseas, I wonder whether the Minister of Roads and Transport (who also has been to Europe) saw the big cities of Europe—in France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Turkey, England, and Wales (if that is a separate country; some people think it is).

Mr. Coumbe: What about Scotland?

Mr. MATHWIN: I did not go to Scotland. All these countries without exception are building freeways.

Mr. Coumbe: Did you go to the capital of Ireland?

Mr. MATHWIN: I lived for some time in the capital of Ireland—Liverpool! I suggest that the Minister of Roads and Transport saw all of this when he went overseas. I would not ask him to build an arrangement like the well-known “spaghetti junction”, as it is called, which looks like a bowl of spaghetti in Birmingham with its overways and overpasses, but I ask him, now that he has returned from overseas: did he close his eyes to what he saw or does he forget what he has seen when he gets back?

Mr. Wells: He might answer you!

Mr. MATHWIN: I should like him to answer me on that. He must have seen all of this because every country in Europe is building heavier and bigger roads and freeways. No matter how good is the control of the Minister of Roads and Transport, he will not stop people buying cars and in the future becoming two-car, and in some cases three-car, families.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The member for Davenport would disagree with everything you have said so far.

Mr. MATHWIN: That does not matter very much: she went to America but I did not to go to America—I went to Europe. I have asked many questions about the overpass at the Oaklands crossing in my area. I have asked whether it would be land-filled. We ask why there should be such a monstrosity in an area like that in the beautiful city

of Adelaide when we could have a cantilevered or concrete construction to satisfy those people who live there, instead of their having to be satisfied with a type of land-fill that will spill over into their properties.

I turn now to tourism, which is a main reason why I travelled overseas recently. I thank those people in the tourist bureaux of Istanbul in Turkey, of Rome in Italy and of Zurich in Switzerland for the wonderful co-operation they gave me when I visited them and asked them for information about their methods and ways and means of encouraging tourism in those countries. The first place I visited was Turkey, which one would regard as the gateway to the East. That country has much to offer the tourist, but its biggest problem is similar to ours—lack of accommodation. We have suffered this problem of accommodation, a problem that must be overcome. I refer particularly to Istanbul, in which there are about 140 mosques, the main ones being the St. Sophia and the Blue Mosques. (They are blue, of course, and not red.)

The people are warm and friendly but when I was there military law was in operation. I was lucky to get out of there alive. Nevertheless, it is a great country to be in. The people and the officers of the tourist bureaux were very kind to me. Some dancers there contributed to tourism, but unfortunately I was unable to see them. It is said that there are more Greek ruins in Turkey than there are in Greece itself. Tourism is financed through the tourism bank, a Government bank that has a capital of 500,000,000 Turkish lire. The sum of 227,000,000 Turkish lire in Treasury allowances is provided annually. The bank's three functions are to lend money, build hotels and invest capital.

The great financial problem in connection with tourism in Turkey is that the country has a law that states that no-one can invest in building hotels unless he is a Turkish national; assistance is provided only to Turkish nationals. I believe that the law has lately been eased to some extent but, in my opinion, it has not been eased to a sufficient extent; now, about 60 per cent of the investment must be controlled by Turkish interests. In Turkey there are problems related not only to accommodation but also to public transport, particularly the railway system. The Turkish Government is very conscious of the need to improve the environment. On the outskirts of Istanbul, the Government has sponsored a tree-planting scheme, involving a corridor of trees that is 5 km wide. Stocks of trees have come

from a Government nursery. Turkey does not have a bed tax, but there is a service tax of 10 per cent on all hotel bills and there is an airport charge. The next place I visited was Italy, where the people have had many years of experience in the tourist industry.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member would do justice if he tried to link his remarks to the Address in Reply.

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I point out that I am referring to tourism, a most important matter in South Australia. It was mentioned by His Excellency in his Speech.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There is nothing in the Speech about Italy.

Mr. MATHWIN: But we have to learn from other countries. There is nothing in the Speech about the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, but some members referred to it. I wish to offer the Government some constructive assistance; my main reason for going to Italy was to get information for the Government on tourism. I believe the Premier is interested in this matter. The tourist industry was started in Italy as long ago as 1919, and last year about 33,000,000 people passed through that country. Because Italy has an open frontier it is difficult to ascertain exactly how many people stay there. In that country tourists account for 130 billion lire annually. The country has tourist offices in all European capitals and in America and South Africa. Its only office in the Far East is in Tokyo. Italy's tourist budget is two billion lire, and the Government controls some aspects of the industry. However, pilgrims journeying to the Vatican are not taxed, in accordance with an ancient law.

Italy has no bed tax on hotel bills, but the Government will lend money for hotels in areas where it believes they are necessary. The Government assists in the building of tennis courts, golf courses, etc., to assist tourism. The Government has controls over restaurants, and it ensures that travel managers and hotel managers are experienced in foreign languages; that point is relevant to the South Australian tourist industry. In Italy a year book is published in which hotels are listed in categories, on-season and off-season tariffs being stated. In that country, too, local government offices are controlled by the Minister responsible for tourism. The accommodation tax is devoted directly to local tourism.

Mr. Burdon: Do you suggest that an accommodation tax should be introduced in this State?

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not think it would be a bad thing. It is imperative that we do, because we have to have more finance; that is the basis of everything connected with tourism. We have to have more money for tourism, because the benefits are great.

Mr. Burdon: Do you think that tourism is a State responsibility?

Mr. MATHWIN: I do. In Switzerland it is governed by the cantons. The Swiss have the most effective tourist machine in the world. Of course, the Swiss people are very experienced in this field. A report on the Swiss tourist industry for 1970 says that for the fourth successive year tourist traffic exceeded the previous year's record. About 35,600,000 people were registered in Swiss hotels overnight. To that must be added subsidiary accommodation, including camps, chalets, caravan parks and youth hostels, etc., and this accounts for another 25,000,000 people, making a total of 60,000,000 people who stay overnight in Switzerland. Someone has called Switzerland the cradle of tourism; the tourist industry started there back in the nineteenth century, when usually the only people who visited other countries were members of the privileged class. But, now, many thousands of people visit other countries, as well as travelling about within their own country. The tourist industry in Switzerland is third in importance of export value. The pamphlet I received from the Swiss National Tourist Office states:

Rich in natural beauty but poor in natural resources, Switzerland is economically dependent upon its high-quality processed products and upon the rendering of services (tourism being of prime importance). The Swiss Federal Bureau of Statistics provides the following list of export values for 1970:

	Billion francs
1. Machinery, apparatus and instruments	7,633
2. Chemicals and pharmaceutical products	4,677
3. Tourism	3,900

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How many Swiss francs to the dollar?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is speaking to the Address in Reply debate, and I would appreciate co-operation from Government members. The honourable member wants to do the right thing, and I would appreciate it if members would refrain from interjecting and trying to get him off the subject. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The pamphlet goes on to say that in 1970 Switzerland earned 620 francs per capita from foreign tourism, while spending 290 francs abroad, and this shows that it is a good proposition. The Swiss National Tourist Office headquarters in Zurich employs 52 people, and there are 202 people in its various foreign agencies, making a total staff of 254. There are offices all over Europe and other parts of the world, but unfortunately not in Australia. An interesting point is that in other countries the Swiss use an airline company office as an agency, and I think that system could well be adopted here. Some may say that it does not involve Australians, but I point out that, in 1962, 51,217 Australians stayed overnight in Switzerland; in 1966, the figure had risen to 70,750; and in 1971 it had reached 107,383. It can be seen, therefore, that Switzerland is not too far away for many Australians to visit. In 1934, the Swiss realized that one of the most important factors regarding tourism was its railways, which were upgraded and all made electrical railways. The Minister of Roads and Transport might consider this point when he talks about upgrading the railways in South Australia. The pamphlet to which I have already referred also states:

In addition, a word about the finances of the tourist office because tourist promotion, especially abroad, is a very expensive matter. The Swiss National Tourist Office started 50 years ago with a budget of about 850,000 francs. From 1971 on, it has more than 16,000,000 francs available annually.

That sum is merely for promoting tourism abroad, and it illustrates the value of the industry. I think the Swiss people themselves are well aware of the benefits derived from this industry. Indeed, they go out of their way to help the tourist department in its efforts to stimulate tourism: for example, local councils and residents are happy to comply when the authorities demand the closing of a street or streets to create malls, which are situated in many places throughout Europe, for the benefit of people, not the motor car. I think the Swiss road programme alone last year was worth 700,000,000 francs, and it would do well to note the sum being spent in South Australia in this regard. I suggest that the Swiss programme involves the construction of freeways and of reinforcement pillars often to a height of 600ft. in order to support cantilever roads.

Although some progress is being made in South Australia regarding the tourist industry,

and more finance is being provided for it, there is still much to be done to foster this important industry. We must realize that it is a multi-million dollar industry, which can benefit the whole community. I believe that we are far behind other countries in this respect, and this is shown in many ways. I suggest that if members wished to obtain some information on tourism (especially tourism in Australia) the first place to visit would be the library. However, when I went to the library to study some up-to-date material, the book I got was *Australia's Travel and Tourist Industry*, which was published as long ago as 1965.

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

Mr. MATHWIN: *Australia's Travel and Tourist Industry* comprises 339 pages, yet the section on South Australia consists of only five pages (pages 221 to 226), and one of those pages is a map. Anyone looking for tourist information about South Australia would have difficulty in getting it from this book. I find it most upsetting that this book, which is said to have been edited by professionals, contains no reference to Glenelg, which is the birthplace of South Australia and which contains many points of historical interest, including the Old Gum Tree.

Dr. Eastick: It's the premier tourist resort of South Australia.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was coming to that. One could call it the Mecca of South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I thought Port Gawler was the Mecca of South Australia.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, it is Glenelg, and with the assistance of the Government it could be an even better tourist resort.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who rebuilt the jetty at Glenelg?

Mr. MATHWIN: That was the subject of private tender.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Under what Government?

Mr. MATHWIN: The estimate that we have of the people who come into and leave the State is arrived at from statistics obtained at fruit fly checkpoints on the border. This is merely an estimate; we do not have reliable figures. I believe that the Tourist Bureau and its Director (Mr. Pollnitz) do a good job, but Mr. Pollnitz has the big problem of insufficient money being spent on tourism in this State. The 1971 Auditor-General's Report (the latest available) shows the expenses of the Tourist Bureau as being \$146,844 compared to \$168,207 for the previous year, yet receipts for the same period increased from \$236,018

in 1970 to \$249,458 in 1971. Although receipts increased, spending decreased. I suggest that this is not the way to sell South Australia. We are losing the opportunity to make many millions of dollars a year.

South Australia must participate in the package-deal field. The recent breakthrough with regard to oversea airline fares should have happened years ago, and this section of the tourist industry will grow. The world is becoming a much smaller place in this regard. Qantas may be wise enough, I hope, to buy the Concorde (a great aeroplane), so the travelling time between Australia and England will be reduced to 12 hours. As one will be able to travel more than half-way around the world in such a short time, the world is becoming very small.

We need more hotels of international standard; of that there is no doubt. However, I do not think that we should provide hotels of differing national styles as suggested by the Premier, who said that a Japanese style hotel should be built. I believe that most tourists, no matter what their country of origin, prefer to have local accommodation of good standard. If we are to attract people to this State we must have accommodation of a good standard, but it is unnecessary to provide different types of hotel for different nationalities; that would be a retrograde step that we should not follow.

It is most important that we should gather data on tourists. Most members and others who have travelled abroad know that in most countries a tourist is issued with a card in a hotel and, when he leaves, he provides data on where he has been, how he has stayed, and where he is going. Such information, which provides valuable data for the country's tourist organization, is the only method of acquiring statistics on what the tourist industry in any country is doing. I believe that every effort should be made to exchange staffs, so that staff members working in our tourist industry, particularly the office staff in the Tourist Bureau, could be exchanged for staff in tourist organizations in Switzerland, Italy, or the United Kingdom for, say, six months. This would be an advantage to all concerned, certainly to those who need the experience that could be gained from people well versed in the industry. Such a system operated in Europe before the Second World War, whereby many catering staff employees in Europe were transferred to England, France, Germany, Switzerland, etc., to gain experience.

The Government should give its blessing to the making of Jetty Road and Moseley Square,

Glenelg, into the finest shopping mall in Australia (I think it has every chance of being the finest shopping mall in the world). If the Government assisted towards such a scheme it would be a great asset not only to Glenelg but to the whole State. Such a project should not be left in the melting pot for 10 years but should be carried out soon. However, the Government must come to the party in this respect. Any South Australian town or city has the potential to attract tourists; this would also assist decentralization, but that does not appeal to many people. I have read with interest of a place in Texas which had nothing to offer tourists but which decided that it would dig a well, which it announced as the deepest man-made well in the world and which attracted more than 65,000 tourists.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's a gimmick, and it's crook.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is not crook, because the people enjoy going there.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But the people are deceived. Are you the shadow Minister of Tourism in the Liberal Movement?

Mr. MATHWIN: I might be working my way up to that. Any city, town or village that sponsored 24 overnight visitors for one year would have a new industry with a payroll of about \$100,000 annually. That would mean employment, and surely it is well worth thinking about.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How do you do it?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister does not even listen. Indeed, that is one of his problems. He listens to no-one but himself. If we want our share of this industry, I suggest that we get on with it. Any support given to projects of this type must be measured against any unfavourable aspects of the proposed scheme. Indeed, it would be folly to erect apartments or hotels or any other type of accommodation without first ensuring that the drinking water and other facilities were suitable. Another important consideration is that the basic asset of tourism, whether the industry be based on tradition, folk lore, or the countryside, is irreplaceable once it is destroyed. We must look ahead to see what the visitor in the year 2,000 would require, especially in his role as a consumer. As a tourist of the next century, he would require transport to take him quickly and comfortably to his recreation area.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What sort of recreation do you foresee?

Mr. MATHWIN: At the present time a good recreation would be coming to Parliament House. We in Australia have one of the greatest assets: we have good fresh air, which is already hard to obtain elsewhere in the world, and we should guard this asset most jealously. I believe that the officers of the Minister of Environment and Conservation should work closely with the officers of the Minister of Tourism because, if two portfolios were ever meant to come together and combine as one, these two seem to be ideal.

Tourism is enjoyed by people of all ages. Although I have spoken with many people who have said that we are too far off the beaten track, I suggest that that view is not correct, and if we even think in this way we will miss out on the tourist industry. Man-made attractions are important, and it is to these that we should turn our attention if we are to attract people to our country areas. The establishment of Aborigines in a village on a reserve in their own environment would certainly not degrade them but would allow them the right and pleasure of displaying their arts and crafts and to explain their own folklore and their proud past to visitors. Such a reserve would be a great attraction in South Australia, especially in one of our outlying districts. A gift shop, of course, would be an added attraction, and the financial result from such a shop would be quite considerable; tourists are always keen to buy gifts to take home or to give away.

The Government has a great opportunity to assist the township of Morgan, which is in a bad state because of the removal of its main industry. With its past history and its situation within reasonable distance of Adelaide, Morgan could be made into a great tourist centre. The payroll for the industry I have mentioned would be about \$200,000 a year. It behoves the Government to agree on the matters I have raised, particularly those in relation to Morgan and to Glenelg, the latter being the area I represent. The shopping mall I have suggested could be the first in the State. I visited Rotterdam, where three or four such malls have been established and are enjoyed by citizens and tourists. Perhaps it is hard on the motorist to be kept out, but it is a good thing, because people enjoy shopping of this type.

I have not seen fit to ask the present Minister of Labour and Industry a question in this House. Perhaps I will do so, but one of the first questions I asked in this place was on the matter of a compulsory political levy against

people in some unions. I asked this question of the Minister's predecessor, who was, I think, a former member of the Miscellaneous Workers Union and who said that he had never heard of such a thing.

Whether they like it or not, Government members must realize that a great number of unionists object to this type of levy, and I do not think they should be forced to pay it. They should be allowed to contract in to any union fees, or any fees given over to any political Party. They should have the privilege of doing this, and not having it stopped from their pay. They should be able to contract out and to tell the shop steward not to deduct it from the wages. It is an obvious and wellknown fact that the policy of compulsory unionism is merely the Labor Party's action to swell the funds of that Party.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not so. You keep on telling lies on this.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister knows that is not true.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Labor Party is not in favour of compulsory unionism, and you know it.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Labor Party is.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You do not understand it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I understand it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: If you are not telling lies, take a point of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that members opposite have a catch cry: "Why should not a member be made to join a union? He gets a benefit from the union." I agree it is unfair that a person who does not join a union gets the benefit. I agree with that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Then you support preference to unionists.

Mr. MATHWIN: Instead of just looking at a section of the workers, why do they not look after all the workers?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you tell the truth you will get some appreciation from this side.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister of Education will listen, he will learn something. I know he cannot contain himself and will try to involve himself with anything that happens in my district to get the kudos from it. If the Minister will be quiet, I will tell him something that will do him some good.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Tell the truth this time!

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister of Education will allow me, I will tell him what

the Government should do. Why does it not introduce legislation in this place to establish agency shops? An agency shop will give anyone the legal right to join a trade union; it will also give him the legal right not to join if he does not want to. He will not be forced to join a union against his will. An employee will either have to join a union or, if he objects, he will have to pay to the union a contribution equal to that which he would pay to his union but less certain deductions including a political levy. If he is a conscientious objector to paying either of those dues, then in agreement with the union secretary or the union he will pay his money to a selected charity. This will eliminate the free rider.

Mr. Ryan: Who runs the agency shop?

Mr. MATHWIN: The agency shop runs in conjunction with a closed shop. The member for Port Adelaide knows a lot about closed shops. If members of a union decide it will be better for their relationships in their efforts at collective bargaining and the like, they can have a closed shop. It is as simple as that. If the Government is so concerned about all workers and not just a section of them (I hope the member for Unley is listening because he mentioned it last week), I suggest it look into legislation for establishing agency shops.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What do you suggest about General Motors-Holden's?

Mr. MATHWIN: The workers in G.M.H. would probably decide it would be a closed shop, but it is for the workers themselves, not the Government, to decide.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do they decide by a majority vote?

Mr. MATHWIN: They decide by ballot.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And, if it is a majority vote, it is accepted?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, quite. Members opposite must realize that we on this side have considerable support from trade union members who look to us for protection against the strong-arm tactics of some of the trade union bosses—because there is no doubt that this does happen. Last week, some members referred to a pamphlet about Mr. McLeay. Do they say the statements in it are a complete fabrication? Do they say they are lies? The statements must have been made because, if they had not been made, they would not have been printed. Mr. Hawke proudly admits that the reason he has his big yacht is that he was able to get at someone who printed what he did not say. The Premier has set a fine example in paying the

court costs of a trade union official, and he certainly helped the situation! Within a couple of days the following article, under the heading "We will outdo oil strikers—Union", appeared in the press:

Industrial trouble in South Australia that would make the oil dispute look like "kindergarten stuff" was predicted last night. The trouble may come if a log of claims on behalf of 500 storemen and packers is rejected. The State Secretary of the Federated Storemen and Packers Union (Mr. M. P. Marinoff) said last night "I expect widespread troubles throughout South Australia after July 27".

Not long ago the Premier said that he had taken steps to settle the dispute because he did not want to see industrial trouble in South Australia. However, I suggest that he has failed. I hope the Government will consider some of the finer points I made regarding tourism, and I hope Government members will consider the matter that must be dear to their hearts—protection of the workers. If they want to protect the workers, they should find out more about agency shops. Then, they would satisfy workers who belong to both Parties.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The honourable member, in talking about agency shops, foreshadowed in some ways the remarks that I will make about collective bargaining. I join with other members in wishing those members who are to retire the best in their retirement, and good health and prosperity. I refer particularly to the member for Elizabeth, who is my next-door neighbour in terms of constituencies. In my time in this House he has been of great help to me. I have always found him to be a gentleman and a scholar in the way he has approached his work in this House and his work in his constituency. He has set a fine example in being a kind, thoughtful and wise man. I wish him and his wife well in their retirement; Mrs. Clark, too, is a lovely person.

I extend my best wishes to each member opposite who is to retire. I have known the member for Goyder indirectly through his son, who was associated with me fairly closely in the legal profession for a number of years. I have not known the member for Alexandra very well, except that he was once, I suppose, in a judicial position when I was in a position of advocacy where the present Leader is now sitting, in connection with a Court of Disputed Returns. I have nearly always disagreed with the views of the honourable member, but I wish him well in his retirement. In relation to me as a person, he has always been extremely kind and courteous. I wish the

member for Davenport well, and I wish her health and happiness in her retirement.

Tonight, I wish to examine in what I hope is an objective way what many members in their addresses have touched on, that is, the current industrial upheaval and public unease that exist today at the consequences of this trouble. The period of disturbance that we are now going through commenced in 1966. The current troubles we are facing are small compared with industrial upheavals of the past. Any historian of industrial relations would know, for instance, that, in Britain and in Ireland in the early part of this century and the late part of the last century, industrial upheavals and strikes were dramatic in their consequences. Not only were hundreds of thousands of people out of work for prolonged periods and there was terrible bitterness between unions and employers but also, indeed, there was bloodshed and death on the streets. This sort of consequence has applied in other places at other times; indeed, in Australia in the 1890's and the late 1920's and the 1930's people died as the result of industrial upheaval. I say that only to put the present situation in its context. I believe the present situation is indeed serious, but let us look at it in its context.

There has been over the last century a series of disturbances and upheavals symptomatic of the demand for the worker/salary section of our community to be better treated in relation to the overall wealth of the community. I do not say that to indicate I am satisfied with the current position; indeed, I am not.

Anything to do with arbitration immediately produces all kinds of strong reaction. I think I have a reference to the comment of an American observer of our own scene when talking about the arbitration system. He referred to the very word "arbitration" as a "glandular word" and by that he meant that "the mere articulation of the word causes thyroid and adrenal glands to secrete; mention the term and calm men get bloodshot eyes, pulses throb and temperatures rise". Indeed, that is true. Having been closely associated with the arbitration process, I once abandoned my house because of certain industrial troubles (not domestic troubles, I hasten to add). On other occasions I have been libelled and slandered and called in public everything from a Communist to a Nazi by various people, depending on what I happened to be advocating at the time.

This is indeed an area in which emotion prevails tremendously. It is also an area in which too many people, who know nothing about the subject (or very little about it) and, indeed, have not even tried to know anything about the subject, have far too much to say. I think it is about time that some attempt was made at a logical dissection of the Australian situation. I know that, as soon as I start to attempt a logical or in any way objective assessment, I will be assailed with criticism from all sides, but that should not prevent me from performing my task. Whatever I say will be unpopular; I think I should accept that and aim for the truth. What are the present causes of the disputes around us? If we analyse the situation, we find that the disputes are over a wide area. Amongst others, I quote the demand for greater annual leave, and I instance the Yallourn power strike. Secondly, there is the demand for higher wages on the particular profits of an employer, and I instance the General Motors-Holden's case and the oil companies' case.

Thirdly, there is the demand for the maintenance of previously established relativities, and I instance the 1967 metal trades case and the flow-on strikes that followed. I pause there to say that, as a matter of history, from the fifteenth century to the twentieth century it has been extraordinary that the relativities between certain skills, as reflected in wages and rates, have been constant throughout the whole Western world. This is an instance of the conservatism of labour. Labour is often accused of being radical. Too often, it is just the opposite: it is too conservative. Even today in the oil companies' strike this is one of the factors. It is inflexibility and conservatism rather than radicalism that is causing part of the problem in the oil companies' case.

The fourth factor is the demand for equal pay for the sexes, and I instance the 1970 rubber industry dispute in South Australia. The fifth example is the demand for a 35-hour week, an instance being the 1972 oil industry strike that is on at present. The sixth factor is the demand for compulsory unionism. In this regard, I instance the 1970 bus companies' case in South Australia; the 1971 Seven Stars Hotel case in South Australia; and the 1972 Kangaroo Island case in South Australia. All these demands spread over a wide area, some satisfied and some not, are the result of the efforts of trade unions which, in essence, are seeking that a greater percentage of the national wealth be allocated to wages and salaries.

The position is that the percentage of total national wealth allocated to wages and salaries has been remarkably constant in Western society over no less than the last couple of centuries. Indeed, I think the following remarks would summarize the position. As my authority I refer to a monograph by Mr. Commissioner Portus of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission entitled *Australian Compulsory Arbitration 1900-1970*, in which the Commissioner said:

Economists have pointed out that the share of the gross national product which goes to wages and salaries tends to remain fairly constant. This is evidently a phenomena in many countries. The Vernon report lists the percentage share of wages and salaries for all Australian industries excluding primary production and mining from 1948-1949 to 1961-1962. Professor Isaac has listed the share of wages and salaries in relation to private enterprise net profits over the period 1948-1949 to 1963-1964. Both lists of figures show year to year variations but taken over all they are remarkably constant.

Even if further investigation into this matter shows that the employees' share of the gross national product is rising or falling change takes place slowly and this highlights the importance of the division of the wage cake amongst different wage and salary earners. It also suggests that compulsory arbitration may have the effect of preventing the strong unions taking too much of the cake from the weak unions.

As I see it, the question that has to be answered is what is the significance of this demand by the trade union movement and the effect of this demand, namely, a series of strikes, all of different kinds and all related to different issues, but in one way or another linked back to that central demand which is for a greater allocation of wages and salaries in national wealth and for a fairer division in wages and salaries.

The first thing to acknowledge is that the community is concerned about these things. People generally with whom I have spoken are worried that we are currently involved in an oil industry strike. The second thing we should acknowledge is that people want to know the answers to five questions. The first question is: Are strikes continuing to increase in this country? Secondly, if they are increasing, are they justified? Thirdly, can the aims of the trade union movement be achieved while still maintaining a stable society? Fourthly, does our present system of compulsory arbitration work, and can it work? Finally, is there any other system that is better?

Next we ought to acknowledge that people have a right to know the answers to these questions. One of the most important things to acknowledge is that in our system, economy and industrial regulation the whole community (every one of us) has a duty to open his eyes, to think logically and flexibly, and to act fairly. Accepting that a call to do these things is reasonable, this, I believe, is the least the community can expect of us. I believe that Australians are by no means analysts of what they say and do. They tend to do things, rather than to discuss the effects of what might follow from their actions, or to involve themselves in an analysis of what has gone on in times gone by.

The first point of my inquiry is to consider whether strikes are increasing, and we have only limited knowledge of this topic. Throughout the whole of this area we are completely limited not only because people are traditionally emotional about the topic but because there is by no means adequate research into the topic and by no means is sufficient money spent to achieve what we ought to be achieving. In other words, it seems to me that we are prepared to spend thousands of dollars on research into all kinds of topic ranging from our environment to our tourist potential (as mentioned by the member for Glenelg); but it seems to me that we spend little money on what is one of our most important topics, namely, the fair division of our national wealth and the best system of industrial regulation.

In so far as we can get some information, just what is the position regarding strikes? In the last part of the last century and in the early part of this century strikes were dramatic in their consequences. They were prolonged, and involved large numbers of workers. They tended to be violent, and their end result was usually a humiliating and degrading return to work by most sections of employees involved. But what is the position in modern times? In the period from the First World War to the Second World War strike activity was at a minimum, the reason being that in that period we were dealing with an unemployment economy. No material produced in Australia prior to 1960, or at the earliest before 1950, can help us in the slightest, because the whole of the Australian mentality in the first half of this century was governed by the fact that we lived in an unemployment economy, but this is no longer the case.

I would summarize the position in this way: from 1945 to 1950 Australia suffered its worst post-war period of industrial turmoil. In the

period 1945-1950, 780 working days were lost through strike action, because Australia was having its first experience of a peace-time full-employment economy. Australia was having its first experience for 25 years of any full employment economy. Australia shared the same post-war phenomenon as occurred in England and the United States: the Communist Party had extreme influence in the trade union movement in that period. At one time its influence was so great that the Australian Council of Trade Unions nearly came under Communist control. This period climaxed in the crippling coal and power strike of 1949 when the then Chifley Labor Government introduced strong Commonwealth legislation to bring the situation under control.

In the following period we saw in Australia the strike activity, which characterized the immediate post-war years of 1945-1950, stabilize itself and become a period with a good record of industrial peace until 1966-67. Since 1967 the number of strikes occurring in Australia has continued to increase. One of the major reasons for this, apart from the key reason that we are in a full-employment economy, is the result of a change in the arbitration system introduced in 1967. That change was to take away the automatic adjustment of tradesmen's salaries to follow the fitter's rate and replace that with individual classifications of rates made by Commissioners on work-value cases. That change reflects the inherent conservatism of the whole trade union movement and the Australian community. We did not want, as a trade union movement or as a national community, to see traditional relativities disturbed. Indeed, when we see these relativities disturbed we react violently.

Another question that may be asked at this time is, "How does Australian strike activity compare with that in other oversea countries?" Taking the following countries into account Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, The United Kingdom and the United States—I point out, and my authority for this proposition is the British Ministry of Labor Publication *Employment and Productivity Gazette*, it can be seen that Australian strike activity and strike involvement is not as high here as it is in most other western countries. The reason for this is that we have a system of compulsory arbitration, whereas in other countries labour is under extreme disability in operating under a system euphemistically termed collective bargaining. The answer to the question often brought up, "Why are

strikes increasing?", is found in the answer I have just mentioned. We are in a full-employment economy. The demand for labour is high and has been high, apart from slight seasonal or periodic variation in the last decade. In times of unemployment industrial unrest, generally speaking, is at a minimum, because there is no prospect of strike activity achieving anything other than the possible destruction of the few employers left in a productive situation.

The next question the community might ask is this: is strike activity justified? As a matter of theory, and indisputable theory, strike activity as such is an undeniable right. I cannot conceive of any person who would deny the labourer, the worker, the right to withdraw his services; in fact, that is the only bargaining factor which, in the ultimate, he has. As a fundamental proposition I doubt that I have ever heard anyone deny it. By the same token, however, it must be accepted that this withdrawal of labour must be used only as a last resort, since the people who suffer most from strike activity are the employees themselves. That statement is so self-evident as to need little justification.

The next point at which the community looks is this: are the particular claims enunciated at the beginning of these remarks justified? Is the demand for equal pay for the sexes, for a 35-hour week, or for marginal differentiation between high profit-making and lower profit-making companies justified? There is no easy answer; each claim must be looked at and related to the circumstances existing at the time it is made.

It could be said fairly that all the claims I have just enunciated, with the exception of that relating to compulsory unionism, which I will deal with separately, can be, as a logical proposition, quite clearly justified. That is to say, the object of a 35-hour week, given a certain context, the object of equal pay for the sexes, and so on, is in itself, as a separate aim, eminently justified and is, in fact, justified by most serious writers on the subject.

However, the main point that immediately arises is the valid question put forward by the ordinary guy in the community: assuming that they are valid, what impact will they have on my overall position? In other words, he says to himself, "Sure, I accept your claim that it is a good thing to have a 35-hour week, equal pay for the sexes, and all the other things you have mentioned, but is this going to ruin me? Is the price I will have to pay for these

continuing advantages going to mean a reduction in my real position?" That is surely a valid question and one that must be answered.

Putting it in simple terms, the man in the street is saying: if wages are increased or conditions are improved, are prices automatically going to move? The position is that in most leading economies of the world (some of which I have mentioned earlier) full employment is a characteristic. All of these countries share the problem of inflation, and in each of them the annual rate of increase in prices has moved sharply upwards. It is obvious, because labour, in a full-employment economy, is in a strong bargaining position to force up wages, and so this spiral exists, as it were, of continuous labour demands and continuous inflation. But can it truly be said that, because wages increase, prices must therefore increase? It is interesting to note that in two completely diverse authorities—one by a writer of the Left Wing and one by a writer of the Right—this proposition is defined. I refer to a publication by one J. Hutson written for the Amalgamated Engineering Union, called *Penal Colony to Penal Powers*. In that book the writer discusses just this question and refers not so much to his own thoughts as to two authorities that would probably be regarded as in the conservative bracket. He has this to say:

The Arbitration Commission has no illusions about where the responsibility lies for increasing prices, witness the comment in the 1961 Basic Wage Judgment that, ". . . material was put before us which indicated that in 1960 in certain consumer goods industries prices fell in spite of wage increases. But Dr. Coombs' comments support our conclusion that in spite of the employers' submissions to the contrary costs need not rise automatically with wage increases . . ." In the 1963 Basic Wage Judgment this was reaffirmed when it was said that, "We agree with what was said both in the 1963 Margins decision and the 1961 Basic Wage decision that increases in prices are determined by those who fix prices." The comment referred to of Dr. H. C. Coombs, Chairman of the Reserve Bank, was made in 1959 when he said, "Consider the pricing policies of industrialists and trades. No doubt some degree of competition prevails over a wide range of industry and commerce but there are degrees of monopoly and tacitly accepted practices which mean that prices are determined by management rather than by the market for a wide range of goods and that within significant margins producers can decide at what prices their goods shall be sold."

But, even more interestingly, let me refer to the author's observations on the remarks made by Sir Garfield Barwick, now Chief Justice of

the High Court and a former Attorney-General in a Liberal and Country Party Administration in Canberra:

This was substantiated by the statement of Sir Garfield Barwick in 1963, when he was Attorney-General, that there were between 500 to 600 trade associations in Australia which had been formed to implement restrictive practices designed to maintain price levels. In 1965 a Royal Commission set up by the Tasmanian Government found that two-thirds of the trade associations in that State engaged in restrictive practices. The result is that the law of supply and demand has become inoperative in some areas and so is of little benefit to the consumer of many goods. The resistance of the monopolies to reducing prices has now reached the stage that even in times of recession when the market becomes flooded they prefer to cut production to suit rather than to cut prices. Some have even been known to increase prices during a recession in order to maintain their rate of profit on the reduced production. So any attempt to control prices could only be fully effective if a strong restraint was put on the power of such associations to manipulate prices in the interests of the big monopolies.

Not only is that true as a general proposition but also I know that here in Adelaide the same observation can be made. Indeed, only recently I was involved in proceedings in which a small but reputable electrical trades dealer in Gawler Place was prevented from being able to purchase goods from National Electronics because that company demanded that he maintain what was a completely unjustifiable price in any circumstances; he, not as a Socialist but as a fully convinced and quite happy capitalist, was stunned by this attitude. He was willing to take the matter further, only to find that the producers, who were determined to maintain this restriction on his capacity to compete, threatened him with complete bankruptcy by using legal powers and costs in connection with the so-called restrictive trade practices tribunal.

Mr. Crimes: So much for free enterprise.

Mr. McRAE: So very little for free enterprise! I wish to refer to the sort of reaction one gets when there is a series of demands, such as demands for a 35-hour week, equal pay for the sexes, and dramatically increased wages. I am reminded of a character called Hanrahan in a poem who at every stage of a season, whether it was dry or wet, typically replied, "We'll all be ruined." I believe that the final line of the poem was this:

We will all be ruined, said Hanrahan.

In some ways this sort of reaction is not completely unjustified, because the fact of the matter is that the general community is simply not told in any sort of analytical or

objective way just what is involved. All the community has before it is the competing propaganda of the different parties. I shall refer to the oil industry dispute as an example, and I shall not lay the blame on any side; I shall merely look at the three parties involved. First, the oil companies are determined to suggest that to give in to the union's demands would mean an increase in the price of oil; so, that is a fear factor. Secondly, the Commonwealth Government is determined to suggest that at the root of all this there is the basic problem of law and order, and that suggests to the ordinary householder the idea of safety in his own house; that is a fear factor, too. Thirdly, the trade union movement suggests that the entire issue is the absolute necessity to get a 35-hour week now for the people involved; again, that is a fear factor.

Each party, in trying to outdo the others in propaganda, has put the whole community into a confused situation. I do not blame any ordinary member of the community for reacting as he is now reacting, because the ordinary member of the community is concerned, confused and frightened, and he will go on in that way unless all the parties forget their propaganda and slogans and try to set out what is going on and analyse the situation, regardless of slogans, dogmas and old theories. I am not concerned with slogans, dogmas and old theories, nor am I concerned that, because I do not use the appropriate catch-cry, in some way I may appear not to be loyal to some supposed dogma: what I am concerned with is to find out what is the truth and, having found that out, to put it as strongly as I can. I am sure that that is a widely accepted Australian proposition.

Even if all these questions could be answered (and I am sure that I could not answer all of them) we have still by no means solved the entire problem. We are in desperate need now, as we were in the late 1920's and the 1930's, of another Premiers' Conference. I call upon this Government and the Commonwealth Government seriously to consider just such a thing. It is not because I fear that a certain issue of the moment (be it the Kangaroo Island dispute, the oil industry dispute, or the abattoir dispute) will lead to disaster, because I do not think it will lead to disaster. I am concerned to find a genuine incomes policy for Australia. I believe that what we want in Australia is a damn sight less slogan calling and fewer dogmas and an attempt to get some reality and a community consensus on what we want.

Surely, the answer is to determine what is the fair section of the national wealth which ought to go to the various sorts of people (not classes, because I reject classes, and every Australian rejects classes) to whom I have referred. We certainly need investors and entrepreneurs, because it is from people who take risks that progress comes in many ways.

What fair percentage ought to go to wage and salary earners? What fair percentage ought to go to fixed-income earners? Surely there ought to be some greater percentage going to wage and salary earners without putting us in a situation of ruin, disaster or upset, and to achieve this I believe we need a systematic tax revision; I believe we need a price control tribunal; I believe we need a revision of our arbitration system (but not its destruction); and finally, I believe we need new social legislation. So, for what it is worth (I suppose it is worth little, if anything, from a back-bencher), I formally ask, so that I will get some answer, even if it is "No", that the Premiers and the Governments of the States and the Commonwealth look into this question because, if they cannot see this sort of problem, they have not done much in the way of research; in fact, they have done nothing in the way of research along these lines.

I turn then to the second line of argument. We have looked at the question overall in terms of economy, and it is obvious that the arbitration system is dealing only with wages and salaries and not with income policies as a whole and, therefore, that it cannot provide the whole answer. The question is whether it can, within its limited field, deal with its specific area, and in many ways that sort of question is provoking much interest in the community today. So the two questions that I pose are these: can the present system work; and, if it cannot work, can any other system work? As I see it, we can have two choices (collective bargaining or compulsory arbitration), and to some extent I have been able to do some research into collective bargaining in Britain, the Scandinavian countries, Continental Europe, and America. Having done that, I will commence my observations on this topic by referring to the White Paper produced by the British Government relating to its own system of collective bargaining.

Mr. Mathwin: Is this the Donovan report?

Mr. McRAE: Yes, it is based on the Donovan report. The first three paragraphs of this White Paper, headed "In Place of Strife: A Policy for Industrial Relations", state:

1. There are necessarily conflicts of interest in industry. The objective of our industrial relations system should be to direct the forces producing conflict towards constructive ends. This can be done by the right kind of action by management, unions and Government itself. This White Paper sets out what needs to be done.

2. Our present system of industrial relations has substantial achievements to its credit, but it also has serious defects. It has failed to prevent injustice, disruption of work and inefficient use of manpower. It perpetuates the existence of groups of employees who, as the result of the weakness of their bargaining position, fall behind in a struggle to obtain their full share of the benefits of an advanced industrial economy. In other cases management and employees are able unfairly to exploit the consumer and endanger economic prosperity. It has produced a growing number of lightning strikes and contributed little to increasing efficiency. There are still areas of industry without any machinery for collective bargaining at all. Radical changes are needed in our system of industrial relations to meet the needs of a period of rapid technical and industrial change.

3. Until action is taken to remedy these defects, conflict in British industry will often be damaging and anti-social. The Government places the following proposals before Parliament and the nation convinced that they are justified on two main grounds. First, they will help to contain the destructive expression of industrial conflict and to encourage a more equitable, ordered and efficient system, which will benefit both those involved and the community at large. Second, they are based on the belief that the efforts of employers, unions and employees to reform collective bargaining need the active support and intervention of Government.

Countries involved in collective bargaining are characterized by some of the things I will refer to. Taking the United States of America as perhaps a very appropriate example, there are large sections of industry and of employees whose rewards are substantial indeed. To summarize without referring to precise figures, as a result of my research I can say that the lowest-paid employee equivalent of the vehicle builders award in the United States collective agreement is receiving \$92 a week, whereas our employee under our minimum wage classification is receiving \$52.90. The highest paid employee receives about \$272 a week, our equivalent employee receiving about \$84 a week.

Many union members would say that that was magnificent, and that sort of example in the Detroit vehicle establishment I can also show in the Chicago meatworks establishment and on the Western seaboard of the United States. What they do not say is that 20,000,000 workers in the United States are on the

bread line. Just as the British White Paper says, the reason why they are on the bread line is that they are not in an industry that is tremendously profitable; they have no bargaining power and they are weakly organized. Although a significant yet still fairly small percentage of American workers enjoys a magnificent standard of living, a great many American workers receive so little. The same type of observation could be made in varying degrees about other collective-bargaining countries. Moreover, the total percentage of union membership in collective-bargaining countries is much lower than that in Australia. Although there has been some progressive achievement in recent years, it is not sufficient to detract from the general point I make.

In other words, I suggest that any trade union leader who suggests collective bargaining as an alternative and who is referring to the system in the United States (I do not mean the idea of agreement and round-table conferences with employers within our conciliation and arbitration machinery) may be doing a tremendous disservice to our whole working force and to the community. Our current Australian system is obviously in need of review in many ways. There is tremendous public confusion as to what role the commission is expected to play in our community. Great public confusion exists with regard to the whole notion of penal clauses inside our system, and there is even greater public confusion about the use of so-called civil remedies by employers.

I shall now summarize what I am saying. "Collective bargaining" is what it says: there is an agreement, instead of between one or two people, between thousands of people (namely employees) on the one hand and one, 10 or 100 persons (namely employers) on the other hand. Just as in common law private contracts there is an additional provision, so there is in collective bargaining. In collective bargaining countries, therefore, the appropriate remedy is to take out the kind of writ that was taken out in the Kangaroo Island case; that is the accepted thing by the unions. Believe it or not, but on the West Coast of the United States the Teamsters Union paid out \$140,000,000 in a court judgment based on one of these writs. The system of thinking is that power must be met head on. The agreement is made, say, for three years, and no doubt the union knows that at the end of three years another conflict is to come.

Because its members are involved in a highly profitable industry and because the wages of

the last agreement are so high, the union can say to its members, "We will levy 10 per cent, 12 per cent or 15 per cent of your monthly rate to accumulate a strike fund and a litigation fund for what will happen at the end of our bargaining period." How foolish can you get when you are actually advocating a head-on clash at the end of what is supposed to be a reasonably negotiated agreement? I assure the House that that is what happens. Towards the last six months of the agreement a series of negotiations takes place and, if all goes well, the strike fund and other moneys that have accumulated are returned back in varying sums to the employees, with some reserve held. Often, however, the two parties cannot be reconciled and the strike money must be used to pay the men, who by now are out of work for a prolonged period, and to meet the court damages claims that will arise. I believe that this kind of activity is absolutely ridiculous and criminal.

In Australia in the 1890's we had a better answer than they have in America today. Of course, a thorny question must be answered. Most employers say that, if under compulsory arbitration there is some kind of sanction such as the writ in civil action, we do not need the writ. What is happening now is that certain unions (only a small percentage, because most unions, particularly the smaller unions with less bargaining power, know that it would be the height of foolishness to abandon the arbitration system) have tried to abandon it. Such unions happen to be involved in certain industries that can pass the costs on to the public. They can take the risk of this kind of civil action, whereas most unions cannot do so.

As the reaction to this, many employers are today asking: Why should we have the arbitration system when we would be much better off without it? In other words, if we happen to be in the pastoral industry or in an industry that cannot be easily organized, why worry about the arbitration system? I do mention the pastoral industry not with the object of provoking an argument with the Opposition, nor did I mean to raise Kangaroo Island specifically. Take another example in the light of the glare from the member from Eyre. Take any industry that is hard for unions to organize and one will see that it is a natural response for employees in a current situation to ask themselves, "If we cannot get an award carried out under the arbitration system, why not bust it? At least, we shall be able to fall back on our writs, the same as they do in America."

Although I am not identifying any group at this point, I allege that there is a concerted attempt in this State to break the arbitration system, not only by the unions on the whole, but by certain employer groups that want to break the system for their own advantage so that these very writs can be used.

The case of the employer is put this way: "We would not break the arbitration system, seek collective bargaining agreements, or issue writs if there was some sanction in industrial arbitration. The trade union movement can no longer logically assert to the community that penal clauses should be removed." The clear reply to any such question is, "No, that cannot be asserted." Any form of contract or of law and order has a sanction of some kind. The justification of the attitude shown up to the present has been the use that was made by a group of employers mainly centred in the metal industries and related production industries from 1967 onwards.

Members opposite who are seriously interested in this topic may have been misinformed, and I believe that they should ask those concerned in the matter and determine for themselves whether or not it is a fact that, from 1967 until the recent change in Commonwealth legislation, there was a deliberate concerted attempt by the Metal Industries Association, Chamber of Manufactures, and Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited (with all due respects to the member for Whyalla!) to break the backs of the unions by the continuous use of penal clauses and by the use of the most expensive counsel to add continually to costs. That is why unions that previously had been prepared to accept the validity of a situation that there should be some reasonable sanction reacted as violently as they did.

I say that it is time all sections of the community forgot their slogans and shouting, reassessed their situation, and looked and asked whether, by a reasonable variation of the arbitration system and by some provision for sanctions which we do not need to call penal clauses in the sense of criminal proceedings (putting a union official in gaol as though he were a common criminal amongst the drunks and rapists who shared the cells with the late Clarry O'Shea), we can come up with a solution.

I should like to show members opposite how ridiculous is the current situation. Any research undertaken on this matter leads to the question, "Whence do we get the legal precedent for

this writ, anyway?" Believe it or not, the genesis of the writ used in the Kangaroo Island case was the 1348 Statute of Laborers in Britain. That was also the year of the Black Death plague. The reason for such a Statute was that, as so many able-bodied men had died, laborers who had never previously in medieval times been able to bargain were suddenly able to do so. The Government of those days therefore enacted a Statute to ensure that these people could not concert together to demand an increase in wages.

Therefore, the problems we face today are not all that new. One may trace this sort of action to a case decided in Britain in 1853 (*Lumley v. Guy*), in which an opera singer who had been engaged to work at the Royal Theatre in London for a season was persuaded by someone else to break the contract, and an employer succeeded in an action to recover damages from the person who persuaded the breach of contract. That, in turn, was extended to trade union-type actions.

The other cause of action, intimidation, relates to a case decided in 1748, when a British slave trader, who was attempting to sell his ill-gotten goods to a tribe of natives on the West African coast, was attacked by the same natives with a volley of spears. Suing them in Privy Council he succeeded in recovering damages for intimidation for stopping other people recovering his goods. It is on that kind of absurd precedent that these rules are based.

We need a little less bombast, a little less dogma, a little more intelligence, and a great deal more analysis of what we are actually looking at so that we can produce a solution for the community instead of confusing it further.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I congratulate His Excellency on the delivery of his Speech on the Opening Day, and on behalf of my constituents I wish Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant good health, and trust that we will have them with us for many years to come. With the greatest respect, I suggest that one day we will have to consider the appointment of a successor to His Excellency, and I hope the Government of the day will consider a much younger person, perhaps someone in the mid-50 age group.

I also pay my respects to the relatives of those former members who have passed away since last we met. To members who have announced their retirement from Parliament at the end of this session, I extend my thanks, on behalf of my constituents, for their untiring

efforts on behalf of their districts and on behalf of the State. I trust they will be blessed with good health and that they will enjoy a long retirement.

Much has been said in relation to industrial matters in South Australia, and also regarding the Kangaroo Island dispute. His Excellency's Speech referred to the possibility of changing laws so that certain events cannot occur again in South Australia. I, too, add my protests at the Government's action in paying the costs awarded against Mr. Dunford. I believe that action is to be deplored. Irrespective of the sum involved, the union has breached a principle that I believe was involved in this dispute. It is clear that the union wishes to achieve 100 per cent membership, particularly on Kangaroo Island. No-one would deny the union this aim. Indeed, union leaders and members have tried to achieve it.

However, anyone with common sense and respect for individual freedom will recognize that working men and women have a right to join or not to join a union. Forced membership of any organization merely brings about resentment. I realize that an endeavour to organize a body to protect the workers would naturally require the workers to join forces. At the same time, we must consider the freedom of the individual, and in this regard I refer to the first object of the Liberal Party, which states:

An Australian nation dedicated to political truth and the freedom and dignity of man. We on this side are often accused of aiding and abetting industrial trouble in this country, but I deny this most vigorously: we do not aid and abet industrial disputes. We believe everyone has the right to act in accordance with his wishes but that he should not have that right forced upon him through virtual compulsory unionism. The validity of the Government's argument that it felt compelled to pay the costs in the dispute that arose on Kangaroo Island is not in accord with the State's Constitution. All I can say is that I believe the State Government was campaigning for the next election with State funds, particularly from an already over-taxed community. I will endeavour to show this later.

The credibility of the beneficiary in this case is doubtful, and I think this is the crux of the issue. It is a matter of principle how far we will use State funds to defend the credibility of a person. I understand that in the past Mr. Dunford has had to use aliases to obtain employment. This is unfortunate because he is now leading the union, and

the action taken could have resulted in serious industrial trouble within the State. Members of unions should exercise restraint and common sense in the future. The Australian Workers Union has enjoyed an excellent reputation in this State over the years as an industrial organization. To debase the union over a personality clash is ridiculous. I appeal to all union members and workers now to show a greater interest in their union and its affairs than hitherto. The whole crux of the industrial trouble in this country today is that workers join a union and then consider that that is as far as their responsibility goes. The workers are scared to take a stand against their union officials for fear of intimidation. In some unions, trouble really begins not with the union leaders but at shop steward level. It is difficult for the large unions to spread throughout the State with the union leaders keeping a tight control on the shop stewards.

I remember a case in Sydney where men were brought on to a large building project. Two professional agitators came on the job, their task being industrial sabotage. What they did was continually to hold safety strikes. The men working on the job would suddenly be called together and informed that a piece of timber or some nails were lying on the ground and therefore they must have a safety strike in order to discuss the dangers. It was said, "We must warn all the workers on the site that they must not do this." By that, the company lost a lot of time. After several weeks of safety strikes of a day here and there, the men became sick and tired of losing a day's pay every week, so it was left to the men to take action. To ensure that those professional agitators were removed from the site.

However, before they did this, the shop steward on the job refused to call a safety strike when called upon to do so. When lunch time came on that day, the men could not find Bluey, and they could not find him because certain persons had got to Bluey, beaten him up and left him behind a toolshed. That is what professional agitators are doing to the unions: they are destroying the unions and their credibility when they serve their members and the workers of this country well.

The time has come for the Australian working man to take a greater interest in his union. He must not be content merely to go along to union meetings or to put his point of view: he must be prepared to stand up for his rights. We know that in the unions in which the men do stand up for their rights, where they are

prepared to stand up and speak against industrial disputes, they are dealt with. If they have the courage of their convictions and are willing to stand by those convictions, the trade unions implement one of their rules; that rule provides that, if a member does not abide by a union decision, he is fined by the union, and the union has the right to expel him. And, if a person is expelled from a union, he cannot get a job in his trade. Union membership in this country today is nothing but straight-out blackmail. What are the trade unions doing to gain employment for their members?

Employers do not get out scot-free, either. There are far too many closed shops in this country. If a man does not have a union ticket, the employment officer says to him, "Fill in this form and join a union." It suits the employer to have a closed shop because he knows that every time the court makes a decision about wages or conditions its award states the minimum for that job. However, the employer makes it the maximum for the job. So, are the trade unions really serving the workers of this country? The unions have themselves to blame for the industrial trouble we are experiencing today. As a President of a union, I always believed that it was our ultimate aim to obtain 100 per cent membership, but we never stood over the employees. If they did not want to join the union we tried to embarrass them into joining. We used the commonsense approach; we said, "If you want to do the right thing by your fellow workers, you will join the union. You should take an interest in the union."

Mr. Payne: How did you get expelled?

Mr. BECKER: Three times they tried to expel me, and three times they failed. I am willing to defend in this House any worker who believes he is being intimidated by a union. It is time that Parliament considered legislation to protect the rights and freedoms of the individual. Let us consider the shopping hours fiasco. What a great comedy of errors it has developed into! The only solution is to go back to square one and start again. I do not see why this State should have been put to such expense and I do not see why so much legislation should be necessary, as a result of which some people will have certain shopping hours forced on them against their will. What does the union want? I go along with the unions in some respects. I enjoyed a five-day working week. So, why can they not enjoy such a week, too? No matter what action Parliament takes in rela-

tion to shopping hours, there will always be anomalies. Bearing in mind the threat of increased retail prices, I believe that we should not force late-night shopping on people in those areas that do not want it. We have heard during this debate references to the current oil dispute, and I should like to quote an interesting paragraph from the *Review*, dated July 22-28. The passage, headed "Oiling the A.L.P.'s Political Slipways", states:

As for Hawke, he is caught between a coalition of the Socialist left, who wish to destroy him, and a right wing rapidly increasing in membership in the A.C.T.U. This latter group of unions, including the Shop Assistants Union, the Federated Clerks Union and others are the ones who are benefiting from the compulsory unionism in the big retail stores. The right wing now have the numbers to bring Hawke down. Given the implacable hatred of some of the Socialist left in Victoria, Hawke could be disposed of at will.

So we see that the mighty Hawke is in trouble, the man who was considered at one stage as a replacement for Mr. Whitlam as Leader of the Australian Labor Party. We find in the trade union movement in Victoria the presence of the Socialist left, but what we have not yet heard in this State is that there are also troubles within the Labor Party itself. We hear much rubbish in this Chamber about trouble in the Opposition Party (Government members are hoping for trouble within the Liberal and Country League), but what we are not yet hearing is that the Socialist left is prepared to take over the A.L.P. Make no bones about that! At the next Commonwealth election the Socialist left will wreck the A.L.P. more quickly than anything else will. Reference has been made to a document circulated in the Commonwealth District of Boothby, and this document contains a surprising quote, namely, from Mr. Hawke, as follows:

I would like to see a Federal election fought on whether the Government or the trade union movement was running the country.

That is an interesting comment. As we know, Mr. Hawke is in trouble within the A.C.T.U. Referring to the State Budget, I said earlier that I believe we have been and are being over-taxed. At the same time, I point out that the State Government has been fortunate to receive so much money from the Commonwealth Government. In the financial year ended June 30, 1972, State taxation increased by 17 per cent or \$10,100,000. During that period, average weekly earnings increased by as much as 12 per cent but, over the whole 12 months, they averaged out at just on 10 per cent. In other words, all people earning an

income in this State received an average increase in earnings of about 10 per cent, but the State Government increased taxes by 17 per cent. On top of this, employers were faced with a 40 per cent increase in pay-roll tax. This was reflected in an increase in the cost of living, because unfortunately, as industry could not contain that extra increase in pay-roll tax, it had to be passed on to the consumer.

The State Government had promised that it would contain prices and control the cost of living. However, it did nothing about it; it could not get money into the Treasury fast enough. When it brought down the Budget, the Government provided for a deficit of \$17,300,000. When I said in that debate that we should force Governments to balance their Budgets, I was severely criticized. Because of its taxation policy and as a result of the generosity of the Commonwealth Government, the State Government ended the year with a deficit of \$1,066,000. One or two questions may be asked about this. Either the State did not spend according to its Budget, or it has received a greater income. If the Government had been true to its philosophy at the time of bringing down the Budget, it would have spent up to the Budget to bolster trade in this State. In addition, it would have stuck to that Budget to try to reduce unemployment. Instead, it has played politics.

The Government has accused the Commonwealth Government of not assisting it. All I can say is that this Government should no longer aim its attack at the Commonwealth Government, because in the last financial year the Commonwealth has provided an extra \$11,559,000 in taxation reimbursement grants, and \$1,279,000 as additional assistance. The Commonwealth has also provided \$1,495,000 in debt service reimbursements, and an additional \$2,000,000 as a section 96 grant. All in all, by the grace and generous assistance of the Commonwealth, the State has received an extra \$16,333,000. That is not bad for a Commonwealth Government that has been continually abused and attacked by the present Government. Moreover, the State has received an extra \$10,623,000 in receipts. We find that in one area that particularly hurts, namely, stamp duties, the figure was \$1,099,000 in excess of the Budget and that gift duties exceeded the Budget by \$64,000. Generally, the other items went according to the Budget. However, only one item in the Budget went true to the balance sheet: \$19,500,000 paid

toward the deficit of the dear old South Australian Railways.

I believe the system of presenting the State Budget should be reviewed because, although we receive the Budget usually in the first week of September, at least two months of the financial year are lost. The State Government is usually trying to Budget for the remaining 10 months of the financial year, but the Government should consider introducing a Budget every six months. By bringing down a six-monthly Budget, the Treasury would be forced to try to estimate what will happen in the next financial year, and that area of estimating could be reduced. I believe that we should receive a quarterly report by the Treasury on the State's financial affairs. Such a report would provide one way or another what was expected and an estimate of what was likely to happen in the following three months. The antiquated system of an annual Budget no longer serves its purpose.

The practice in most industries today is to try to prepare a half-yearly budget. In fact, most industries try to prepare a quarterly budget because, as a result of increases in costs and wages and the effects of inflation, it is important that anyone running a business or industry (and we run a large industry in this State, for which I expect the next Budget to exceed \$500,000,000) should pay great care and attention to preparing the budget. If we had a six-monthly Budget, any tax increase placed on the people would not be as great as some we have seen in the past.

I was interested to note recently that the Government is to consider increasing first mortgages on houses financed by the State Bank. However, I believe the Government should do even better than that, because the time has come for the State to consider assisting young married people, who should be given an incentive to own their own home. The State could and should consider matching the Commonwealth home savings grant scheme. If young people save \$1,500 over a minimum of three years the Commonwealth Government pays them a grant of \$500. I believe it is in the State Government's reach to match that \$500. If a young couple managed to save \$1,500 and received \$500 from the Commonwealth Government and \$500 from the State Government, it would give them a \$2,500 deposit, which would give a reasonable chance of purchasing a house. The limit on first mortgages available from the State Bank under the State housing agreement should be limited

for the time being to \$13,000. This would mean that the average house, whether it be built by the Housing Trust or by private enterprise, would be within the financial reach of young people. A house to the value of about \$15,500 could be obtained by these people.

The limit of \$13,000 for the first mortgage should be restricted to properties not exceeding \$17,500 in value. This would be an incentive scheme and a scheme which, I believe, the State Government should most carefully consider. If the Government is concerned as to how much this suggestion could cost the State, I point out that the seventh annual report of the Department of Housing for the year ended June 30, 1970-71, shows that in South Australia 3,671 people applied for and were accepted for grants under the Commonwealth homes savings grant scheme. This cost the Commonwealth Government \$1,587,579 at an average grant of \$432. This is within the competence of the State, especially in view of the continued generosity of the Commonwealth Government.

Like most home owners, I am concerned that excess water rates are to be increased. An anomaly existing under our present water rating system has been highlighted not only in my electorate but also throughout the metropolitan area. In recent years there has been a considerable increase in the construction and completion of home units and it must be realized that four or five such units can be built on one normal house block while the water rates applying to such units are collectively four or five times greater than the water rates applying to one house on a block of land of similar size. It is time that the Government looked at this anomaly. Indeed, I represent many owners of home units who have a property frontage of only 25ft. and with little or no garden at all. These people are generally pensioners or persons soon to become retired or widows or widowers; yet their water rates are as high as my own water rates, and my property has a 65ft. frontage and a depth of 150ft. and houses a family of four. There is no comparison. The Government must act and, indeed, it is the responsibility of the Minister to act as soon as possible to remove this anomaly.

There is no incentive under this Government for persons wishing to be superannuated or considering retirement to endeavour to provide themselves with their own home. It is time the Government encouraged people prepared to provide themselves with their own residence in the latter years of their lives. One way by

which the State should do this is to introduce a water rating system that is fair. Therefore, the anomaly under the water rating system regarding home units must be reviewed and I hope that, when the matter is reviewed, the owners of home units will receive a fairer assessment.

It is also my belief that it is time that this State adopted the policy adopted by the New South Wales Government whereby pensioners owning a home can apply to their local council for the State Government to pay 50 per cent of their council rates up to \$80. I understand that in some localities councils will waive the remaining 50 per cent. Under the water rating system in New South Wales, pensioners may apply, under a similar scheme, for the remission of 50 per cent of their water and sewerage rates, with a maximum of \$40 for sewerage and \$40 for water rates. This is a wonderful contribution by the State Government of New South Wales, and it is high time South Australia followed the same practice.

Critics of the scheme will immediately ask how we can afford it, where we will get the money to allow these benefits, or what area we must tackle to provide such benefits. All we need is to introduce greater economies and efficiencies in the handling of the taxpayers' money in South Australia. A 2 per cent saving in general efficiency would provide an extra \$10,000,000, and with that sum the State could remove rural land tax and gift duty, and provide certain benefits for our senior citizens. This is the great challenge that should be accepted by the State Government. It should, with care, and with the generous amounts provided for it by the Commonwealth Government, balance the next Budget, endeavour to introduce efficiency in State finances and remove some of our taxes.

Like most people in South Australia I could not but feel sorry for those members of the community who suffered financial losses because of the mismanagement of Travel House of Australia and one of its subsidiaries. Again, I must turn to the *Review*, and an article that must be embarrassing to certain sections of the community. The article states:

The following news report did not appear in the Australian press on July 14: "The future of Travel House of Australia was uncertain this week, following reports that the Melbourne based company was in financial difficulties. An announcement on the company's future was to be made yesterday."

That report appeared instead on the front page of Britain's travel journal *Travel Trade Gazette*. Four days later and 12,000 miles

away, T.H.A. (see also *Review*, May 13) collapsed—leaving its innocent customers stranded and the local press in a flurry.

The local travel industry became highly agitated, too. Among the developments: Astronaut Travel Service, the country's biggest air travel agency, suggested a hardship fund be set up by the Australian Federation of Travel Agents to help T.H.A.'s victims. Astronaut offered \$1,000 for openers, and suggested that travel agents and carriers chip in, but A.F.T.A. knocked the idea back. The reason: implied responsibility and indirect guilt for the activities of a non member.

The regional director for the International Air Transport Association arrived in Sydney as part of a world effort to stamp out discounting and other "malpractices" on air fares. He confirmed reports that I.A.T.A. would soon send a "compliance officer" to police the rules. Major agents in Sydney and Melbourne reported a sudden surge of cancellations, queries, and jitters as the shock wave of T.H.A.'s collapse spread out. All in all, apart from the enormous personal distress, the accumulated \$1,000,000 loss, and belated political moves, the whole mess had given the travel trade a bad name.

The people of South Australia, particularly members of this Parliament, should have realized the position last year when the member for Unley asked the following question about travel agencies:

Is the Attorney-General aware of instances of persons who have paid money to travel agencies, one being Olympic Travel Service Proprietary Limited, in order to travel overseas and who have, as a result, lost their life savings or mortgaged their houses, and can the Attorney suggest what persons can do to protect themselves against such losses?

In part of his reply, the Attorney said:

Where fraud or dishonesty can be proved, there exist appropriate laws, and action is taken accordingly. I have received a report concerning the recent failure of Olympic Travel Service Proprietary Limited in which a number of persons have suffered financial loss, and I have directed that certain action be taken.

On July 5 of this year, a person who had contacted me received this letter from the Acting Premier:

I refer to your letter of June 15, 1972, concerning the Olympic Travel Agency. The Premier took up your representations with the Attorney-General, who has advised that your husband's solicitor wrote to him on November 10, 1970, and a reply was forwarded on November 20, 1970. The Attorney-General has further reported that there were many other complaints concerning this company. The whole matter was investigated and the Crown Solicitor has advised that the evidence would not support a successful prosecution. The Attorney-General made a public statement warning people to deal only with well-established and reputable travel agencies. The Ministers responsible for tourism in the various

States are currently considering the introduction of a uniform Travel Agents Bill in the various Parliaments throughout Australia. It is regretted that there is no action which the Government can take to assist your husband in the personal loss suffered by him.

Here is a case where a question was asked in this House on March 30, 1971, about a certain travel agency, and the Acting Premier's letter refers to correspondence dated November 10 and November 20, 1970; and today the proprietor of that travel agency walks around Adelaide a free man. The question to be answered is this: if it were not for fraud or dishonesty, what was the reason why no action was taken?

Mr. Payne: What's your point?

Mr. BECKER: My point concerns how far can we legislate to protect the integrity of the people who will run, manage or control travel agencies in the future? The Premier has said that legislation will be introduced to control travel agents. We can bond them, make them take out insurance policies, or do what we like; but we cannot insure against the lack of integrity of the individual. If he is going to defraud his company or the public he will find a way to do so. The only method that I believe we can adopt to protect people who deal with travel agencies or companies, where they hand over money as payment for something, is to establish an insurance fund. This was done many years ago; we have to go back to the commencement of the Torrens title system, under which the Torrens Title Assurance Fund was established. When a person purchased a property and received a Torrens title, money was paid into the fund. Eventually, the money in the fund was paid into the Consolidated Revenue of the State because, in all the years that the Torrens title system had operated to that stage, there were only two claims against the fund. I believe that the fund was abolished in the early 1940's.

This kind of fund appears to be probably one of the best safeguards. By 1941 there was about \$1,500,000 in a similar type of fund in New South Wales. I believe that if a fee was paid by travel agents into a fund, it could act as a buffer against frauds by such agents. Further, all travel agents would have to be registered. It would be no good insisting that they become members of the Australian Federated Travel Agents Association or the International Air Travel Association because, if we made such a provision, no-one could commence a travel agency. It is extremely difficult to protect people in this field. The

provisions we make must be such that, if someone wishes to commence a travel agency, he should be reasonably free to do so. If we enact legislation of the type that I believe is being considered no-one else will be able to enter the travel agency business. The big companies will get bigger and the little companies will disappear. The only solution is for Parliament to establish a travel agents' assurance fund. A similar type of fund operates in New South Wales, where there are no land brokers, because all land transactions are handled by solicitors. The fund there is a type of solicitors' assurance fund, on which there have been considerable claims; at least people have not lost all their money.

Last session there was much discussion about pyramid selling. No doubt many motorists have found a yellow card on their windscreens saying, "I have a very interesting business offer to put to you. Could you ring Mr. Thomas: 23 1433." The motorist is invited to ring G. T. Enterprises at that number or another number between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Monday to Friday. If a person telephones Mr. Thomas, and it is well worth a try (I rang him), a person will answer the phone and say, "How would you like to earn thousands of dollars a month? I cannot give any details on the phone. There is no selling, no cash outlay, and you can make thousands of dollars a month. If you come to 274 Pirie Street at 7.15 p.m., I will discuss the whole thing with you. It will take only about 1½ hours."

One finds out that this is only a means of inducing people to become involved in Holiday Magic and in pyramid selling. The person concerned says, "But you said there would be no cash outlay and no selling," but the answer is, "That is only up until the time of this interview." It is very cunningly done. Personally, I think the organization ought to be called "Con a sucker", because it gets people to an address and then tries to con them into taking part in something that we deplore. I believe the community should be told that these sorts of firm are operating.

I believe that South Australians are rapidly becoming fed up with the antics of the present Government. At present, they are festering in apathy, leading what Thoreau called "lives of quiet desperation". They are oppressed by taxation and inflation; they are becoming poisoned by pollution, terrorized by urban crime, frightened of the long-term effects of Socialism, and baffled by the computerized world around them. They have worked all

their lives to obtain their own home, television set, modern appliances and a motor car, but they are finding that their personal lives are generally unfulfilling and their jobs unsatisfying. They have succumbed to tranquillizers and pep pills, and are drowning their anxieties in alcohol. They are becoming depersonalized without any fear of participating in the political process, and they feel rejected and hopeless. Their Utopia of status and security is becoming a tacky-tacky suburb. Their split levels have sprouted prison bars, and their disillusionment is becoming terminal. They are the first to live in a total mass-media oriented world. Every night when they turn on the television and the news comes on, they see almost unbelievable hypocrisy and deceit and often outright idiocy.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who wrote this?

Mr. BECKER: They are coming to realize that the boat is sinking and that, unless they start bailing out, they will sink with it. This is the problem facing our community today and it is largely the effect of the present Government's actions. I highlighted last week another problem facing the community, namely, people accosting schoolchildren. When referring to this matter and stating that children have been asked by strangers to accept a lift around the corner or asked "Would you like to go for a ride into the hills?" I did not realize that this would lead to so many telephone calls instancing many cases involving this sort of thing.

One of the most upsetting telephone calls involved an incident in which a woman had taken her four-year old daughter into a shop in the city. She noticed that her daughter had been missing for about 10 or 15 minutes. She thought that, like all little girls, her daughter had been running up and down the aisles between the merchandise, and she did not pay much attention to it. When she returned home with her daughter she found that the daughter had been attacked and had marks on the lower part of her body that still bore the imprint of the fingernails of the person who had attacked her.

This woman was shocked at the disgusting crime, and rang the store to complain. As she gave the details, the person taking the telephone call said, "Yes, that's right" in reply to the various descriptions the woman gave. The woman asked, "What do you mean when you say 'Yes, that's right'?" This person said, "Madam, that is the sixth report we have had today." What can this Parliament do to

prevent this, because a solution to the problem lies with us? We must endeavour to give the Community Welfare Department the necessary manpower. We must educate people in an effort to prevent this sort of thing from happening in our community in this modern age.

Many snide remarks are made about the Opposition, although I think that many things said are said in jest. However, the Opposition is full of fight and determination. No matter what may be said, it is our role as an Opposition to make the Government work hard, and we will do that. We intend to demonstrate to the people of South Australia that we are capable as an alternative Government. We will give the people the opportunity to participate in the democratic process by offering them a way to exercise their right as citizens and to strike back at the Government that oppresses them. We recognize the specific issues facing the community: increased taxes, education and consumer protection problems, pollution, and unemployment. We will make life exciting for the future generations of the State. We will "turn on" the people of the State, offering ourselves as an alternative Government and as the Party that built the State into what it is today. We will show the people that we have the manpower to put South Australia back on the map.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the motion, which was so ably moved by the member for Elizabeth, whom I congratulate on a job well done. As I believe this is the last occasion on which he will speak in an Address in Reply debate, I honour him for the long years of service he has given to Parliament and to the people in his district. I congratulate His Excellency on the way he presented the Speech to us and on his appointment as Governor of South Australia. It is pleasing to us that at last we have a man born in South Australia now in the highest office of the State. I also congratulate the Government on the legislation of which notice is given in the Speech. It is a continuation of the Labor Government's programme to implement the policy given by our Leader in the 1970 election campaign.

I join with other members who have spoken in the debate in expressing my condolences to the relatives of our late fellow members, principally those of the former member for Stuart (Lin Riches), whom I knew personally for many years, who served this Parliament honourably and well, and who enjoyed towards the end of his term in the House the

high honour of Speakership. I also join with other members in expressing my condolences to the relatives of the late Bill Quirke, who was a member of this House for many years and with whom I had dealings in my former term in Parliament when he was Minister of Lands. I had a very happy relationship with Bill Quirke when he was a Minister. I also join with other members in expressing my condolences to the relatives of the late George Bockelberg, who, although he did not make many speeches in the House, was well liked by all members, and I have no doubt that he was highly regarded in the District of Eyre. I also join with other members in expressing my condolences to the relatives of the late Bill Robinson, who for many years served honourably and well in another place.

I also wish to express appreciation in regard to another friend of mine, namely, the late Bill Vogt, who served in a very responsible capacity on the Citrus Organization Committee and who passed away suddenly only a few months ago after giving very conscientious service to the citrus industry.

With special regard to the problems besetting the industries in the District of Chaffey, I refer particularly to the citrus industry, which over the past several years has gone through troubled times. Unfortunately, as the industry's troubles have not yet been resolved, considerable dissension exists within its various sections. At present, I, together with many other responsible people closely connected with the industry, am at a loss to know what further action can be taken to resolve the differences which have created such a fragmentation of the industry and which have led to a further deterioration in the income returned to the growers for the work they put in.

In the past 18 months the C.O.C., which has carried out its responsibilities in an admirable manner, has performed an excellent service, particularly during the 1971 marketing season, in a manner that has brought some stability to the industry. Nevertheless, as the committee's efforts were not acceptable to various sections of the industry, further fragmentation has taken place. I, along with many other people, have in recent months been endeavouring to bring some unity to the industry to return it to an economic basis, but this unfortunately has not taken place. The resultant fragmentation and the disunity that exists in the industry at present have resulted in unco-ordinated marketing, especially concerning terminal markets, for example, metropolitan markets and especially that

market in Melbourne, where unco-ordinated forwardings of fruit have overloaded the market and prices have consequently been reduced to such a level that it is no longer a paying proposition for growers to forward fruit to that market. The Adelaide market is the only one which the Citrus Organization Committee has any control over and it has been operating in recent months through an agreement between the Citrus Organization Committee and the packers and merchants who handle the produce in the market. There is currently every indication that that form of agreement is likely to break down and once again chaos will take over in the marketing of citrus fruit on the Adelaide market. In January last there was a poll of growers under the Citrus Industry Organization Act as to whether a levy should be imposed on growers as a means of paying for the operations of their statutory body. Unfortunately, that poll resulted in a negative decision, although I believe that the poll was rejected principally because of the confusion that had been created by the various sections of the citrus industry which wished to preserve their own interests at any cost. As a result of the rejection for an acreage levy, I took it on myself to call a series of meetings in the first week of February. I called together the various sections, first, the co-operative packers, at the second meeting the private packers, and at a third meeting, representatives of grower organizations. Unfortunately, no clear picture of what was required by the industry as a whole emerged from those meetings. One point which did clearly stand out from the meetings and which was adamantly held by all sections was that they did require the Citrus Organization Committee to continue as the statutory authority. However, they were fairly divided on what functions that committee should perform and what should be its duties and responsibilities. During the past few months, the Citrus Organization Committee has continued to provide a marketing service for those who require it, and it is quite willing to meet any requests by other sections of the industry or services required.

However, the term of office of the present members of the committee, who were appointed in January, 1970, is due to expire in January next year, and as there is no clear picture at present of what form the committee should take, how the members should be elected or appointed, or just what the growers require, I am now in process of preparing a letter and a questionnaire to be sent to all sections of the

citrus industry and to be distributed as widely as possible in an effort to find out what the industry wants and how it can be organized so that it will be put on a sound financial basis in future.

In the past few weeks the canning fruits industry has received a good deal of publicity. The principal problem facing the industry is the build-up of stocks of canned fruit over and above what the normal market outlets have been able to absorb. To give some idea of how serious the situation is, I shall quote from a circular distributed to shareholders of the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited dated July 12, 1972. It states:

It is with the gravest concern for the future viability of the canned deciduous fruit industry, and in particular that of the State of South Australia, that your directors consider, as a matter of urgency, you be fully informed of relevant matters contributing to its current economic instability.

The financial depression which has engulfed the industry traces back to November 1967, when a decision was taken by the Australian Government, not to align the Australian currency to sterling, which had been subjected to a devaluation of approximately 14.3 per cent. Whilst such a decision may have generally benefited our secondary industries, it was calamitous for primary industries, and precipitated a relentless decline in both the profitability and financial stability of our industry.

The Federal Government in its wisdom, elected to provide some form of compensation, but only for primary industries, which could prove demonstrable and unavoidable financial losses. The basis adopted for payment of compensation was therefore most unrealistic, because of its restriction of entitlement and enforced short term duration. Your company suffered an initial loss estimated at \$250,000 because of such repressive action by the Federal Government. Having been confronted with the disastrous effect such a decision had had on the industry, the Federal Government hastened to establish an inter-departmental committee consisting of representatives of Government agencies, growers organizations and canners associations, to inquire into the resultant continuing problems of the canned deciduous fruit industry. It is significant to note that in the ensuing three years following devaluation of sterling, net sales realizations were pegged at the 1967 level, and that legitimate increases in selling prices to equate cost increases were disallowed as such, and applied in immediate reduction in the applicable rate of devaluation compensation, thus burdening the canner with further substantial financial loss. In this period, cost increases were quite considerable and had to be absorbed by the industry without recourse.

I quote further from this circular because it is relevant to my point:

In addition to the insoluble problems resulting from unfavourable Government fiscal

policies, an alarming imbalance between production volume and economic market capacity became evident, and created an untenable surplus stock position. The proposal by Britain to enter the European Economic Community and sever preferential trade arrangements with Australia threatens to compound the problem to the insurmountable.

I quote further some proposals that have been made to overcome the long-term problem of over-production, in what has been referred to as the tree-pull programme:

Such a proposal which was submitted to the Commonwealth Government several months ago and subsequently subvented, although accepted by South Australia, has failed to obtain the unanimous support of the parties concerned, namely, State Governments and respective grower organizations.

It was announced last week by the Minister of Agriculture that South Australia had agreed to the proposal. After further discussion in Canberra last week by the departmental officers who will be concerned with the administration of the plan now accepted by the State Government, we hope it can be applied to the particular problems facing many fruitgrowers in South Australia. However, the immediate problem confronting the fruit canning industry is the disposal of the surplus supply of canning fruit that has built up in the last two seasons. I quote further from the circular:

Despite a significant reduction of 1,808,000 basic cartons in the 1972 season's production, for obvious reasons it would appear that the carry in stock at January 1, 1973, will exceed that of the previous year.

The situation is becoming such that, in view of the currency realignments that have taken place in the last 12 months, the competitive position of the Australian fruit-canning industry on the world markets has been jeopardized to such an extent that it will now need a remarkable change in the policy of the Commonwealth Government to either subsidize the sales of the surplus stock or do something other than it has done in the past to alleviate the problems of the canned fruit industry.

The other industry that has a great effect on the economic welfare of the district of Chaffey is the wine-grape growing and wine-making industry. This important industry produces, I believe, about 75 per cent of the total Australian production of wine and brandy. The industry had the very great disability of the wine excise tax thrust upon it by the 1970 Commonwealth Budget. Against all the advice offered by the industry, the Commonwealth Government decided to impose that tax. In this connection the member for Angas in the Commonwealth Parliament, Mr.

Giles, performed some fantastic gymnastics. I wish to quote the following letter to the editor published in the *River News* of June 29:

Sir,

In your paper dated 1/6/72 Mr. G. O'H. Giles, M.H.R. (Liberal, Angas), is quoted as having said that the Federal Government deserved congratulations for having reduced the wine excise by half. May I be permitted to put a different viewpoint before your readers?

On the day when the wine excise cut was announced in the House of Representatives, my colleague Mr. A. J. Grassby, M.H.R. (Labor, Riverina) moved an amendment that the wine excise should be abolished.

Mr. Giles voted against this amendment and spoke against it. All Liberal Party and Country Party representatives voted against it, leading to its defeat. All Labor members voted for abolition.

It was an extraordinary situation. The Government Leader in the House, Mr. (now Sir Reginald) Swartz had gagged Mr. Giles by moving that the motion for the half cut "be now put" though Mr. Giles had asked to be allowed to "continue briefly".

The Labor Opposition voted for Mr. Giles to be able to continue his speech. But Mr. Giles voted to gag himself. Here was a case then of the Chief Gagger being gagged (he is Government Assistant Whip in the House of Representatives)—and this partly by his own vote. This is substantiated by page 3146 of *Hansard*, setting forth events of the night of May 25.

Mr. Giles's record on this whole matter in Parliament this year comprises having voted against his own resolution on two occasions, abstaining once, voting against Mr. Grassby's resolution (even though it was based on his), and then voting to gag himself—surely a unique achievement!

Norman K. Foster,
M.H.R. for Sturt.

I can but echo the final words of that letter. It was truly a remarkable achievement by Mr. Giles, who was fighting so vigorously for his constituents on such a vital matter! I quote now from an article that appeared, again, in the *River News*, consisting of comments by Frank Chamberlain, a wellknown political commentator on the Macquarie radio network. The extracts, taken from talks on May 25 and 26 last, are as follows:

Congratulations to Mr. Al Grassby (Labor, Riverina) and Mr. Foster (Labor, South Australia) for their desperate effort to force wine excise imposition into debate by the Parliament before the recess. If you want any evidence of the discipline by the Government Parties, just look at this example of how wine-producing members were made to toe the line. The wine excise tax is one of the Government's biggest errors. The 11 Government members representing wine-producing districts know it. The Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Ian Sinclair) cannot get around it by mild compromises, or by pretending that

politics have been introduced into this matter by his critics.

Yesterday, as the House of Representatives was about to go into recess, Mr. Al Grassby from Griffith in the Riverina, N.S.W., did his best to force a debate. He was scorned by the Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. Sinclair (in an ill-mannered way, mind you). Mr. Foster from South Australia from the seat of Sturt, also tried to support Mr. Grassby. There is no reason why the 11 wine-growing area representatives in the Government benches could not have supported them for a debate. Truly we are told—the Government members do not have to stick to the Party line, but we know how much nonsense there is in that.

I have enumerated some of the problems besetting the fruitgrowing industries in the Chaffey District, and I stress these problems, because thinking people will realize that the basis of the district's economy rests on the welfare of these industries. If the industries concerned are on a sound economic basis, the people in the district can be employed at a reasonable level of income. Having discussed the three principal industries experiencing severe problems, I am sure that there is a need in the River districts for further diversification of production into other forms of primary industry. I advocated some years ago in this House some form of fodder production with the ultimate object of commencing the feed-lot fattening of cattle. Unfortunately, although there is no further issue of water licences for such an undertaking to be implemented, another problem in the River districts concerns the disposal of drainage effluent emanating from all the irrigation settlements.

I believe that we could well dispense with some, if not all, of this drainage effluent by re-using it in its raw form, without any treatment whatever, in the production of fodder, using salt-resistant plants. I know personally of the production of lucerne, which is very salt tolerant. I know of one gentleman who is producing good lucerne crops with flood irrigation by water as saline as 4,000 parts a million of totally dissolved salts. A test I had taken several years ago by Lands Department officers at outfall points of some of these principal drainage outlets showed that in some cases the salinity level of water being discharged into the evaporation basins was much lower than 4,000 parts a million. In some cases, it was down to as low as 150 parts a million at certain times of the year during the main irrigation period. This is one way in which I believe some good use can be made of this drainage water, which is creating many problems for

the Minister of Works as he endeavours to dispose of it without further polluting the Murray River, from which most of the State draws at least some of its water supply.

Over the past few years the tourist industry has developed considerably in the Riverland areas. The present Government has greatly assisted by providing subsidies to establish caravan parks and other amenities for the development of picnic areas at various spots along the river. The Government has also given much support to the definite proposal for the Waikerie Gliding Club to stage the 1974 world gliding championships.

Dr. Eastick: Plans are well advanced, too.

Mr. CURREN: I agree. Not only has the State Government provided financial support for this club but the Commonwealth Government has also supplied money for the upgrading of what was formerly the landing strip. This area has now been improved to allow a heavier type of aircraft to land. Waikerie is to be congratulated on its good fortune in receiving such financial support from both Governments.

Dr. Eastick: A lot of it is on their own initiative.

Mr. CURREN: The initiative of the Waikerie Gliding Club has meant that it will stage not only the world gliding championship in 1974 but also the Australian championship in 1973. Last year the Australian championship was held at Waikerie, too. The Waikerie Gliding Club deserves full credit for what it has achieved. It is one of the strongest gliding clubs in Australia both in its membership and its achievements. As I have already indicated, the State Government has given full support in the initial stages of preparation for the world gliding championships, and I know that an application has been made to the Government, through the Minister of Education, for additional support in the form of permission to use some of his department's facilities in Waikerie that will be required for the housing of the expected 1,000 competitors. The Government is giving every support and encouragement to the club in this important matter.

I briefly mention the great deal of trouble and worry which has upset the Opposition over recent months and which is causing much concern to many people, including the candidates who have been endorsed by the Liberal and Country League in the hope that they may join Opposition members here. Over the

past few months there has been much conniving in the corridors, whispering in the woodpile and stabbing in the back. In last weekend's edition of the *Sunday Mail* there was even some talk of a smear campaign.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Opposition knows all about smear campaigns.

Mr. CURREN: I agree. It is amazing that the Opposition should scream with regard to the smear campaign. It is interesting to note how the candidates are lining up. Some have declared themselves to be supporters of the Liberal Movement, whereas others have decided to stick with the stationary Liberals. However, what interests many people in the District of Chaffey is which camp is Peter Arnold in. The following article, headed "Seven undeterred" and appearing in the *Advertiser* of March 23, states what Peter Arnold had to say:

Fruitgrower Mr. P. Arnold said he had been looking forward to serving under Mr. Hall as member for Chaffey. "But naturally I will accept Dr. Eastick as Leader," he said. However, we need to take into account the manoeuvring of recent weeks. People in the District of Chaffey are right in asking which side the endorsed L.C.L. candidate, Mr. Arnold, is on.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You aren't commenting on speculative press reports!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Chaffey.

Mr. CURREN: I have been reliably informed that Mr. Arnold's sympathies lie with Steele Hall. I believe this, because at present a batch of red wine stored in Peter's cellar belongs to Steele Hall, and I further believe they are good mates. Like many other people in Chaffey I should like to know which side Peter is on. Like many people, I believe that he belongs to the Liberal Movement. I believe also that he, like all other members opposite and all other candidates who have declared themselves, should do likewise.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why not speak about your district?

Mr. CURREN: I am normally a very kind-hearted chap, and in this matter my concern is on behalf of my constituents, the people I represent, and I care not on which side of the political fence they sit. Many people in Chaffey are concerned about this matter almost to the point of having a nervous breakdown. Indeed, I am looking after the welfare of my constituents by pressing for this matter to be brought to a head in Chaffey.

Mr. McAnaney: Which one do you think you can beat?

Mr. CURREN: In 1962 I deposed a King, and, again in 1965, I kept him off the throne. Unfortunately, in 1968 I was deposed myself, but I returned the compliment in May, 1970, and have every confidence that I will once again in 1973 receive a vote of confidence from the electors of Chaffey.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I find it a little difficult to compose my thoughts adequately after having heard the ins and outs of politics from the previous speaker, but I thank him for the great trouble to which he went considering the difficulty he had in explaining all those matters to members on this side. I should also like to congratulate members on this side, the Opposition, on the especially fine way in which they have kept the House tonight. Looking at the other side, the Government benches, the members whose responsibility it is to keep this House, I can say there were no more than seven or eight Government members in the House at a time.

Mr. Wardle: They varied in number from three to six.

Dr. TONKIN: As the honourable member says, they varied from three to six. It is with pleasure that I congratulate His Excellency on the way he delivered his Speech. I wish him and Lady Oliphant well and I am sorry indeed that it was as a result of the death of his predecessor, Sir James Harrison, that he came to that office. We have been fortunate in South Australia in having had Governors who have shown a keen interest in all aspects of the life of this State and who have kept themselves well informed on all matters affecting South Australia. I believe that Sir Mark Oliphant will show himself to be well worthy of the tradition that has been laid down by previous Governors.

I extend condolences to the relatives of former members of this Parliament who have died since the House last met. I extend (because although I may have this opportunity personally at a later stage, I may not have it in this House) my good wishes to those members who are retiring at the end of the session. Particularly I would like to mention, if I may, the honourable member for Goyder, who has been, especially to me, a tremendous help and a source of advice, always sound, and whose interest and help I have valued very much indeed.

Various items in the Governor's Speech draw members' attention. His Excellency referred to the Juvenile Courts Act and I, as I am sure do all members, look forward to

the results of the first year of operation of this legislation. With the establishment of juvenile aid panels and assessment centres, we should see exactly how far this experiment will work, and I believe it will work very well.

Once again, however, at the risk of being repetitious (although this is the first time I have said it this session) I sincerely hope the Attorney-General will never again take the step of suppressing a report. There is a fallacy, which I think has crept into the thinking of the Government, that, once the legislation has been passed and the juvenile aid panels and assessment centres have been or are being set up, we will automatically get results.

Society has a right to protection, and it is no good saying that, because we have passed the Juvenile Courts Act, we will have no more difficulty with juveniles and that we will just treat them and send them back into society. We must remember, and keep very strongly in mind, that those young people who are totally alienated from society in many cases still need restraint, and they must have this restraint until treatment has been successful. They must not be allowed to go out into the community until they are ready to do so.

I am disturbed at the reported abscondings from the McNally Training Centre and the recent riots at Vaughan House. I take the opportunity of wishing the head of staff of Vaughan House a speedy recovery from the serious injury she sustained some time ago in the course of her duties. I pay a tribute to the work of the staff in both those institutions and all the other institutions of the Community Welfare Department. I repeat that society must be protected against young people who are alienated, and young people must be protected against themselves until the measures in this Bill are used successfully in treating them and returning them to society.

Another item on which I must comment, and which has been dealt with by the member for Mitcham, is the Modbury Hospital. It is good to hear that it will open early next year. I had almost forgotten about it, in fact; it seemed to have dropped from sight. I remember very vividly, as does the member for Mitcham, how a bulldozer moved on to the site. I think, from memory, it was the morning of the A.L.P. policy speech, so that the Premier was able to say that in fact work had commenced.

However, I am terribly disturbed and upset to hear that it is not to be a teaching hospital. This is contrary to every undertaking that was given at the time the hospital was

planned. It was planned as an annex to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and to provide additional facilities for the training of medical students and nurses; indeed, this was the entire justification for it. Of course, it was said by some people that the only justification for the Modbury Hospital was to make quite sure that the member for Tea Tree Gully remained the member for Tea Tree Gully, and I believe that events have proved this amply true. All we have done is build a community hospital—nothing more. Of course we shall have trouble in finding staff. As it is not a training hospital, no house surgeon will be interested in taking up a position there, for his service at that hospital will not count towards his experience for a higher degree. If the Government had wished to provide services at a much lower cost, I believe it should have got to work and supported the North-Eastern Community Hospital when it was first planned instead of building what looks very much at present like a white elephant. I am sorry and sad to have to say that.

Dr. Eastick: How many beds will it open with?

Dr. TONKIN: I believe 20. Unless the staff can be found to keep this hospital running and to expand it, what is the good of the building? We may just as well move hospital beds into this Chamber. I am disappointed at this hospital, but this is another occasion on which time has proved the truth of past events. I am cheered, of course, by the knowledge that the Flinders Medical School and hospital is finally under way. That was a little more than a Highways Department bulldozer moving on to the site. In fact, because of the dry weather that so many people in the country complained of, all the earthworks and bulldozing of that site were completed in record time. I can only say that I look forward greatly to medical graduates appearing in the early 1980's, and we may at least be sure that the university, not the Government, will not allow this to become just another community hospital. I am looking forward to the report of the Committee of Inquiry on Health Services in this State. I do so with some degree of a proprietary interest because I think I may have been responsible for some part of the motivation for its establishment.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're too modest.

Dr. TONKIN: Credit where credit is due! Much valuable material has been submitted to that committee and a great deal of work has

gone into the submissions from interested members of the community. The thanks of the Government and of this Parliament are owed to all those people who have worked so hard to further the interests of health in South Australia. I am sure their work will not be in vain. Let me say how much we all appreciate the work of Mr. Justice Bright, the Chairman of that committee. We look forward with great expectations to his report later this year.

Speaking of health and the fitness of the community, I believe that we as a Parliament have always been interested in the physical fitness of the people: as witness the many playing areas in the park lands, the sports fields and the activities of the National Fitness Council—although it is unfortunate, as members know, that the large sums that have been given to the National Fitness Council to administer will no longer appear, according to the last Budget. I intend to speak a little more about the park lands later. Many people watch sport—Australian Rules football, soccer, tennis, cricket, netball, hockey, baseball, and many other types of sport. It is a pity that people watch rather than participate, but many people do participate in sport. I should like to see (I was disappointed that there was no mention of it in the Governor's Speech) some practical help for sport. Particularly I believe this applies in the field of umpiring. The umpire or referee, whatever his title, occupies an important position in any game. Perhaps I may, with no disrespect, liken him to the Speaker in Parliament, who ensures that the rules and Standing Orders are complied with and rules on decisions and doubts. He has tremendous responsibility resting on his shoulders.

The standard of the game depends on the umpire. Further, the outcome of the game (perhaps unlike the position you hold, Sir) certainly can depend on him. For example, in football we are all familiar with the tendency the umpire has to award all the frees against our own team in the goal square of the opposing team and to award all frees going the other way in the back lines! In that game an incorrect decision can, of course, be psychologically damaging to a team, and I think a poorly controlled game can lead directly to some of the appalling football injuries that we have read about recently. I must say that I prepared this part of my speech before we heard the news of the injuries sustained in the last week or so here and in other States. I must admit that almost every Saturday after

watching the football I come home saying, "I did not think very much of the umpire today" if we lost, but I come home saying, "The umpiring was not so bad" if we won.

Although it is a bit of a joke and although some people seem to go to the football purely to criticize the umpire, something ought to be said about this. About 40,000 people watch the football every week in this State and 760,000 people have watched it so far this year. All those people expect a fair standard of umpiring. Those figures relate only to football, but there are many other games, and my comments about the standard of umpiring apply to all sports. No-one expects an umpire to be perfect, because errors of judgment can be made and are made, and they must be expected. League football is a fast game and the umpire must watch many facets of play. Further, the players develop techniques to confuse the umpire. How often have we heard the comment "Give him an Oscar." I am concerned that league football umpires in this State do not enjoy the highest reputation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I believe that the Government can take an active part in doing something about this if it wants to do so. We have not yet seen established a Ministry of Sport, although I believe that the member for Unley was seriously considered for that portfolio at one stage. The move is not impossible or impractical. If we are not to see such a Ministry established, perhaps we should ensure that umpires are thoroughly trained and that the Government makes a grant available to improve the standard of umpiring not only in football but in all sports. I believe that this is doubly important since we are about to have football pools and Totalizator Agency Board betting on the football. This worries me particularly because it will make the umpire's job doubly difficult; he will be especially susceptible once legal betting takes place.

The Government has the power to make funds available to subsidize the South Australian National Football League if necessary to ensure that the umpires' coach is paid what he should be paid. Although some tend to take this matter lightly and in a one-eyed way, I still believe that it is a point that we must think about seriously. I do not look forward to the introduction of betting on league football. Perhaps any of the proceeds that come from betting on football could be put into a fund to support and look after some of the victims of the vicious attacks we have seen

and to look after injured players generally, and that is a suggestion that I put forward, too.

Following my remarks on football and sporting events generally, I must inevitably progress to the park lands. Just because they are called park lands, there seems to be some sort of misconception in parts of the community that they are car parks. I was pleased indeed to hear of the Government's decision announced earlier today (and I have no doubt at all that the Minister of Environment and Conservation had a finger in this pie) that it intended to disallow by-law 73, which was passed by the Adelaide City Council in relation to parking in the park lands. I must admit that I was slightly surprised to hear this, as it came from the Minister of Roads and Transport. I thought he had a rather sickly smile on his face when he referred to this, and I suddenly realized that he was wearing his other hat (that of Minister of Local Government). I am sure that, as Minister of Roads and Transport, he would be tempted indeed to allow as much parking in the park lands as he could.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Shame on you.

Dr. TONKIN: Well, it is one simple way that I can see of his deferring consideration of the tremendous problems of public transport that now face this State.

Mr. Hopgood: Who wants to defer them?

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously the Minister of Roads and Transport does, because he has done precisely nothing, other than talk and call for reports and committees. We have got nothing at all from him, and there has been no activity whatsoever. However, this time wiser counsels have prevailed, and I think one must praise and acknowledge the activities of three extremely dedicated young women who have had much to do with this decision. They have been called various things (cranks and crackpots), but they have been absolutely dedicated to their job, as they see it, of preserving the park lands for our citizens and their children. Mrs. Gillian Llewellyn, Mrs. Jennifer Walker and Mrs. Margaret Doley have between them collected over 48,000 signatures in, I understand, just over three weeks, and they have done this all themselves. They describe themselves as ordinary housewives, but I think they are selling themselves short: I think they are extraordinary housewives who should be thanked, for the community owes them a debt of gratitude. I am pleased that their activities, and the activities of the council in proposing this by-law, have again brought into

prominence the whole matter of the park lands. We take the park lands for granted; we are often told that they are part of Adelaide's heritage, and schoolchildren are taught how Colonel Light planned them. As with all other heritages, they must be guarded and, if we take the park lands for granted, it is likely that they will be susceptible to attack (not a frontal attack but an attack by gradual infiltration). If any firm or massive onslaught were made on the park lands the community would be up in arms, and rightly so. However, what has been happening and what could happen in the future is the piecemeal take-over and alienation of the park lands. As I have said, the park lands are there to be used as park lands and not as car parks.

I am the first to pay a tribute to the work of the Adelaide City Council, its members past and present, and its officers. I suppose that the late Mr. Veale immediately comes to mind. These gentlemen have worked miracles in transforming what was a dry area of grassed plain (and sometimes it was brown and not so grassed) into a beautiful expanse of green park lands, with lakes, fountains, rose gardens and playing areas.

Mr. Wardle: The area now irrigated is 350 acres.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. The council has been instrumental in bringing to life what must have been an important part of Colonel Light's vision. I have no doubt that the council will continue in this programme, and I hope it does. However, I wonder whether it is not now time to change the programme a little. We must bear in mind our lack of water, and the lack of rain in the early months of this year brought this to the fore. One wonders whether the present programme of providing lawns and deciduous trees is the right one to be continued for the whole area. I noticed the following paragraph in one of the letters that I think all members received:

There is no tree in the park lands more than 18 years old. In the past five years the council has planted almost 12,000 trees and shrubs as a continuing improvement to the environment. It will continue to implement a vigorous tree planting programme.

I think that is a fine, worthy and wonderful programme to follow, but I wonder whether it is exactly what we want. Perhaps we should have areas of gum trees and natural scrub. Admittedly there is not a big area where this could be done, but perhaps we could find areas where it would be possible. We want native trees which can withstand the climate

and which do not need a high rainfall. If we did this it might not be necessary to have tape recordings of native bird calls available at the push of buttons, with models of those birds perched high in a tree where they are not easy to find.

By all means let us have tape recordings of bird calls, as it is good for young people to hear these. Let us also have models of the birds. People should hear the calls and see the models so that they can learn to recognize the birds by their plumage and calls. However, fundamentally we should provide the sort of environment so that children may see for themselves exactly what the Australian bush life is like and recognize in this way the birds and their calls. Is native bird life so extinct in Adelaide in our park lands that we must erect a monument, casting the birds in plaster models and commemorating their calls in tape recordings? I hope not. It is a sorry comment on the present state of affairs. Unless we preserve our park lands and recreate the environment we may not see those birds any more near Adelaide. A comforting thought is that I am reliably informed that a kookaburra was heard laughing in the northern park lands this morning. I cannot entirely agree that a separate trust should be appointed to administer the park lands, because I consider that the council, which holds the park lands in trust, has done a good job overall. I think that its record speaks for itself, once again as set out in a letter that all members have received.

I think the council would also agree that it has only just begun to consider areas that will have to be investigated. If we ignore that portion between North Terrace and the Torrens Reserve (and that includes areas of land coming up from the Adelaide Gaol, the Police Barracks, the railway reserve and station, Parliament House, Government House, the university buildings, the Museum, the Art Gallery and the Royal Adelaide Hospital—I do not classify the Botanic Gardens as being an alienation of the park lands—the Engineering and Water Supply Department's depot), and the Municipal Tramways Trust bus station, the Electricity Trust's substation and the water tanks, all these things have crept into the park lands over the years and have come to be taken for granted. We have come to accept the fact that because they are there, they belong there. We should ask ourselves: how did they get there and who gave permission for them to be there? We should consider the future of the West Terrace

cemetery. Should its activities continue and be allowed to expand?

Mr. Wardle: There's little activity there.

Dr. TONKIN: Of course! There are areas behind the cemetery of which I am sure the council is not very proud. I think we need a long-term plan aimed at getting all these things sorted out and eventually moved out of the park lands, which should be returned for the enjoyment of the people for whom they were intended. Perhaps an advisory committee should be appointed, which would serve a similar purpose as outlined in the petition, because such a committee would be of great help. The number of signatures on the petition does credit to the three determined young women and shows the degree of concern that exists in the community. Obviously, the people of South Australia hold their park lands dear.

I believe the public has come to accept periodic parking as it has arisen without thinking of its long-term effects. Many people predicted that, when parking of any kind was first introduced into the park lands, it would be the first step in the door for the wider use of the park lands, and this has proved to be correct. One of the reasons given by the council for the introduction of its by-law was that it would legalize the present position regarding parking. In other words, the areas used for parking have gradually become extended and, having become accepted by usage, a larger area is approved of, and there is nothing to say that such a practice will not continue. A paved area immediately south of the south gates of the Adelaide Oval until recently (by that I mean until this matter came before public notice) was being used for daily parking at a 20c charge. One council cannot commit a subsequent council to a course of action. I wonder whether the definition of "special occasion" when car parking is allowed, would continue to remain the same or whether it would gradually change and become accepted as meaning something wider. I am sure that the Minister of Environment and Conservation would agree that we must regard any form of car parking in quantity on park lands as a purely temporary measure. Indeed, it must be that. True, it is convenient to be able to park near the Adelaide Oval or the racecourse to attend a function, and I am sure the Adelaide City Council appreciates the income, but I believe that this must be a temporary measure only. The need is there only because of an unattractive and inefficient public transport system. It is high time the Minister

started to put forward some ideas, and I hope that we will hear of these.

A Director of Transport has now been appointed and perhaps we will have some progress. However, there appears to have been no progress at all. Indeed, the Municipal Tramways Trust continues to lose revenue and lose custom and I am not surprised, because the trust is not keeping up with the needs of the people. The whole concept of public transport must change. Car registrations are still increasing by about 4 per cent annually and we are doing nothing to cope with this increased number of vehicles. We are going to run out of time. This inactivity from the Minister may well be because of a lollypop being saved up for the next elections and, as in the same way that we may be getting filtered water if we vote the right way, perhaps we are going to get a fantastically good transport system if we vote the right way at the next elections. Perhaps the Minister is not saying anything about this matter because it is getting too close to election time which, after all, is only about eight months away.

Mr. Mathwin: What about dial-a-bus?

Dr. TONKIN. We have heard little about the dial-a-bus system and I suspect that that will continue to be so. If the Minister does have some sound solutions to improve our transport systems—I am glad he has returned to the Chamber—perhaps we will hear about them before the next election. If he is saving them up, he is playing politics and he has no right whatever to do that. Honourable members have received a letter from a Mrs. Barbara Carter concerning the public transport system and I wish particularly to quote the last paragraph of her letter, with which I agree. It is as follows:

It distresses me to see our city deteriorating because the City Council accommodates more cars, and I am deeply worried that our children are growing up in an increasingly polluted environment where they are more likely to be killed in widened roads built to take more and faster cars. I hope an inquiry will be instigated so that our bus services will be upgraded and parking in the city and on the park lands will cease to be a problem.

She has hit the nail on the head. If we had a more attractive public transport system and a more efficient one, which people would want to use, we would not have to worry about parking on the park lands.

Mr. Hopgood: If she had a legible signature I would not have sent the reply to Mr. Carter.

Dr. TONKIN: I hesitate in any way to advertise, but if the honourable member is in such dire straits I should be happy to help him at any time.

Mr. Hopgood: My secretary had the same trouble.

Dr. TONKIN: We have got to tackle the problem of the motor car in the city. We must upgrade our public transport. We must attract shoppers to the city. I support the remarks of the member for Glenelg when he says that shopping conditions could be better. In almost every city in Europe now there is a motor-car-free area, a pedestrian zone, a füssengänger zone, a zone where people can walk without having to worry about cars.

In most of the cities I visited, underground railways were being built. If they already existed they were being extended; if they did not exist they were being built. I was pleased indeed to see a report recently that the Minister is in favour of an underground system.

Mr. Venning: You should have taken the Minister with you.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sure the member for Rocky River would have joined us with great pleasure, but I am not sure whether we would have returned with the Minister of Roads and Transport. I believe these are pleasant shopping conditions. I think the fears of the Rundle Street traders that they may lose business are groundless. By and large every report I had from these areas showed that business had improved and had increased following the introduction of these very pleasant zones. I shall not go into the pronunciation of the word "mall". I think honourable members know what I mean.

I should like to deal briefly with the subject of Adelaide's water supply. In the past I have asked several questions, and I have received numerous complaints. I have not taken to writing my notes on bark parchment, as may appear from the sheet I hold in my hand, but I find it very useful to write on. It tells me, reading from my notes, that this filter paper—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot offer it as an exhibit.

Dr. TONKIN: Not at all. I am using it. It has a note to say that it was installed on April 25, 1972, and was removed on May 5, 1972. Because I cannot exhibit it in any way I would say that it is the colour of a dark chocolate and it looks as if it has been soaking in coffee grounds for that period.

Mr. Clark: It looks like the parchment used by King Solomon in the olden days.

Dr. TONKIN: That is another way to describe it. I do not think anyone would pretend that Adelaide's water supply is aesthetically beautiful; we can eat it. I shall go through the history of the matter. Honourable members will recall that before the last election, which was based predominantly on the issue of water, it was said that Adelaide's water supply would be filtered. This was part of the policy statement of the Liberal and Country League delivered by the member for Gouger, then the Premier. It was pooh-pooed as a suggestion: it would never work, it would cost too much money, the people of South Australia would not stand for it.

Mr. Clark: They didn't, either. They turned it down.

Dr. TONKIN: Members on this side have asked several questions on this topic. The next thing that was said was that Adelaide's water supply may be dirty, it may be filthy, it may look like chocolate, but it is perfectly safe. The Minister corrected me earlier this week and said he had not made three public announcements. I am prepared to accept that, but I say that three public announcements have been made since the Labor Party has been in office that Adelaide's water supply will, may or probably will be filtered. I understand from the Minister that he did not make any of these announcements or, if he did, he made only the last one, not the first two, and although apparently some newspaper put out front page stories to this effect, the Minister did not really intend this at all. I wonder.

The significant thing about the last announcement, which was made recently, is that for the first time the Minister said that the filtration of Adelaide's water supply would have to be made on the grounds of safety. This is a complete reversal, for we have been reassured time and time again that, although the water is filthy, it is safe; but now the Government is worried about safety.

Mr. Hopgood: At present.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the member for Mawson has come in with "At present", because that was going to be my very next phrase—"at present". Since the member for Mawson apparently knows so much about this, perhaps he will be prepared to tell the House, later, if he has an opportunity, just when is "at present" and when "at present" ends. I am disturbed about this. In answer to a question that I asked last week, the Minister said that the danger, or potential danger, to Adelaide's water supply, lay in the amount of

suspended organic solid. This, of course, is a well-known hazard in water supplies because it is suspended organic solid that leads to the added growth of micro-organisms, viruses, bacteria and amoebae.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You have already caused enough trouble talking about all that.

Dr. TONKIN: And I will cause more trouble if a move is not made by the Government that should be made. I will keep on talking about it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Be a little more responsible about it.

Dr. TONKIN: We are told that Adelaide's water supply may be dangerous because of the presence of suspended organic solid. The member for Stuart presented a petition signed by people who were worrying about the same thing occurring in the water main that supplies his area. The great danger there is the presence of suspended organic solids, together with amoebae causing meningo-encephalitis. It seems to me that the Government is failing tremendously in its responsibility to the community when it says to the people of Adelaide, "We will filter your water, which is potentially dangerous, but we will do it only if you elect us at the next election." That is what is being said. The Government has no intention of filtering the water that flows through the Morgan-Whyalla main. I should have thought that this was even more important and that the petition presented recently by the member for Stuart would highlight this need. We are told that the Government has no intention, either before or after the next election, of filtering that water.

Mr. Harrison: What were you doing in the last two or three years before you went out of office?

Dr. TONKIN: I have kept much more up to date with scientific developments as regards amoebae than has the vocal member now interjecting. I have been accused of stirring, and I will keep on stirring because I believe the Government has a moral responsibility to get that water filtered. To say that suspended organic solids can be flushed out of the main by the use of chlorine is just so much nonsense. The Minister ought to know better and, if he does not know better, he ought to get some better advice. In spite of all the fuss that this appears to be causing, I believe that the Government has a moral duty to filter the water, and it is about time it recognized the potential danger to the communities in the Mid North.

Mr. Clark: For how long has this been necessary?

Dr. TONKIN: Members opposite show a lamentable lack of knowledge.

Mr. Harrison: You had better talk to Dr. Anderson.

Dr. TONKIN: If the honourable member talked to Dr. Anderson he probably would not be able to make head or tail of what he heard, but that is not his fault. This matter should not be viewed as an election gimmick; we must label the Labor Party's record as poor in connection with our water supply. Now that something can be done the Government refuses to do it. South Australian scientists have isolated the amoeba, the causative factor in amoebic meningitis, which affects people, at the end of a main. The Government must take note of the work done, yet it has no plans whatever to filter the water in the main. Lives could depend on this. The Government should recognize the potential danger. If the water is not safe in the main in the summer, surely that is where filtration should take place. As long as there is any doubt at all, something must be done about it. I should like to see a central filtration plant situated at the point of intake of the water. I should like to see a plant treating the water, and I should like to see treated water being put into the main.

If the skilled engineers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department cannot come up with an answer (and I am sure they can) they should seek information from Humboldts of Cologne, Citra of Paris, and the Degrement firm, which are concerned with the installation of water purification systems. I am sure that our engineers have seen plans for such systems and are well aware of their capabilities. They are expensive, but it depends on what value one puts on human life.

I shall not say much about the nurses memorial centre, but I still believe it is a shabby deal that the proposed site should be changed and that the nurses should be offered participation in a development scheme under terms that they cannot possibly accept. How on earth can the nurses hope to accept a proposal connected with a 12-storey apartment block? They have been offered a strata title for three floors. Twelve other sites have been mentioned, but the owners of 10 of the sites do not even know the Government has its eyes on them and some are already the subject of redevelopment plans. I can imagine what would happen if the nurses, having moved from one site to another site because of Government acquisition, then had to move to another site,

which might then be acquired. One can imagine what the nurses are beginning to say about the way they are thought of: I think it is a confidence trick—a pretty shabby deal. I come now to one last matter and I refer to two speeches I made in this House previously (in 1970). I quote from the speech I made during the second reading debate on the Dangerous Drugs Act Amendment Bill, as follows:

The position today is extremely disturbing. Statistics in regard to this matter are hard to obtain. One can be alternatively optimistic, when one hears that drugs are not really a problem in the community, and very pessimistic, when one hears that they are a tremendous problem in the community, because these views vary as they are stated in television programmes, in newspaper articles and in other ways through the mass media. As I have said, reliable statistics are extremely difficult to obtain. The patterns that apply in the development of drug dependence overseas are very much beginning to be followed in Australia and South Australia, and this is most disturbing.

The second quotation is from remarks I made during the Address in Reply debate, as follows:

I am afraid that here there is a "head in the sand" attitude that is all too common. It is said, "It cannot happen here," and, "It cannot happen in our community." I am sure that it can happen in our community and it is beginning to happen in our community now, and the pattern is being repeated. It is alarming to be told that we should accept marijuana as a way of life because it is no more addictive and no more harmful than alcohol; but, except in extremely few instances, young offenders appearing before juvenile courts who are drug dependants have begun their career as drug dependants on marijuana. Almost without exception they graduated from the same source and the same supplier and were actively encouraged and pushed on to hard drugs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not in any way intend to say "I told you so"; that would be presumptuous. However, I have every evidence (and it

disturbs me greatly) that the drug problem is still increasing in this State, and I am horrified to find that it is following the same pattern that it has followed in North America and in the Eastern States. I ask that the people of this State take the problem seriously and that they not forget that it exists. Because we no longer hear as much about it as we did, we should not think that the problem does not exist, for it does exist and, in addition, there is evidence now that the big criminal combines (and the member for Hanson referred to the Mafia) are involved, that the situation is now being highly organized, and that a severe attack is being mounted on our way of life.

I know that the Government is undertaking education programmes in schools. I know that

many voluntary organizations and individuals are giving their time to speak to young people and to other organizations, and I ask, without criticizing in any way, that the Government do everything in its power to step up the actions currently being taken against drug dependence in this State. Everything I have said in my other speeches on this subject applies even more now. I feel strongly that if we are not careful our way of life as we know it will be destroyed.

Mr. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 26, at 2 p.m.