

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

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

LIQUID FUEL (RATIONING) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

The Hon. L. J. KING presented a petition signed by 37,416 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 The petitioners prayed that the present abortion laws be repealed and that legislation be introduced by which the right to life of the unborn child and of the mother would be safeguarded.

Mr. RYAN presented a similar petition signed by 17 persons.

Mr. CURREN presented a similar petition signed by 26 persons.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

PETROL SHORTAGE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, say what action the Government has taken to inform the public and individual police officers adequately of the implications and responsibilities involved in the Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Act, which passed this House last evening? There is the community much disquiet at the announcement in the media about the implications of police action or the police powers conferred by section 16 of the Act. At 8.45 a.m. this morning a very senior member of the Police Force, when approached on this matter, could not indicate that he had any knowledge of the responsibilities of the police in the matter and, therefore, he could not tell the person inquiring of the manner of approach or the manner of future activities. The problems involved in sections 16 and 21 of the Act were canvassed last evening, and these sections received the majority support of this House and another House. I do not deny that but, because ignorance of the facts can be a very serious problem in the community, I ask the Deputy Premier whether any direct action has been taken to inform members of the public of their responsibilities and the responsibilities of the police.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The first thing I want to tell the Leader is that it does

not surprise me that at about 9 o'clock this morning a senior police officer did not know exactly what his duties or the duties of policemen generally were in this matter, because the Act under which they will operate became an Act of Parliament at only about 11 o'clock last evening. I do know that the Commissioner of Police would have taken appropriate action to get copies of the Act and to study it. The Government has given no direction to the Commissioner as to how the Police Force will act in this matter: I want to make that perfectly clear. The police will be required to study the Act and, as is the case with any other law, to administer the law as contained in the Act. I do not know whether the Leader expects me to outline certain circumstances as to when the police may prosecute. The Leader has said rightly that the matter was canvassed in this House last evening, and certain examples were properly cited. Possibly, it will be a day or so before the entire Police Force is fully informed of what action—

Dr. Eastick: Will there be an advertisement?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take the matter up with the Chief Secretary to see whether he considers it necessary to confer with the Commissioner on whether this is required. I think the Attorney-General appeared on a television programme today, and doubtless he was questioned closely and replied to such questions. That was one means of getting this information across to the public. I assure the Leader that we will take every action possible to see that sufficient publicity is given to the likely attitudes and the way the police will enforce the law, but I will take the matter up with the Chief Secretary urgently to see what can be done. As to informing the general public of the provisions of the Act, press releases have been drawn up by the Minister responsible for the Act (the Minister of Labour and Industry) and issued to all country radio and television stations as well as to the country press. This press release indicates where permits can be obtained, the duration of the permits, and what are the categories that can apply for permits, and details of other matters contained in the Act. I am sure that the Minister of Labour and Industry would be happy to make a copy of that press release available to all members.

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Marine say whether the oil tanker which has been moored off Port Stanvac has yet been berthed? It is reported in this morning's press that

this tanker could have been berthed on the 7 o'clock tide this morning, but that the Seamen's Union had refused to handle the vessel, thus delaying the unloading of this vital fuel. As I understood that the next suitable tide was at 1 p.m. today, I ask the Minister whether agreement has been reached regarding the berthing of the vessel today so that this fuel can be made available to Port Stanvac to ease the present critical position.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Premier has made representations this morning to the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. Hawke) and also to the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council of South Australia (Mr. Shannon). Following those representations, submissions were made to a meeting of seamen in Adelaide and the Seamen's Union agreed to handle that ship. It was intended that they berth the ship on the 1 p.m. tide—

Mr. Coumbe: If the weather permitted that—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —if the weather allowed. I do not know at this point in time whether the vessel has berthed.

Mr. Hall: It hasn't.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is all the information I have. However, I take this opportunity to commend the Premier for the magnificent work he has done in this matter. He has not spared himself, either during the day or during the night, in trying to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion. Not only was the Premier largely responsible for the maintenance men returning to work at the Port Stanvac oil refinery, but also, I am sure, his intervention this morning influenced the decision by the Seamen's Union to handle this ship.

Mr. Mathwin: A bit too late, though, wasn't it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I wish to refer here to another member of this House who has played a prominent part in the negotiations and discussions that have taken place in connection with this dispute: I refer to the member for Florey, who is President of the Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, and who has also done sterling work. Indeed, I am as proud to be associated with him as, of course, I am proud to be associated with the Premier of South Australia in this matter.

Mr. WRIGHT: I wish to ask a question of the Leader of the Opposition. Will he, as Parliamentary Leader of the Liberal Party, immediately contact the Prime Minister (Mr.

McMahon), requesting him to allow the oil companies to commence negotiations with the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the unions involved in the oil industry dispute, so that a settlement can be effected and a national crisis thus averted? I emphasize the word "allow", being firmly convinced that at this stage the Prime Minister is trying to force a confrontation with the unions, especially following his—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question the honourable member is asking of the honourable Leader of the Opposition is not one to which the Leader has to reply, and really it is not one that should be properly allowed in this House.

Dr. EASTICK: My only comment is that it is high time that the member for Adelaide ceased playing politics—

Members interjecting:

Dr. EASTICK: —such as those he played last week when he asked a question of this nature of the Premier (a question that was not founded on fact any more than is the question he has just asked).

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the public transport system has been able to cope adequately with the increased commuter demand now being placed upon it? The current petrol shortage has resulted in a greater use of public transport by commuters. It is important that people be shown that the public transport system is a viable means of transport with many advantages. One advantage, apparent to all people who travel into Adelaide by air, is that with the decrease in air pollution Adelaide can be seen in all its natural beauty.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although I cannot say that the public transport system is coping adequately with the increased demand being made on it, I can certainly say it has done a tremendous job in its effort to provide an adequate service. Regrettably, one or two complaints have come in. I had one complaint only this morning from an irate regular patron of public transport in the District of Tea Tree Gully. He was understandably upset when the bus he had been catching for many years went straight past him because it was already full. He did not appreciate the fact that his normal means of transport had been taken away from him by people using public transport for the first time. Action has already been taken to overcome this (and I hope it will be speedily put into effect) by the private bus operator receiving on loan some of the redundant

Municipal Tramways Trust buses so that he can provide an even better service.

I think the M.T.T. buses have coped admirably with the problem. I do not say there has not been some inconvenience to people travelling but, generally speaking, I think it is fair to say that the commuters are being moved on time and reaching their destinations on time. The Railways Department has its services under review at present. It is experiencing, as is the M.T.T., a greater demand for its services but it is examining the possible addition of carriages to provide a little more comfort for the number of people currently travelling. So, although one would be naive to suggest that the public transport system is coping without difficulties, it is handling the current crisis admirably. I express the appreciation of the Government for the fine effort, not only by management but also by the workers in public transport in the present situation. They have done a magnificent job and they are to be commended by all.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government will help local councils throughout the State to carry on work after their supplies of fuel are exhausted? When I raised this matter with the Premier yesterday, he indicated that, as from today, action would be taken, in conjunction with councils, to ascertain what fuel they were holding in order to enable work to be done. From telephone calls I have had, it seems that confusion exists among councils throughout the State as to what they will be required to do about employing men or standing them down. Can the Minister say what action is now being taken, particularly as legislation has now been enacted, in order to ascertain what work will be done with the stocks of fuel held by councils?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My first point is that the legislation enacted last evening has no bearing on the position of councils.

Mr. Rodda: Requests were made to local government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, there were requests, and I am pleased that the honourable member used that term. On Sunday three officers of my department spent all day telephoning town clerks that were available, advising them of the situation as the Government saw it at that time, and asking them whether they would co-operate with the Government and conserve their fuel supplies. Subsequently, they have been asked to provide the officers with details of their stocks of

fuel and these have now been compiled and are in the hands of the officers who are administering the general distribution of fuel. However, at no stage (and I make this point perfectly plain) have councils been directed not to use fuel. At no stage have stocks of fuel held by councils been appraised, but councils have been asked to co-operate in an effort to overcome the crisis. I am pleased to say that most councils are extending full co-operation, but some are not. However, whatever decisions they make are theirs, because they are autonomous. If the stage is reached where a council has a stock of fuel and uses it (as it is entitled to do) for its normal operation but then cannot obtain more, and an emergency call is received for an ambulance to be used to save the life of a dying person and the council cannot help, the responsibility will be heavy on the shoulders of that council. Generally, however, councils are co-operating to the hilt.

Mr. McAnaney: What about those councils whose employees are on strike?

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know of any council employees who are on strike although, regrettably, I know of council employees who were stood down on Monday morning. The council concerned could not act quickly enough to stand its employees down, and we think that that action is regrettable.

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Local Government say whether the Highways Department was asked to stop operating road-making machinery yesterday morning? As the Minister has explained, councils were contacted on Sunday and asked to stop using machinery, except vehicles collecting garbage, and were asked not to put off any men. To my great surprise, on my way to the city yesterday morning I noticed Highways Department machinery working on reconstructing the Port Wakefield Road.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department was notified of the Government's decision the same as all other departments were notified over the weekend, and all departments, including the Highways Department, gave effect to that decision. Considering the scattered nature of the Highways Department's operations and the size of the department compared to what is involved with councils, there would inevitably be instances where the necessary instructions

might not have got through as at the commencing time yesterday morning. However, those cases would be isolated, and I know they were all attended to.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government yesterday chartered an aircraft from Adelaide to Melbourne and return and, if it did, who accompanied the Premier on the flight, how much did the charter cost, what type of aircraft was used, and for how long was the Premier in Melbourne?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is permitted only to ask one question at a time. It is unfair to his colleagues for him to ask half a dozen questions. Which question does the honourable member want to ask?

Mr. BECKER: Why did the Premier not telephone the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. Hawke) rather than make a personal visit for such a short time with such little result?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Premier did charter an aircraft yesterday to fly to Melbourne. I do not know who went with him; I do not know how much it cost; I do not know how long the Premier was there; but I do know that the personal contact he made with the President of the A.C.T.U. and the Disputes Committee of the A.C.T.U. (not only Mr. Hawke, but the Disputes Committee which, after all, is the committee that makes the decisions; it is not Mr. Hawke) played a large part in having the men return to work this morning at the Port Stanvac oil refinery.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should like the honourable member to evaluate the cost of transporting the Premier to and from Melbourne compared to the cost to this State had the result gone the other way. The honourable member will not do that, of course, because he knows he would come out on the wrong side.

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what is the position of country fuel agents who have in the normal way accepted orders and booked out fuel, both distillate and petrol, at the commencement of business on Monday last and during that day? I have received telephone calls from country fuel agents who have accumulated orders in the normal way over the weekend for fuel and who have booked out the fuel first thing on Monday morning. They want to know

what is the position regarding the fuel they have booked out to those clients.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Although the fuel had been booked out, it was still in the retailers' tanks and, therefore, they would be liable for consideration by the Government. However, I will have the matter investigated as soon as possible to ascertain the situation regarding the orders already taken. This question has not been posed before. I should say that, if the fuel has not been delivered, there is a strong likelihood that it will not be.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Deputy Premier obtain from the Prices Commissioner a report on what are the present wages received and hours worked by people employed by the petrol companies on which the price of petrol is based, and will he ascertain what would be the price necessary to cover a 35-hour week and a \$25 increase in wages? I understand that Mr. Hawke has publicly claimed that out of their present profits the oil companies could pay this extra sum in wages and reduce the number of weekly working hours to 35. If this is so, surely the price at present fixed by the Prices Commissioner would be far above what the price should be.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although the Minister of Labour and Industry might have this information, I will ask the Premier to have the Prices Commissioner examine the honourable member's question.

Mr. GUNN: In the absence of the Minister of Labour and Industry, can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has considered the situation of service station proprietors on the Nullarbor who are having difficulty because visiting motorists wish to obtain fuel for their vehicle? I have been approached by some service station proprietors in this area who have told me that there is no police station nearby to issue permits and that there are people travelling through their area without a permit. Such people will become stranded if they do not receive petrol.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the point made by the honourable member and I will have this checked out quickly for him.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government has given any consideration, as a result of the petrol situation, to the future sittings of this House?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government intends, as it has previously indicated,

to complete the Address in Reply debate today. I appeal to all members who have yet to speak in the debate to confine their remarks to the more important matters out of consideration for other members and for the staff of Parliament House, because the Government desires that the House shall rise this evening in time for members and staff to catch public transport home before it ceases to run. Further, the Government intends to rise tomorrow in ample time for both members and staff of the House to catch public transport home. Of course, on Thursday there will be no problem in this regard because the House will rise shortly before 6 p.m. It remains to be seen what the situation will be next week. I appeal to members to bear this in mind in speaking today, not only because of the transport problem but also because it is imperative for the conduct of the business of this House that we complete the Address in Reply debate this evening.

BUS TICKETS

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether it would be possible to institute a system of issuing transfer tickets on Municipal Tramways Trust buses? As everyone is aware, most bus routes, like spokes in a wheel, radiate from the city, and quite frequently, because there is no cross-country public transport service, a potential patron wanting to visit a suburb actually quite close to his home, or close to the starting point of the journey, must of necessity first go into the city and then catch another bus to his destination. This involves passengers in considerable extra expense. Similarly, if one wants to go to Semaphore but from a certain terminal point can catch only a Largs bus, that person has to change buses in the city and pay another fare. I point out to the Minister that in certain oversea countries and, I think, in some Australian States it is possible to get a transfer ticket when one buys a ticket for the first leg of the journey. Because of the peculiar situation existing here, and because of the radiation of bus routes from the city, will the Minister consider instituting a system of this kind?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have now had this matter under active consideration and investigation for a considerable time. A desirable system has not yet been determined but that does not mean it is a dead issue—far from it. It is my desire that the transfer system should apply not only from one M.T.T. bus to another but from one form of public trans-

port to another. This matter is being considered actively but I cannot say when we shall be able to do anything or what form it will take. The matter is certainly being considered and in due course an announcement will be made.

DIABETIC DRINK

Mr. WELLS: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to the question I asked on July 19 about the drinking of a diabetic soft drink known as Tab?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that Tab is one of the range of soft drinks and foods that contain artificial sweetening substances in place of sugar. There has been some evidence in the United States of America that some of these substances in large doses may have ill effects in animals, but there has been no evidence of harm to humans by consuming cyclamates or saccharin. However, the consumption of these substances has increased greatly in recent years, and it cannot be predicted with certainty when an individual taking excessive quantities may reach the limit of safety. All Governments in Australia, acting on the advice of the National Health and Medical Research Council, have, therefore, considered it wise to require a warning on such foods to discourage excessive consumption, while making sure that these materials are readily available to those who need them.

MORPHETTVILLE SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say what priority will be given to replacing the old timber classrooms at the Morphetville Park Primary School? I understand that it is programmed to erect an open-unit classroom at the school, the present timber classrooms being in a bad state of repair.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I do not have the information with me at present, I will check on the matter for the honourable member. However, my recollection is that it is likely to be some time before we replace those classrooms.

HOME-MADE BOMBS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General consider banning the sale to persons under 18 years of age of certain chemical substances that are used in the manufacture of home-made bombs? My interest in this subject arises from the lamentable circumstances in which the child of one of my constituents blew himself up shortly before cracker night this year, as a result of his experimenting with an explosive mixture consisting of icing sugar and

a certain common weed killer. I have had correspondence with the Director of Chemistry on this matter. Any explosive mixture consists of a fuel that burns and an oxidant that provides the oxygen for burning. Fuels are extremely common substances, often being edible substances such as castor sugar, icing sugar or flour, as well as common inedible substances such as carbon and sulphur. There is no chance of banning the sale of these substances. However, I have here a list of common oxidants that I believe could be banned from sale to minors. Since I think it would be irresponsible for me to place it on public record, I will not read out the list I have, but I will make it available to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will consider the matter.

PHILIPS INDUSTRIES

Mr. HALL: In the absence of the Premier, can the Deputy Premier say whether the number of persons employed by Philips Industries Limited in South Australia is being progressively reduced from its peak of about 3,000 in the late 1960's to fewer than 1,000 by the end of 1972? Some months ago, at the twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations of Philips Industries at Hendon, the Premier said, "South Australian Governments have had a long association with Philips, and we are confident it will remain that way." He continued, "I believe their progress in the coming 25 years will be as good as in the last 25 years." I draw the Deputy Premier's attention to an explanation given by the Factory Manager in November, 1971, as follows:

Due to rationalization of production which is taking place within various companies of the Philips concern in Australia, the design and manufacture of radio and television sets and related products will in future be located at the Clayton, Victoria, works of Radio Corporation Proprietary Limited. Transfer of activities will take place progressively starting early in 1972 and it is anticipated to be completed in the latter months of the year.

That explanation is followed by reference to conditions under which several persons were to be transferred or dismissed. Even more disquieting is a time table which has been sent to me and which purports to be a description of a gradual run-down at Hendon. This time table reads as follows:

1. Telecommunications: Transfer to Sydney completed by end of April, 1972. Ipec moving out last pieces of equipment. All personnel given notice; skeleton staff will leave by May 31, 1972. 2. Radio/television: Transfer of radio assemblies now completed. E.I.L. Clay-

ton, Victoria, has started production. Television moving out progressively; 12in. television production already transferred. Transfer to be completed by September. All personnel in this building been given notice. 3. Industrial Design Drawing Office Engineering Department: Skeleton staff until television and radio transfer completed. Buildings 2 and 3 completely empty by September/October, 1972. 4. Press shop and 5. machine shop: Finish production for radio and television by August. Some machines plus relevant tools to be transferred to Clayton, Victoria. 6. Plastics division: As 4 and 5. The three departments, 4, 5 and 6, to be combined later this year. Result: only approximately 20 per cent of total personnel to stay. 7. Plating shop: Closed down end of April, 1972. One person left to complete transfer to Clayton, Victoria. 8. Research laboratory: Closed down approximately 1969. 9. Cabinet shop: All personnel have been given notice. Progressively transferred to Cainsborough, Clayton, Victoria. Cabinet shop will cease production end of August.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable member for Gouger is quoting from copious notes in an endeavour to explain his question. I believe that I may have been over-liberal in letting him go this far. This is not an occasion for the honourable member to make a speech or to read out detailed statements. I regret that I inadvertently missed hearing the honourable member's initial question, but I ask him to confine his remarks to explaining that question.

Mr. HALL: I did not want to transgress, but I am dealing with an important matter.

The SPEAKER: The importance of the subject does not determine its relevancy before the House.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have noted your statement that you think you have been over-liberal. If you continue to feel that way, I can direct your course in a proper manner. The last paragraph of this time table states:

Total staff by end of year reduced from about 3,000 to less than 1,000.

That takes me back to where I was at the beginning of my question. I should point out that what I have quoted is a general opinion and is not an authoritative statement by company management. However, the general opinion is that the company will close down within five years. Because of the seriousness of what is contained in this time table that has been placed in my hands, I have quoted it. Will the Deputy Premier obtain for me a full report on this company, which has been a notable company in South Australia and which is the subject of concern because of the obvious run-down in the departments to which I have referred?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will do as the honourable member requests. Obviously he will appreciate that I cannot give the type of reply he could expect from the Premier, because I am not informed about the matters he has raised. I was rather amused to hear the honourable member say that he was quoting a general opinion; I thought he had said earlier that he had received the information from one man. Anyway, as this is a serious matter, I will obtain a full report for the honourable member and bring it down as soon as possible.

ROAD SIGNS

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have investigated the need for "stop" or "give way" signs to be erected at the intersection of the Renmark-Morgan road and the Monash-Berri road? I have received the following letter:

You will find here a petition signed by the majority of the people of Monash, plus visitors, asking for a "stop" or "give way" sign on the crossroads at Monash. During the last 12 months vehicles have collided here four times; fortunately only one accident was serious. The near misses have been innumerable. Since the speed limit has been raised from 35 m.p.h. to 45 m.p.h. on this stretch of road the cars and semi-trailers don't seem to ease up at all and many schoolchildren use this road. The people of Monash have been trying to get a sign here for many years, but to no avail. Both our local councillors have signed this petition. We also have the backing of the tourist officer in Berri. We appeal to you, as our member of Parliament, to help us before there is a fatal accident. We are relying on you, Sir.

Accompanying the letter are the signatures of 246 residents of the area.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated.

OCCUPATIONAL NURSES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say how many occupational nurses are employed in Government departments and whether this number is considered adequate for the welfare of employees in those departments? First-aid officers perform a very useful and, indeed, necessary function in industry and in Government departments. These officers are always willing and anxious to help, but I consider that it is not fair to expect them to accept responsibility for more than the most minor injuries that occur. Some industries have their own full-time industrial medical officers, but these are few. As a result, it has become generally accepted overseas (and, I understand, in Australia) that

occupational health nurses are necessary and should be employed by large undertakings. As I think the employees deserve this service, I should be interested to know whether the Minister considers the number in South Australia to be adequate.

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

RECREATION FACILITIES

Mrs. BYRNE: In the temporary absence of the Attorney-General, will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask his colleague to obtain a report giving the details of schemes for recreation facilities that attracted grants or subsidies, giving also the amounts allocated, through the special committee headed by Judge Marshall, of the Juvenile Court? The last State Budget made available \$100,000 to improve recreation facilities for young people.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am certain that my colleague will be delighted to get that information for the honourable member.

STRAYING ANIMALS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether necessary precautions have been taken at the Belair National Park to prevent the recently released native animals from straying on to neighbouring public roads? A constituent (I think wisely so) has stated that the decision to release the animals was good, but some people are concerned that some animals, particularly kangaroos, could stray on to roads. In foggy and drizzly weather visibility in the Adelaide Hills is extremely poor and the animals may be injured and traffic hazards created. As much as residents of the area appreciate the action taken to give the animals greater opportunity to roam, they are concerned that some of the fences surrounding the park may not be suitable to retain the animals.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Although some weeks have passed since the animals were released in the park, I have certainly not heard of problems occurring in the way referred to by the honourable member. However, I certainly think the matter is worthy of examination and I shall be pleased to take it up.

WHYALLA POLLUTION

Mr. BROWN: Will the Minister of Marine obtain the results of the latest investigation into the obvious pollution of the sea in my district? May I say that this is about the third major incident of pollution of the seas around Whyalla and also that for some time

professional fishermen have expressed grave concern about the reduction in the availability of fish. Obviously, this pollution would not assist that situation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take the matter up with the Minister of Agriculture, who is responsible for fisheries in this State and whose Director of Fisheries would know of investigations in this matter. I point out to the honourable member that I, as Minister of Marine, am responsible for pollution of the sea only by oil from sea-going vessels. Fisheries are under the administration of the Minister of Agriculture, and the Director of Fisheries is responsible for matters that may have harmful effects on fish. As the Director would doubtless know about the matter raised by the honourable member, I will obtain the information.

DAMAGED STOCK

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what compensation is available to producers whose stock suffer damage while in yards owned by the Government? I have been approached by a constituent who recently sent six steers to be slaughtered at the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must remain quiet when their colleagues are asking questions. Otherwise they are being most unruly.

Mr. CARNIE: The arrangement with the buyer on this occasion was that these steers were to be slaughtered and sold over hooks. After stock had been slaughtered, the Department of Primary Industry inspector rejected one carcass *in toto* because of severe and widespread bruising. However, these cattle, which were lot fed and were used to being handled, were quiet, and there is no doubt that, when they left the property, they were all in the same good condition. The carrier concerned is willing to swear that the cattle travelled quietly to the Port Lincoln yards and it is reasonable to assume that at that stage all the cattle were in a similar good condition. Some time between then and slaughtering, one beast was somehow so badly bruised as to warrant total rejection. I also raise the point that the rejected carcass was destroyed so that the seller had no way of checking the degree of bruising that occurred. However, as in all similar cases, it is necessary to rely on the judgment of a responsible D.P.I. inspector.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to comment. He must explain the question.

Mr. CARNIE: This meant a loss of \$96 to the seller. Will any claim for compensation be considered?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up this matter with my colleague and obtain a report.

FOOTBALL POOLS

Mr. SLATER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about football pools?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that approaches have been made by several private organizations seeking authority to conduct football pools in South Australia. The feasibility of establishing football pools in South Australia is being considered by the Government. No decision has been made as yet.

REGISTRATION OF SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to introduce the registration of independent schools? If this is intended, what are the reasons for the move? I believe that there was a recent press report about this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The question that arises relating to many independent schools concerns the educational standards that those schools are to maintain. Negotiations have been under way relating to this matter and it is intended that a system of registration should be introduced relating to independent schools. I might add, as I said last Sunday, that, while such a system may provide a degree of annoyance to some independent schools, I believe that substantial benefits will arise from this practice, not only in drawing attention to the situation where educational standards may not be quite what they should be but also in assuring the public that the money made available by the State is spent for educational purposes. We already license certain schools through the Technical Division of the Education Department (now the Department of Further Education) and it is intended that that system should be further extended. It is the responsibility of the Education Department generally, where it is not providing educational facilities in its own establishments, to ensure that members of the public receive a fair deal regarding educational programmes provided by private individuals or companies.

PORT HASLAM JETTY

Mr. GUNN: Did the Minister of Marine approve of the night attack on the Port Haslam jetty and is he aware that the jetty was left in a dangerous condition? I wish to quote from the *West Coast Sentinel*—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is entering into debate across the Chamber. He must learn to conduct himself in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House. If the honourable member seeks leave he may explain his question, but he may not enter into discussion.

Mr. GUNN: I will briefly explain my question by quoting from the last edition of the *West Coast Sentinel*, in which the Chairman of the council is quoted as saying:

The barricade erected at the end of the inner part is totally inadequate and dangerous.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The first thing I want to do is to deny categorically that the contractor is named "Corcoran's Raiders". I have already informed the honourable member that tenders were let to a contractor to demolish the outer end of the Port Haslam jetty. That contractor acts of his own volition within the terms of the contract. I have not been in touch with the contractor, nor has he been in touch with me, to work out what tactics he will employ in order to dismantle the end of the jetty. I believe that some contact was made with him by the progress association, which threatened that if he came to the area it would picket the jetty and not allow him to get on to it. Perhaps, because of this, the contractor made the sneak attack; I do not know. However, I will check the matter concerning the barrier because I understand that the jetty was breached, or that something like this happened, and if the barrier is considered to be dangerous I will have it examined to see whether it can be improved.

ACCIDENT DAMAGES

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Attorney-General aware of certain hardships that have been caused as a result of prosecutions launched under section 124 of the Motor Vehicles Act prior to the enactment of the recent amendments to the law on this matter? A constituent of mine (a woman with meagre resources) some time ago, before the relevant amendments were implemented, rented a car from a reputable Adelaide company and was unfortunately involved in an accident in which her daughter, a passenger in the vehicle, was injured and subsequently received compensation payments through the court. The insurance company

(Pearl Assurance Company Limited), which is obliged under the old section 124 to receive written advice of an accident, has now sued my constituent for a considerable sum (over \$3,000, I believe), which my constituent cannot pay. I remind the Attorney-General that the original section in the Act to which I refer was described by His Honour the Chief Justice as "Draconian in nature" and, of course, many hardships have occurred under that provision. Indeed, that is why the amendments were introduced. Unfortunately, however, this accident occurred before the amendments were implemented. That it was a car rented from a hire company would, in my view, indicate some responsibility to that company. Is the Attorney-General aware of this type of occurrence and, if I hand him certain papers that I have in my possession, will he investigate the case involving my constituent?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The operation of this section has undoubtedly worked great hardship in the past and has often meant that a person in the position of the honourable member's constituent has thought that she was performing her obligation by notifying the owner of the car of the accident, but has nevertheless found herself in breach of the requirements of the insurance company through not notifying that company. This situation has arisen in various forms and, as the honourable member said, the Chief Justice commented strongly in one case on the operation of the section concerned. It was for this reason that the Government introduced the amendment, which has alleviated the harshness of the operation of this section but, unfortunately of course, that cannot affect accidents that took place prior to the passing of the amending Act. I know of nothing from a legal point of view that can be done in a case such as this. I consider that in many cases an insurance company taking advantage of this situation is using the law in a harsh and, in some instances, an unconscientious way.

I do not comment on the instant case, because I do not know sufficient of the facts to comment on this attitude of the insurance company. However, if the honourable member gives me the details, I shall be happy to consider the matter and, if it seems to be an appropriate case, I shall be willing to make representations to the insurance company and to ask it whether, in the light of all the circumstances and of the impecunious position of the lady concerned, it will be willing to forgo what seem, on the face of it

anyway, to be its legal rights. However, as a result of the amending legislation introduced last session, I hope that situations such as this will not occur in future.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether investigations have been made into the problem concerning static electricity generated by steel beds with rubber wheels, which are generally used in our public hospitals, where the condition has been aggravated by the constant rubbing of linen sheets against plastic mattress covers? This matter was drawn to my attention some weeks ago by a friend of mine who works as a sister in the Royal Adelaide Hospital and who discussed at some length the shocks that nurses are receiving when handling patients in the hospitals. A little later, my attention was drawn to an article that appeared in the paper, showing that this problem was not isolated but that, in fact, it was occurring at the Mount Gambier Hospital. I have since heard that the same problem occurs at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital caused, in all instances, by the various factors to which I have referred. I was led to understand that this matter was being investigated but, as I have not heard any more about it, and well knowing that the problem exists, I ask the Minister whether he himself knows anything about it or whether he will refer it to the Chief Secretary for investigation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As I have no personal knowledge of the matter, I will obtain a report on it from the Minister.

COWELL SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Cowell Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The first tender call for work on the Cowell Area School oval was made on April 7, this year, but as there was no response it was re-advertised on July 24. Tenders now close on August 11. Funds have been approved for the conversion of a building to an open-space unit, and tender documents will now be prepared. The Public Buildings Department expects that tenders will be called in about six to eight weeks time.

NO-SMOKING AREAS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport examine the possibility of providing no-smoking areas in public transport vehicles, especially buses and trams?

Strange as it may seem, many people object to being forced, in enclosed areas, to put up with the nauseating stench of cigarette and tobacco smoke. I point out that in certain other countries the authorities allow—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to debate the issue. He must confine his remarks to explaining the question.

Mr. MATHWIN: If I may explain it, I point out that the authorities in certain other countries allow people to smoke at the rear of a bus or tram leaving the nicer part of the front of the bus available for those people who do not wish to put up with this nauseating smell.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It would appear that the honourable member has not travelled on a bus for a long, long time because the Municipal Tramways Trust buses provide for smoking in rear seats only. I suggest that, if the honourable member cares to hop on a bus, he will see the proof of what I am saying. So far as the railway carriages are concerned, they have one end for smokers and one end for non-smokers and the M.T.T. buses have exactly the same.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the tram?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On the tram, one end is for smokers and one end is for non-smokers. I think the honourable member really ought to give his motor car away for a few days and enjoy the benefits of public transport.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister appeal to members of the staff of the trust to police the non-smoking rules and signs on public trams and buses? Although I have travelled on the train, I have been told that some people refrain from using public transport because of the conditions I have outlined.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, I will not, because, frankly, appealing to the employees to police the rule is an acknowledgment that they are not doing their job properly. I refuse to acknowledge that, because I believe they do their job.

Mr. Mathwin: You do not believe that anyone smokes in no-smoking areas?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I believe that the employees adequately police the rule. I appreciate how much the employees put into their job, but obviously the honourable member does not.

FOOTBALL VIOLENCE

Mr. SIMMONS: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to a question I asked recently about violence at football matches?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the practical difficulties to be faced in prosecutions arising out of violence in body-contact sports would appear to be (a) establishing the degree to which the victim had consented to the use of force, and (b) negating accident. It is conceivable there could on occasion be cases of undue violence used which might be shown to be entirely unconnected with play. If so, there seems to be no legal reason why proceedings could not then be instituted following appropriate post facto police inquiries. This possibility, however, would not seem to justify having police attend football matches on the chance of detecting such an occurrence, but rather the responsible authorities organizing the games should provide proper surveillance to discourage undue violence or, alternatively, to enable evidence to be obtained in respect of it.

FLUORIDATION

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works say what effect fluoridation is having on the metropolitan water supply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report. I have never inquired whether it has been as effective as expected or, indeed, whether it has been detrimental to the system, as some people thought it would be.

Mr. Coumbe: Also, whether the system is working?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The system is working perfectly well. I will also see whether it is affecting pipes, pumping, etc. as some people said it would.

WATER LICENCES

Mr. WARDLE: My question is to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Treasurer. I asked the Minister of Works a similar question last week but I redirect the question to the Treasurer to see whether I can get another opinion. Will the Deputy Premier ask the Treasurer to reconsider the situation whereby a holder of an irrigation licence, though he has not developed his block with that licence, has that licence taken into account when the value of his property is assessed for land tax purposes? I appreciate the information the Minister of Works gave me last week and, on re-reading part of my question, I can easily see why he gave me that information. As I understand it, the Valuation Department does take into account, when assessing the value of allotments that have an irrigation licence, the fact that it is there and the value is assessed differently because it is there. Because a licence granted

in respect of undeveloped land is no use to the seller when he sells the land, it seems hardly fair that he should pay additional land tax merely for having it if it is not worth having.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On the contrary, as I pointed out in my earlier reply, there is considerable value attached to any property sold if that licence is to be automatically transferred. In the past, some people have paid much more for land because it has a water licence—

Mr. Wardle: When it is developed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Even if it is not developed. Before land is paid for and transferred, if a water licence is attached to it it is imperative that the person purchasing the property contact the department to ascertain whether the licence will apply, because in many cases it does, provided that there is clear indication that there will be development. When that happens the person who sells that property is getting very much more for it than if there were no water licence at all. Therefore, the Valuation Department is perfectly correct in valuing that property on the basis of whether or not one has a licence. If the honourable member wants the Treasurer to look at the land tax aspect, I will ask him to do so.

MINING REGULATIONS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation consider suggestions from miners to improve the new mining regulations? The Minister will know that there was controversy over the Mining Act when it was passed and many miners believe that, when the regulations are put into effect, they will have a detrimental effect on the mining industry. Will the Minister accept any reasonable submissions the miners may wish to make?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have not received any complaints about the matter to which the honourable member has referred, but I shall be pleased to consider any submissions that are made to me.

PHILIPS INDUSTRIES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Deputy Premier inquire of the Premier's Department, particularly the Industrial Development Branch, whether there has been any change in the programme of relocation of Philips Industries Limited from Hendon, South Australia, to Clayton in Victoria?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Your predecessor has already asked that question.

ADVERTISING

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General say whether he can take any action concerning advertising in picture theatres? Towards the end of the recent school holidays I was approached by a constituent who complained that, immediately after the interval at the theatre at which the Beatrix Potter film was being shown and which was attended largely by young people, a long, rather attractive and glamorous advertisement for cigarettes was shown. My constituent was upset that this sort of advertising should be indulged in at a performance that was intended purely for young people. Can the Attorney-General take any action on this form of advertising?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No power exists under the present law to take action in the circumstances referred to by the honourable member.

BEETLE

Mr. Carnie for Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the common name of the beetle *sisyphus rubripes*?

2. Is it harmful to livestock, agriculture or humans?

3. Has it been introduced into South Australia?

4. What benefit would be derived from its introduction to this State?

5. Is the Agriculture Department investigating the possibility of introducing this beetle?

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

1. There is no common name, but the genus *sisyphus* are generally known as "dung-rollers".

2. No.

3. *Sisyphus rubripes* is a beetle adapted to tropical areas and will not be introduced into South Australia. As the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has had some success with this beetle in tropical areas it is now screening and breeding another species showing promise for South Australian conditions.

4. The benefit to be derived in South Australia from the introduction of dung beetles, which can effectively bury the large wet dung pads of domestic stock, would be immense.

5. Yes.

HOMOSEXUALITY

Mr. Evans for Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): How many prosecutions have been initiated in connection with homosexual acts in private premises, as a result of police investigations during the past 12 months?

The Hon. L. J. KING: For the 12 months ended June 30, 1972, two adult males were prosecuted for committing homosexual acts together in private premises, and 10 adult males for homosexual acts committed on consenting youths in their early teens in private premises.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. Evans for Mr. VENNING (on notice): How much finance has been given by way of subsidy to July 25, 1972, for stock movement and grain freights to assist primary producers in this State who have suffered hardships because of drought?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although some inquiries regarding freight rebates on the transport of fodder and stock in drought-affected areas had been received by the Lands Department by July 25, no formal claims have been lodged. Consequently, no rebates have yet been paid.

CEDUNA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What plans has the Government to replace the existing Ceduna Area School?

2. Is it intended to use a new site for any future replacement school?

3. What type of structure is it intended to build?

4. What would be its estimated cost?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. A brief has been prepared for a replacement area school at Ceduna and it is shown on the design list. No dates are at present available.

2. Present intentions are for the replacement school to be built on land owned by the department that consists of an area of over six acres in the present site, and adjoining land of 17 acres for agricultural purposes.

3. Solid construction.

4. Until the design is more advanced, no accurate estimate of cost can be made.

STREAKY BAY SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Why has there been a delay in calling tenders for building the Streaky Bay Area School?

2. When will tenders now be called?

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

1. Planning of this school provided for a notional date of June/July, 1972, for the calling of tenders, subject to the establishment of a firm tender-call programme for 1972-73.

2. A firm tender-call date has not yet been determined, but is subject to examination in relation to other high-priority school projects, and the availability of Loan funds.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What consideration has been given to complete abolition of State succession duties, so as to give relief to the rural sector of the community and also small business concerns?
2. Has any consideration been given to an alternative form of tax to replace State succession duties?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran, for the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has, on several occasions, considered representations from a variety of sources concerning the abolition of State succession duties. These sources have included the Stockowners' Association, the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Inc., the report of a Select Committee on Capital Taxation from the Legislative Council, and a Commonwealth Senate select committee concerning itself with such matters. The South Australian levies are less severe than those in other States, their impact is more equitable in that they are succession and not estate duties, and they give better exemptions and concessions both to rural producers and in respect of the matrimonial home than is given in other States. If this State wishes to continue to provide social services at least comparable with those of other States, it finds no alternative other than to tax comparably.

2. There have been submitted a variety of alternatives particularly to relieve succession duties on farm properties by an additional annual levy upon land values or, alternatively, by an annual wealth tax. However, the Government is satisfied that the alternatives so far submitted would be found even more objectionable by the rural community than the impact of succession duties.

CATTLE TESTS

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many cases of cattle infected by tuberculosis have been detected at the Gepps Cross abattoir and the Port Noarlunga and Murray Bridge meatworks this year?
2. What arrangements are made for slaughter of animals reacting to tuberculosis tests and which come from infected properties detected in subsequent tests?

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

1. Gepps Cross abattoir, 258; Port Noarlunga, 48; Murray Bridge meatworks, 1.

2. Reactors to the test for tuberculosis are slaughtered at (a) the Noarlunga abattoir by special arrangement with the management and the Department of Primary Industry; and (b) various country abattoirs at which there is a meat inspection service. Animals from infected properties may be sold only for slaughter.

WORKING WEEK

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

1. Is it the policy of the Government to support a 35-hour working week?
2. If not, what is the policy of the Government on this matter?
3. If supporting a 35-hour working week, does the Government propose to support the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union in its proposal that its members refuse to work more than 35-hours a week from next September?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran, for the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government supports the principle of a 35-hour working week applying to all employees in circumstances which will ensure fair treatment of all sections of the community and upon its introduction nationally.
2. *Vide* No. 1.
3. The Government has not received any request to support such a proposal nor can it see how its "support" is involved.

PARLIAMENTARY ACCOMMODATION

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

1. What has been the cost so far of the construction of the room which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, House of Assembly, is now occupying?
2. What is the estimated total cost of the construction and furnishing of the room?
3. Is this cost in addition to the total cost, estimated at \$11,800, of the provision of a waiting room for the Premier's visitors?

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

1. One contract has been let for the various alterations to rooms and costs are not separated.
2. \$5,900.
3. No.

DIAL-A-BUS

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

1. Has the Government abandoned plans for the trial of a dial-a-bus system which was

referred to by the Minister of Roads and Transport in the House on August 4, 1971?

2. If so:

- (a) why were the plans abandoned;
- (b) when was this decision made; and
- (c) has any announcement yet been made of such decision? If not, why not?

3. If not:

- (a) when will such trial take place;
- (b) in what area; and
- (c) what has delayed the trial so far?

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

1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. (a) The study of the possibility of implementing a demand actuated public transport experiment in the metropolitan Adelaide area is being undertaken by a steering committee consisting of Government officers, private agencies, and a local consultant firm. Whether a trial will take place in a selected area will be to some extent dependent upon the results of this study.

(b) This will depend on the decisions taken following the study mentioned in (a).

(c) The study referred to in (a).

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. Who valued the land bought by the Government for the Hackney redevelopment project?

2. How many officers in the Housing Trust who made frequent contact with the residents involved in this area have qualifications as sociologists or social welfare workers?

3. Did any private developers participate formally or informally in the original planning of this redevelopment?

4. Were any private developers consulted before or after any supplementary plan was adopted?

5. If so, when were they consulted and who were they?

6. Will the Government consider a review, by an independent committee, of the Hackney redevelopment proposals?

7. If so, is it the intention of the Premier to ensure that the committee comprises at least one qualified social worker, a qualified sociologist and an independent town planner?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran, for the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Officers of the Housing Trust.

2. None. They were headed by the most experienced officer on the problems of occupants of substandard housing in Australia.

3. No.

4. Some private developers were consulted during the committee's early deliberations. No supplementary development plan has been authorized.

5. In 1967-68. The Redevelopment Committee does not have consent of the parties concerned to reveal their names.

6. It would be improper for the Government to make a decision prior to a report from the State Planning Authority. When a report on the supplementary development plan and the submissions on it are received consideration will be given on any further course of action.

7. See answer to question 6.

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. Why is the Government proceeding with demolitions in the area, if the Hackney redevelopment project has yet to be promulgated and submissions are still being considered?

2. Will the Government make public all reports considered and made by the State Planning Authority, together with the minutes of the Redevelopment Committee?

3. If so, when will they be available? If not, why not?

4. Has the Government instructed the State Planning Authority, or the South Australian Housing Trust, to give the residents in Hackney a written statement as to their legal rights under the planning appeal section of the Planning and Development Act?

5. Is there a co-ordinating body for the purchase of land for Government purposes?

6. If so, is the South Australian Housing Trust in Hackney working outside the auspices of this co-ordinating body?

7. Has the Government and/or the State Planning Authority given the opportunity to residents in the planning area to consider alternative proposals? If not, why not?

8. Has the Government and/or the State Planning Authority considered the retention of some land uses and rehabilitation of suitable properties?

9. If such alternatives have been rejected, what are the reasons for this?

10. Did the State Planning Authority reject a request from the St. Peters Residents Association that Hackney citizens affected by the plan should have direct representation on the Redevelopment Committee of the State Planning Authority? If so, why?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran, for the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Demolition has only occurred with respect to properties which have already been formally declared by the local board of health as unfit

for human habitation, or to properties which were declared substandard under the Housing Improvement Act or which were quite undesirable for continued human habitation. The remaining residents of Hackney requested that demolitions of such properties should take place.

2. Reports made by the State Planning Authority in some cases contained matters of a confidential nature including financial and economic details of proposals which would prohibit the Government's effective negotiations with interested developers to get the best deal for the public. However, the bases upon which decisions have been taken have been revealed in the press and at a series of public meetings, and have been subject to public questioning of the Minister concerned and officers of the State Planning Authority and the Housing Trust. Additional details for information of residents and the public will be contained in a brochure which is now being prepared.

A report by Kinnaird, Hill, deRohan, and Young Proprietary Limited, entitled "Hackney Neighbourhood Renewal" was considered by the Redevelopment Committee and the State Planning Authority. The Government does not have copies of this report for distribution, but a copy is in the library of the State Planning Office, and members of the public are at liberty to peruse it. Kinnaird, Hill, deRohan, and Young have been informed by the Government that we are quite happy for them to release the report to any interested person if they wish to do so. It is not the intention of the Government to ask the State Planning Authority to make public the minutes of all its proceedings nor the minutes of all the Redevelopment Committee's proceedings. It would be impossible for the Government to get people to serve on public bodies where discussions formulating their opinions are revealed rather than those opinions as formulated after the discussions. However, the nature of the final opinions arrived at by the Redevelopment Committee and by the State Planning Authority have been made known publicly and have been discussed at meetings of residents.

3. See answer to 2.

4. No, but it is common practice for the person aggrieved by any decision made under the Planning and Development Act to have his attention drawn to any rights of appeal which may apply. If a supplementary development plan is adopted, residents will be circularized and statements of their rights will be made in that circular.

5. No. Government departments normally negotiate purchases through the Land Board although this is not invariably the case. The Housing Trust makes its own arrangements for purchase.

6. In Hackney, the Housing Trust acted under its normal manner of acquisition as a willing buyer with respect to owners who notified that they wished to sell and be relocated. This was done in response to repeated requests by Hackney residents, including requests made at meetings of the St. Peters Residents Association.

7. In accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, a supplementary development plan has been exhibited as well as a conceptual design. All members of the public have been given the opportunity to make relevant submissions concerning it. Reasons for rejecting a proposal merely to upgrade some housing within the area have been fully discussed at public meetings. No alternative proposal affecting only the Hackney redevelopment area has been put forward at any time.

8. Yes.

9. The Hackney redevelopment area is subject to the following conditions:

- (1) An extremely bad traffic pattern hazardous to residents and children in the area, and a growing nuisance.
- (2) A series of non-conforming uses to residential improvement which cause inconvenience to residents.
- (3) A high proportion of substandard houses which are not rehabilitable.

In consequence, the Hackney redevelopment area has been considered to require comprehensive redevelopment whereas retention of existing land uses and rehabilitation of suitable properties is more applicable to areas of Hackney south of the proposed redevelopment area. The Government is preparing for discussions with residents on the subject of rehabilitation of other areas of Hackney. The plan proposed by Kinnaird, Hill, deRohan, and Young related to a much larger area than the Hackney redevelopment area at present the subject of the project. It not only retained unsatisfactory and hazardous traffic patterns, but retained non-conforming uses which create considerable nuisance and annoyance to residents and involved a wide acquisition of properties which are not substandard and which have not gone beyond their economic life in areas far beyond the existing Hackney redevelopment project.

10. Yes. The Redevelopment Committee has much wider terms of reference than the Hackney project and it would be quite inappropriate to involve the St. Peters Residents Association in all proceedings. However, the Town Clerk of St. Peters is a member of the Redevelopment Committee in order to give representation to local residents. The St. Peters Residents Association itself is not representative of all residents of St. Peters, nor indeed of residents in Hackney itself. In the rehabilitation proposals mentioned earlier, the residents of the area concerned will be involved in discussion and planning work from the outset. Comprehensive submissions from the association have been received and the Redevelopment Committee is aware of the views expressed by the association and is giving serious consideration to them. Furthermore, there has been frequent liaison between officers connected with the project and the residents association.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from July 27. Page 341.)

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I support the motion because it is traditional that members do so. Traditionally, the Governor's Speech outlines the Government's past achievements, if it has any, and its intentions for the future. Unfortunately, as in the past, the document we are debating is rather empty, so there is little we can find in it to debate. Last year, when speaking in the Address in Reply debate, I complained that the rural section of the community received scant attention from the Government. I said that it rated only seven lines in last year's Governor's Speech. I suppose it was a little unreasonable for me to complain so much, for that Speech was an improvement on the previous year's Speech in which only four lines were devoted to the rural section. When this year I saw that not only were rural matters referred to in the Speech but that they also rated 30 lines being spent on them, I felt rather pleased that what I and many other members on this side had said the year before had been taken some notice of.

Then an uncharitable thought came to me. It occurred to me that this would be the last Governor's Speech in this Parliament, and that there would be an election before another Speech could be made. The thought came to me that this could be the reason why the rural section in the community was receiving some attention from the Government; the

Government had suddenly realized that this section of the community had been forgotten by it for two years.

Mr. Ryan: Of course, you got rid of that uncharitable thought.

Mr. CARNIE: I wish I could eradicate it, but it persists. I suppose that it is not strictly correct to say that rural communities have been forgotten by the Government, because they were not forgotten when new taxes and charges had to be levied, and they were not forgotten when a community that depends on primary producers was held to ransom by militant unions. This last example of union action has been a sad blot on the history of unionism in this State. Despite what the Minister of Roads and Transport persistently says, I am not opposed to unions; I oppose the abuse of power. Over the years unions have become very powerful. In itself, this is not necessarily a bad thing, but we must remember that power carries with it a responsibility, and that responsibility is not only towards members of unions but also towards the community at large.

I oppose militancy and stand-over tactics, and this is what we had on this occasion. Moreover, the Government's action in paying the costs awarded against Dunford in that well-publicized case was an example of appalling mismanagement by Cabinet and showed the extent to which it was dominated by unions. Since then, Cabinet and the Government have tried desperately to remedy that mismanagement, and I am sure all members have seen examples of this. One example that came to my attention in my district was that from time to time an announcement was made of the Government's intention in this case, and I received many phone calls from people in my district who expressed their dissatisfaction at what had happened. An appreciable number of these calls came from unionists, who made a point of telling me that they were unionists. One unionist told me that, having done a survey in his place of employment, he was pleased to be able to say that he spoke for 21 unionists in that place who bitterly condemned the Government's action. One man to whom I spoke is prominent in Australian Labor Party and union circles in Port Lincoln, and, to use his own words, he told me that the Government's action stank. A week later, that man had a letter published in the Port Lincoln *Times* justifying the Government's action. Obviously the word had gone out to save the Government and the unions, because he reversed what he had told me a week earlier. I wonder whether

letters in the newspaper at that time were written by press secretaries employed by this Government. The Government should have taken action regarding the Kangaroo Island dispute long before it did. A petition signed by 90 unionists on Kangaroo Island expressed concern about the T.L.C. action.

I have mentioned the burden of increasing taxes and charges placed on the public and there seems to be no hope of obtaining a reduction of these while the present Government is in office. One of the most insidious cost burdens that the farmer has is the high and unrealistic value on which many taxes are based. That value is used for land tax and water rates and many councils use it to assess their rates. Rural land tax will be abolished when this Party returns to office. There seems to be no hope that it will be abolished while this present Government is in office. The Deputy Premier made this clear at a meeting he attended about a week ago. That meeting was reported in the *Chronicle*, in a statement headed "Government won't scrap rural land tax." The report states:

The State Government has no intention of scrapping land tax on land used for primary production. This was made clear by the Deputy Premier (Mr. Corcoran) at Mil Lel last week, when he said that the Government was not prepared to do this when it could see no other way of raising the \$1,000,000 tax raised annually.

Many people consider that it would not be necessary to raise an additional \$1,000,000 if the Government, by sound management and some trimming, could—

Mr. Burdon: Why don't you quote the whole of his statement at that meeting?

Mr. CARNIE: We have been asked to save time today but, if the member for Mount Gambier wants it, I shall be pleased to quote the whole statement.

Mr. Burdon: Don't quote it out of context.

Mr. CARNIE: As the member for Mount Gambier has raised the point that I have quoted the Minister out of context, in deference to him I will read the whole report.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. CARNIE: For the benefit of the member for Mount Gambier, the report continues from there and states:

There was, of course, Mr. Corcoran said at a meeting arranged by the UFG, the alternative of cutting out land tax for particular sections of the community and then reducing, by a commensurate amount, the services provided in that community. But this would result in

a most unhappy situation, he added. School buses for country children is one example of a special service provided for country people. "Seriously, would you want that service cut out?" Mr. Corcoran asked. We could do this but it would be an immense blow to the children who must have this service if they are to acquire a reasonable education. Similarly, by dropping land taxes, the State Government's subsidy now paid to the Electricity Trust to provide electricity as cheaply as possible in rural areas could be done away with. But we don't believe we should do that and we don't propose to. Neither did the Government propose to do "what Bolte did" and cut out rural land tax then add 10 p.c. on to the land taxes paid by urban, country-urban and metropolitan residents. That is not the policy of this Government, he said. If the State Government was to cut or abolish taxes in one area or for one section of the community then there was justification for cutting or abolishing it for another. Every section of the community has to rely on other sections. Mr. Corcoran said that residents of Mount Gambier paid \$69,000 in land taxes in 1971-72. The residents of rural areas surrounding the city paid out \$42,000.

I do not consider that the part of the report that I quoted earlier was out of context. I intended to quote the next part of the report, because I consider that to be a deliberate attempt to continue the misleading implications that this Government has been making for two years. The *Chronicle* report in relation to this meeting then states:

Some people would claim that the Premier had said at the farmers' march in Adelaide that he would reduce land tax and that he had not done so. This is not true, Mr. Corcoran said. Taxation over the whole State has been, by amendment to the Act, reduced by 40 per cent. I know some of you have had increases of up to 400 per cent, he told the meeting. There are cases where this has happened but I am talking of the whole State when I say that land taxes have been reduced by 40 per cent. This had reduced the amount collected from \$1,550,000 to just over \$1,550,000.

That is just not true, because rural land tax to the value of \$1,550,000 has never been collected. That is the amount that would have been collected if pressure from this side of the House—

Mr. Burdon: If it had not been reduced by—

Mr. CARNIE: The member for Mount Gambier should do his arithmetic.

Mr. Burdon: I think my arithmetic would be just as good as yours.

Mr. CARNIE: This report states that the amount collected was reduced from \$1,550,000. Can the member for Mount Gambier say that that amount was ever collected? Of course he cannot, because it was never collected.

Mr. Burdon: Because the figure promised by the Premier reduced it from the amount it would have been.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There will be only one speech at a time and the member for Flinders is addressing the House at present.

Mr. CARNIE: My point is that, if there had not been pressure from this side of the House and from farmers' organizations, that amount of \$1,550,000 would have been collected. This had no bearing on the 40 per cent. The reduction from \$1,500,000 to \$1,000,000 was made by a revaluation of land and it has nothing to do with a 40 per cent rebate. The member for Mt. Gambier knows that very well.

Mr. Burdon: Your arithmetic doesn't work the same way as mine.

Mr. CARNIE: I can well believe that: it is obvious. I think the time has come when a review should be made of the method of valuing land. Basically the present method is to use a sale in the area involving a willing seller and a willing buyer. Too many anomalies can enter into this method of evaluation. I shall quote briefly from a speech made by Mr. Grant Andrews, General Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Inc. He points out an anomaly that can occur under this method of valuation when he states:

For example, how is it possible to value a broad acre farm alongside a property which has been developed for vineyards, without due regard to the economics of the grapegrowing industry, he said. Even though the land may be suitable for growing vines, increased grape production at that time could well bring the industry to its knees. As the situation stands today land can be assessed at a much higher valuation because of its proximity to some other form of intensive agriculture. It is essential in cases like this that consideration be given to the use to which the land is being put without the emphasis being placed on its potential.

To me, this is the important matter. Mr. Andrews mentioned the case of a broad-acre farm near a vineyard. Another example is of broad-acre farms near residential development areas. Because they are near, the valuation is increased to such an extent that it is no longer economic for the farmer to continue farming the land. He may not want to develop that land for residential purposes but may want to continue to farm it, but at the moment a valuation is placed on the potential of the land, which is wrong. After a figure is reached for the valuation of a farm as it is, an

arbitrary figure representing all improvement costs (buildings, clearing and fencing, etc.) is then deducted. I suppose it is feasible to value buildings and fences, because these are things that one can see, but how can a cost be placed on clearing of land that was cleared 100 years ago? This assumes that the valuer can imagine what the land was like before it was cleared (whether it was heavily or lightly timbered) and that determination is then balanced with today's clearing costs. As all members would agree, this would be a difficult task.

I believe there is a need for a committee of inquiry into the entire valuation system in South Australia. I believe that such a committee would come out in favour of an initial valuation based on as many factors as possible. Such a valuation should then be adjusted annually according to a set formula which would be, in effect, a reflection of the viability and profitability of the primary industry involved in the area at that time. We would then no longer have the situation arising of some idiot paying a ridiculously high price for a farm and his actions affecting the valuation of all properties in the area. A person who pays a high price for a property does not do himself any good. Indeed, he gets a low, or lower, return on his capital investment and, in some cases, the capital is borrowed and there is great difficulty in servicing the debt. The person concerned either survives or goes bankrupt, but what he does should not affect his neighbours and other people in the same district, which is what happens now.

The position concerning slaughtering facilities is a cause of continuing concern to meat producers throughout this State. The problem they face is not easy, because it involves the strategic placement of meatworks and inducements to get buyers to go to several areas of the State so that producers can get a fair return for their produce, and for this reason the physical location of abattoirs throughout the State is of great importance. There are currently five killing works in South Australia, and one other is pending. One of these, that at Port Lincoln, is Government-owned and another, that at Gepps Cross, is a semi-government works. The other killing works in the State are located at Noarlunga, Murray Bridge and Peterborough, and a new killing works is planned for Naracoorte. All of these are run by private enterprise, but the time has come to make a serious examination of the future of the Gepps

Cross abattoir and whether it should continue. There is no doubt that its future is limited.

It is necessary only to look at a map to see that the abattoir and the holdings of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board are surrounded on three sides (north, east and south) by suburban growth, so we are faced with the situation of available land becoming scarcer while the needs of the abattoir become greater. I question also the advisability of having these works in the centre of a residential area, which is what is happening. The Gepps Cross area is rapidly growing, and the need for the abattoir to enlarge rapidly is also present. Therefore, now is surely the time to examine in depth whether the retaining of the Gepps Cross abattoir is warranted. We should check now whether any further expenditure on this site can be justified. An investigation is going on, but that investigation will not tell those of us who are interested anything at all, because Mr. Ian Gray, the consultant retained by the Government, will not be making a written report to the Minister. In his reply last week to a question by the member for Rocky River the Minister said:

... the terms of reference of the consultant do not contemplate a written report on the investigations, as the honourable member appears to have assumed.

Surely it is a perfectly normal and reasonable assumption that any person retained by the Government in this capacity would report in writing to the Minister. That this is not so was made clear by the Minister in the Legislative Council in replying to a question when he said:

This is purely and simply a matter of Mr. Gray's verbal report to me on my discussions on the meat industry generally in South Australia.

Surely this, too, is neither normal nor wise. I am not criticizing Mr. Gray or what he is doing, but it is far from clear exactly what he is doing. It appears that no record will be kept of what he recommends to the Minister. I am criticizing the ineptitude of the Minister in his handling of this whole matter. I shall have more to say in criticizing the Minister when I refer specifically to Port Lincoln. Regarding Gepps Cross, the thinking seems to be along the line that it is essential to retain the abattoir to supply the metropolitan area.

However, I question that because, in these days of fast transport and good roads, there is no reason why killing works should not be strategically placed throughout the whole of the State and be still easily able to supply

the metropolitan area. The Port Lincoln works is the most distant from the metropolitan market, yet heavy transport can get from that centre to Adelaide in 15 hours, which is not an unreasonable time when it is considered that the metropolitan market could be supplied.

The matter raised in another place seemed to be on the basis that there should be another abattoir in this State. I do not agree that this is correct—certainly not at this stage. I advocate the closing down of the Gepps Cross abattoir over a period. There is no longer any need for it, and the abattoir no longer warrants the expenditure that will be necessary in future years to maintain it at the required standard. I can remember when, as a child, and after the Second World War, I passed the abattoir coming to Adelaide from the north: there was the stretch of open country between the abattoir and the metropolitan area of Adelaide. However, members know that there is a vastly different picture today. That area is entirely built up, and the abattoir site would be valuable as a development property. Is it good economics to use land of that value for this purpose? Surely it would be better to realize on the value of this land, and I ask that, before any further loans are made to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, the Government examine the feasibility of diverting this money to the development of regional abattoirs.

As I have mentioned, abattoirs are strategically located at Noarlunga, Murray Bridge, Peterborough and Port Lincoln, and another works is in the planning stage for Naracoorte, which will serve the South-East. Money would be much better spent if it were lent to the companies operating those works (in the case of Port Lincoln the Government owns the works and therefore it would be a straight capital expenditure) to increase the capacity of those works to cope with the metropolitan demand, so that they could not only cope with what they are doing, which is mainly export, but also supply the metropolitan area comfortably.

I am sorry to say that I recently had occasion to criticize the Minister of Agriculture concerning several aspects of the running of the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln, and this received considerable publicity, although I do not need to repeat the full story here. However, after I made a statement on this matter to the *Port Lincoln Times*, the Minister informed me during a telephone conversation that I had stuck my

neck right out by saying what I had said and that he was going to chop it off. Although a statement by the Minister appeared in the *Times* a week or two later, I point out that my head is still where it should be and that his statement was not very well received by people in my area.

I should like to refer to one aspect of the Minister's handling of the works at Port Lincoln which I think shows a lack of thought on his part, and it concerns something that certainly never would have occurred in private enterprise. Earlier in the year a group of Japanese business men came to South Australia looking for supplies of beef for the Japanese dim sim market. A report, appearing in the *Advertiser* on April 26 last, states:

There are problems associated with the production in northern South Australia of beef dim sims for the food market in Japan. The Secretary of the Spencer Gulf Industrial Promotion Committee (Mr. R. J. Mayes) said yesterday that negotiations were progressing with a group of Japanese business men for the manufacture and export of dim sims and other beef products from the northern Spencer Gulf area.

But the outcome for the dim sims was not encouraging because there was no export abattoirs in the area. The Japanese group, which visited South Australia recently, told Mr. Mayes that they were interested in importing South Australian fish as well as beef. Mr. Mayes said all the help possible would be given to the Japanese group because a valuable export industry for the north of South Australia could result from the negotiations.

When I read that report, I immediately wrote to the Minister of Agriculture, pointing out that the export abattoir at Port Lincoln was not much farther away and, in view of the concern I had had for some time about the losses incurred by those works, I asked whether the Government would approach this Japanese group and put to it a case for at least examining the feasibility of conducting its operations from Port Lincoln. The last paragraph of the short letter I received from the Minister states:

I have noted your comments, which will be borne in mind in conjunction with the consideration of any proposals affecting the future operations and functioning of the Port Lincoln establishment.

That reply was not very satisfactory, because it seemed that something might be thought of in future, so I wrote back to the Minister pointing out that time was important and asking once again whether he would make representations to the Japanese group to see whether some mutually agreeable arrangement might be made. The last sentence of the somewhat longer reply I received on that occasion states:

So far as I am aware, these negotiations are still in the "discussion" stage, and I have some reservations about Government intervention in the matter at this juncture.

I submit that this does not involve Government intervention in the normal sense. If private enterprise ran the Port Lincoln works, it would have approached the Japanese group, pressing its case, and I consider that in this regard the Government is in a similar position. The Government owns the works and, contrary to what the Minister says, it would not involve Government intervention in the normal sense. In fact, I believe the Government had every right to try to put its position to the group concerned and, in fact, had a duty to do so. These works are incurring heavy losses: in the 1970-71 financial year a loss of \$317,000 was incurred, and over the five previous years a loss of \$1,217,000-odd was incurred. Those heavy losses must not be allowed to continue. I understand that this year's loss is somewhat less, although it is still too much.

The Port Lincoln works is licensed for the export of all meats to destinations except the United States. In fact, there has been pressure in the past to upgrade the works to the standard required in connection with beef exports to the United States. I have expressed doubt whether Eyre Peninsula has sufficient numbers of beef cattle to warrant the expenditure involved (I believe it would amount to about \$500,000), although there is no doubt that the number of beef cattle is growing rapidly and that it would not be long before there was a sufficient number to warrant the expenditure. However, as a result of the interest expressed by the Japanese, the possibility was raised that extra numbers of beef cattle coming from the North might be sufficient to tip the scales. The problem remains that, as only certain cuts are required for dim sims, the rest of the carcass would be left. However, this problem could be solved by upgrading the works to the standard required in connection with beef exports to the United States. In connection with the Port Lincoln works, the Government has shown ineptitude and has prevaricated, but I hope that it will soon do something positive so that people in my area know what is going on. I point out that in this regard there is an awful feeling of uncertainty among producers on Eyre Peninsula.

Concerning the overall picture in respect of meatworks throughout the State, the suggestion has been made from one source that a completely new export killing works should be constructed, by means of a Government loan if necessary, somewhere in South Australia. The

idea is that this works would be used specifically for export purposes and that it would remove the pressure from the Gepps Cross abattoir, which would then be used for local metropolitan killing only. I believe that we do not need a new works at present, for, as I have pointed out, two works are already strategically placed throughout the State and, therefore, any expenditure in this regard should be directed to upgrading those works so that they can kill for export for all markets, as well as supplying the metropolitan area. This should be only an interim measure, followed next by the phasing out of the Gepps Cross abattoir. I repeat that the time of usefulness of the Gepps Cross abattoir is almost past. With the establishment of the Naracoorte works, we shall have slaughtering facilities distributed throughout the State. The Government should ensure that assistance is given, if necessary, to see that this abattoir is built as soon as possible. The Government has already announced that it believes in decentralization, as do most thinking people, and a move such as this would be a further step towards regional development.

The continuing mounting road toll concerns all people not only in this State but also throughout the Commonwealth. However, it should particularly concern the people of South Australia because, although I understand that the number of road fatalities occurring this year throughout the Commonwealth is less than that of last year, the number occurring in South Australia is greater. By midnight last night 171 deaths had occurred in South Australia compared to 165 in the same period last year. Certainly, it is not a big increase, but there should be no increase at all: there should be a decrease. There is no complete solution to this major problem, but I point out that the report on road safety, which is commonly referred to and known as the Pak Poy report, shows how several factors are inter-related. These factors include the road user, the vehicle, the road and the environment, and under these major headings there are many subheadings. For example, under "road user" there are factors including sex, age, disease, amount of alcohol, judgment, learning, and even personality. Under "vehicle", factors include headlights, brakes, steering, internal layout, and construction. Under "road", the factors include gradients, skid resistance, markings, signs, and so on. "Environment" includes climate, the volume of traffic, and so on.

All of these factors, and more, play a part in road safety. For example, a car may be perfectly safe, its brakes may be adequate and

it may have good steering on a good road, yet that same car may not be a safe vehicle on a bad road when rain is falling. That is what the report means by all factors being inter-related. Road accidents are caused by a combination of things. It is a matter of whittling down a little here and a little there until, in the aggregate, some impact has been made. It is no good saying, as has been said to me, that there is no point in remedying a certain defect because it causes only 3 per cent of all accidents and therefore will not make much difference. When we were discussing the merits of roadworthiness certificates, I was told that unroadworthy vehicles caused less than 5 per cent of accidents and that roadworthiness certificates would therefore contribute little to the reduction in the road toll. This is not the point. If one thing reduces road accidents by a little less than 5 per cent and something else reduces it by 3 per cent, surely in total some effect will be made.

Last session I introduced a Bill to make inquests compulsory when road deaths occurred and I believed this would play a great part in reducing the road toll. In my second reading explanation I said I believed it was a Bill with far-reaching effects, and I still believe this, yet despite this the Government would not accept it. From the figures available it is apparent that in most cases, if not in all cases, an inquest is held into deaths caused by motor vehicles in the metropolitan area, but obviously very few inquests are held in the country. In his contribution to the debate the Attorney-General said he believed that less than the desirable number of inquests were held in country areas. The Pak Poy report, referring to the accident rate in rural areas, states:

The extent to which the human element on road factors contributes to these factors is not known. Accidents in rural areas are generally more severe than in urban areas. In 1969, approximately 25 per cent of all accidents occurred in rural areas, and these 25 per cent of accidents caused 48 per cent of the deaths. . . . An investigation of causes of casualty accidents on rural roads would intuitively appear to be areas in which the results would justify the expenditure on research.

I raise the matter of compulsory inquests again because of the growing belief in the community that these would be desirable. An editorial in the *Central Times* of April 26 this year, dealing with the appalling Easter road toll, states:

Every fatal accident should be subject to a coroner's inquiry. The findings should be made public and include age of driver, previous offences, speed at time of accident, presence of

alcohol or other drugs, hours of driving previous to accident, place of accident, type of road, estimated causes of accident (mechanical and/or human).

In the *News* of May 1, Dr. Hecker (then President of the Australian Medical Association) is reported as saying:

Coronial inquiries would be regarded as ideal. We understand from the Attorney-General there are practical difficulties in achieving this. There may be practical difficulties in holding compulsory inquests, but it is a matter of how far we are prepared to go to reduce the carnage on our roads. The Pak Poy report refers to a cost-benefit basis, but can the cost be put on human lives? Roadworthiness certificates are used in many oversea countries and in New South Wales. Under this type of legislation, it is necessary to have a roadworthiness certificate before a car can be registered each year. The requirements for the certificates vary. For example, in New Zealand all vehicles are included, but in the United Kingdom it was phased in over several years. When the Bill was introduced some years ago only vehicles over 10 years old had to have certificates. After some period it was reduced to seven years and then to five years. I believe that currently all vehicles over three years old have to have a roadworthiness certificate. The Pak Poy report deals with this matter and finds against roadworthiness certificates mainly on the basis of cost-benefit.

I am willing to argue the cost-benefit value case. It is very hard to place a value on this. The Pak Poy report refers to an alternative method of reducing the number of unroadworthy vehicles on the road by increasing the number and effectiveness of on-the-spot vehicle inspections. This would involve using mobile police patrols for efficiency and the effective checking of all aspects that are considered important. This method, used in California, involves inspecting 10 components of the vehicle: tyres, brakes, steering, lights, horn, mirrors, glass and glazing, reflectors, wind-shield wipers, and (one which is not relevant to South Australia but which I hope will be in the foreseeable future) the air pollution control device. The annual cost of these on-the-spot checks is estimated to be half the cost of compulsory inspection of every vehicle. On that basis, I should be willing to ask the Government to examine this, although my initial thinking was about roadworthiness tests.

In Victoria, the P plate is used, and it is estimated that the use of the P plate for "provisional" or "probationary" has reduced the accident rate in the new licence group

in New South Wales. Possibly the overall percentage would not be very high, but any reduction we can get is worth while. To effect a reduction in the road toll it is necessary to attack the problem in as many ways as possible. There are many ways in which it can be attacked and it is impossible to discuss them all at once. I know that this Government and previous Governments have studied the problem for many years, and many committees have been established to study all or certain aspects of safety on the roads. I should like to reduce my requests to the Government to three only: I ask the Government to examine the feasibility of compulsory inquests (a measure which I introduced last year but which was unaccountably, to me, not accepted by the Government and defeated in the last session); secondly, to introduce roadworthiness certificates, or to follow the Californian method of more and efficient on-the-spot investigations of the roadworthiness of motor vehicles; and, thirdly, to introduce P plates for provisional licences, so that for one year after obtaining the licence the licensee is on probation, and any infringement of the law will result in his starting again with an L plate. I believe these and many other small points may help to reduce the road toll, instead of having the constant increase that has been apparent for many years. I support the motion.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): I rise with pleasure to support this motion which, as most members know, will be the last one to which I speak in this House. It takes me back to the first Address in Reply to which I spoke.

Mr. Coumbe: As the first woman member of the House.

Mrs. STEELE: That is correct. Before referring to the things that have happened during the time I have been a member of this place, I, as is customary and because I think it is due, should like to pay my respects to those members who most of us have known for a long time but who are no longer with us. I refer to Mr. Riches, Mr. Quirke, Mr. Bockelberg and the Hon. Mr. Robinson. I knew the three deceased members of this House for the whole time I have been here, and I join with other members in expressing my sympathy in this place to their families, although I did this privately at the time of their passing. I should like, once again, to pledge my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen whose representative in this State, Sir Marcus Oliphant, as

Governor of South Australia, presented the Address to Parliament at the opening ceremony. When I entered Parliament in 1959 I came in on a wave of change, because in that year there was a record number of women who sought to enter Parliament; in fact, nine, the same number as that now seeking to follow me in the seat I have represented for a long time. At that time the Hon. Jessie Cooper and I were the first two women elected to Parliament in South Australia.

I recall with much pleasure the time I have spent in this place and the kindly, courteous, and chivalrous attention my male colleagues have paid to me whilst I have been here. The first day I came into this place the then Chairman of Committees telephoned me and asked me to lunch with him. He was also chairman of my Party, the late Mr. Dunnage, and he asked me to lunch with him before attending a Party meeting. The declaration of the poll for my district had been set at 1 p.m. and I told him that I would not be able to attend until about 1.30 p.m. He told me to come in when it suited me. Lunch was a disturbed meal, because people were being introduced to me, but finally I finished and said, "Thank you very much indeed." Pointing to the desk in the corner, Mr. Dunnage said, "You pay over there." It was a good thing in some ways, because it put me right from the word go on a basis of equality. Although other people may have a different impression of his remark, I was grateful to him for it. I think this is one of the few spheres into which women have entered and in which there is absolute equality.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do they need a different refreshment room?

Mrs. STEELE: I am entitled to go into the refreshment room but rarely do: that is one of my personal foibles. I have enjoyed serving alongside members who are still in this House: those who were here when I first became a member, and many who have been elected since. This is one of the few places where women have equality of pay and opportunity, and this cannot be said of other places that now enjoy equality of pay. For example, in the Public Service the opportunities are not available to women as they are in a place like this. As the Minister of Education would know, the Education Department is one of the places in which women have this opportunity, if they are prepared to offer themselves for service. I was asked to move the adoption of the Address in Reply when I first became a member, and this I regarded as a great

honour. After I had been elected the news must have been cabled to London, because I received a cable from Viscountess Mary Astor, the first woman member of the British Parliament, congratulating me. In my reply I said that I had been asked to move the Address in Reply, and she pointed out to me that for the first two years she had served in the British Parliament not one of her friends had spoken to her.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I understand that she was a pretty tough cookie.

Mrs. STEELE: Perhaps. I am now making my last contribution to the Address in Reply debate. I was the only woman member until the present member for Tea Tree Gully, then Barossa, won that seat and swelled the ranks of women here. I suppose I cannot say that she swelled them too much, but she added quantity and quality to Parliament. I have watched her career with much interest, and have been told by someone who should know that he had served under several chairmen of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation but that the member for Tea Tree Gully was one of the best chairmen he had served under. I pass that comment on to the honourable member and share some pride in it. At present a few South Australian women are members of Parliament: there were five when we had a woman in the House of Representatives, but that was for a short time only. Now two women are contesting the seat of Davenport, and I think it would be nice if a woman were successful, but that lies in the lap of the gods or, more realistically, on how members who are eligible to vote mark their ballot-papers! During my years here as a member, I have had the great pleasure of seeing appointed South Australia's first woman Queen's Counsel, who then went on to the great honour of being elevated to the Supreme Court bench. I refer to Justice Roma Mitchell, who is a great friend of mine and whom I have known for many years. Most people will agree that she has served with honour and distinction. Not only do I think that it is time that we had a South Australian on the High Court bench but I am sure that there is no person better suited to serve than Justice Roma Mitchell.

Another matter of interest to women was their being given the right to serve on juries. Women in this State had sought this right for a long time. I remember in the past waiting on Sir Thomas Playford, when he was Premier, in company with the Hon. Jessie Cooper, Justice Mitchell, Miss Ruth Gibson, and several other prominent women and putting before Sir

Thomas a substantial case for the right of women to serve on juries. I am pleased that this right has been won for women because experience has shown that the dire consequences that were supposed to follow giving women this right have not occurred; in fact, women are serving well indeed. Some women feared that serving on a jury would be the worst thing that could happen to them, but most women who have served on juries say that it is one of the most interesting jobs that they have ever had to do.

Equal pay for women has also been introduced, although regrettably, as far as I was concerned, it was not at a time when my Party was in Government. All sorts of obstacles were put in the way of implementing equal pay for women. Many of these changes are resisted for a long time, but they are then introduced without even a ripple on the surface with regard to providing the necessary money, and they bring justice to the people concerned. This was the case with equal pay, which I was glad to see implemented and which I was also pleased to see carried on during the time my Party was in Government from 1968 to 1970. As I have said, although equality has been provided in salaries for women, they still do not have what I consider to be equality of opportunity. Although I am no member of Women's Lib, I believe that women must still fight strongly for several things, one of which we will be debating very soon (I am strongly in favour of women's rights in this matter).

One matter that has left its mark on community life more than any other recent change has been the liberalizing of the Licensing Act. I think this has been a good move. In this regard, for a long time one had only to travel overseas to see how much better conditions were there than they were in Australia. The changes that have taken place have occurred all over Australia and not just in South Australia. Over the last decade or perhaps a little longer, throughout Australia we have seen licensing laws liberalized. When the licensing changes are considered together with the way in which our eating habits have changed as a result of the ideas of people who have come from overseas, we can realize what a much more pleasant life we can enjoy in Australia with the abundance of good things we have. Not the least consideration in this regard is the superb wine South Australia produces in such quantities.

These changes have led to an improvement in the facilities available. No-one can gainsay

the fact that our hotels are much more attractive places these days than they used to be. Nowadays we can go into hotels or restaurants and obtain first-class meals. One is not ashamed to take people from other countries into these places, because one feels that one can offer facilities that compare favourably to anything a tourist can get overseas. In my recent travels, I did not see any restaurant that was better than some of the best restaurants that we have here. It is a great pleasure to realize that we can offer the touring public conditions such as they are used to in countries overseas. Throughout most of my life I have had a special interest in education. This was compounded when I was Minister of Education from 1968 to 1970.

Mr. Coumbe: The first woman Minister.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, in South Australia, and I was the first woman Minister of Education in Australia. As I am not used to blowing my own trumpet, I am reluctant to say these things. As members realize, I held this portfolio at a time when "crisis" was the operative word. It was strange that immediately our Government went out of office and the present Minister took over the portfolio all the clamour and tension died down immediately. Since he has been in office, the present Minister has had a perfectly wonderful spin, as I am sure he will not deny. The situation that faced me when I was Minister was not peculiar to South Australia but applied throughout the Commonwealth. I remember at Ministerial conferences swapping confidences with my counterparts from other States, and they were experiencing similar difficulties. Despite the fact that this was a torrid period in the history of education in South Australia, I will refer to some of the highlights of that period because we notched up an impressive number of achievements in the two years. I had the great pleasure of appointing the Karmel committee, and it cannot be denied that its report is now being used extensively as the blueprint for the present Government's education programme.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It wasn't very much wanted by many people.

Mrs. STEELE: True. I was sorry that I was not still Minister when the report was ready for release. Without a doubt, the report contained some most excellent recommendations. Most of these have been implemented by the Government, as they would have been implemented by us had we still been in Government.

Secondly, we initiated the national survey of the needs of education. It was my responsibility as Minister and as Chairman of the council of education meeting held in South Australia that year to put up this proposal to my colleagues in the other States. It was seized on with alacrity. We know the tremendous work that went into preparing that survey into the needs of education and the staggering sum of money that, when it was all collated, appeared to be necessary to spend on education.

Another thing that happened was the setting up of regional offices. These were established in Whyalla and Mount Gambier. I remember at the time having a fight with the Treasurer to get this through Cabinet, because when we took office the Treasury finances were in such a poor state that we were permitted to spend only what was absolutely necessary. I remember putting up a tremendous fight with Sir Glen Pearson and eventually getting him to accede to my request for this money to establish regional offices in Mount Gambier and Whyalla and also to appoint a Regional Guidance Officer in the Northern Territory. At that time we were responsible for education in the Northern Territory.

Another innovation was the initial action to establish a Research and Planning Branch. This was undertaken by appointing a Principal Planning and Research Officer of senior officer level. I have no doubt that this branch has been extended greatly, because it is an essential part of any education system. During my period as Minister of Education, there was the biggest infusion of ancillary staff to schools at all levels that had ever been undertaken in any State. This took effect at the beginning of the 1970 school year, with 534 clerical and technical members of staffs in private and secondary schools and a Registrar for each technical college and for the South Australian School of Art. In addition, clerical staff were provided in adult education centres and technical colleges.

The Bedford Park Teachers College was completed and the Salisbury Teachers College was sufficiently advanced when I went out of office to be able to accept the first students in 1970. Just before we left office, plans to build a teachers college at Murray Park were announced. These plans were approved by both the State and the Commonwealth Governments, the latter Government having provided \$3,600,000 for completion of the college.

Mr. Coumbe: That's not a bad sum!

Mrs. STEELE: No, it is a good sum. We also extended the Raywood Inservice Training

Centre by providing accommodation for 31 additional students. One matter that arose out of a question of great moment at the time was the appointment of the Barnes committee, charged with reviewing student teacher allowances. Although we went through much travail at the time, I consider that this move was good and has probably served the State well. In this period, too, mature age allowances and allowances for married men were introduced. The payment of normal allowances to women at teachers colleges was also approved. Women students who married while at a teachers college were given the opportunity to elect to continue to receive allowances.

All these matters are only small items but they make up a background for those who go into education that is most important to them. The provision of accouchement leave was another matter that we introduced. About 48 main advances and innovations came into being in this period. We increased the book allowances for fourth-year and fifth-year secondary students to \$24 and \$26 respectively, with effect from January, 1970.

Also (and I think this is important), a progressive extension of the number of part-time teachers was made and release time scholarships granted teachers time off from teaching duties to obtain higher qualifications. For those who will be the executive people of the future, this opportunity is indeed important. New standards and improved designs of teachers' residences were accepted as policy and during the two years that I was Minister of Education the total cost of teachers' residences provided was \$610,000. Again, that is not a bad sum, but when I remember how we were criticized for the things that we did or did not do, it is nice to be able to think of what we achieved in those years in Government. They should not be forgotten, because we have pride in them. I have, anyway.

We provided for the building of eight experimental schools, open-space units, in primary schools. This was their beginning. They commenced in primary schools, in the city and in the country, in areas where they could test climatic and social conditions under which children would be taught. They were selected carefully for this reason. They became so successful that the planning went forward to build secondary schools in the same type of construction, and members recognize that this has made an important contribution to education in South Australia. Now we are having whole schools built in this way.

For those who are interested in Aboriginal education, I mention that in 1969 we appointed an Assistant Superintendent to concentrate merely on education for Aborigines at all levels, and six Aboriginal teaching aides were appointed to Aboriginal schools. The training of 10 such aides was commenced at Amata Aborigines school that I had the pleasure of opening in 1969. Although I do not know for certain, I understand that this programme has continued and has been expanded from time to time.

Honourable members will realize that we had the problem in 1969 of a teacher shortage. One just does not produce teachers out of thin air, although I remember how much I and the Government were criticized at the time because we could not do that. Realizing that the problem was world-wide, we took action and I appointed a senior officer of the Education Department to go overseas to recruit staff in the United Kingdom and the United States of America. That this has been successful is evidenced by the fact that we have many teachers here now from other countries. We increased the boarding allowances for secondary students from January 1, 1970, but in 1969 we had increased the allowance for teachers college students. Also, as a Government we implemented the locality allowances for teachers early in 1969.

We also announced in the 1968 policy speech that we would make grants to independent schools, and these were instituted in 1969 on the basis of \$10 a student in primary and secondary schools. Later, to justify our promise to increase the allowance when funds permitted, we increased the rate for secondary school students to \$20. I think I have given sufficient evidence to show the House that, despite the pressures and tensions exerted by the teachers between 1968 and 1970, we achieved much. The teachers were supported by the Opposition at that time: there was no secret about that. Everyone knew that the Opposition was supporting the teachers most vociferously.

I remember coming to the House day after day and being asked, by the then member for Glenelg, the same kind of question each day in a different form. It was rather refreshing when I came to this side of the House and heard the Minister being asked the same kind of question as I was asked and giving the same kind of reply as I had given him. This is the luck of the game, I suppose. One must take this kind of thing in politics, and honourable members do not bear one

another any malice for it. Those two years were highly productive of well worthwhile innovations in advances in education.

I have some reservations about where we are going in relation to education. Considering the enormous sum that is spent on education today, I wonder whether we are getting out of it what we should expect to get out of it. I have always been highly critical of the sum of money spent on school buildings. Indeed, during my term of office as Minister of Education I was always telling my senior officers that I thought we were spending too much on some of the new schools. By saving, say, \$100,000 on each school, we could literally build one extra school in every nine or 10 that are built. It is not the school building but the quality of teaching that really matters in the education of our children. In this respect, I wonder whether we are getting value for our money. This is, of course, a generalization, because plenty of teachers are dedicated to their profession. I recommend that honourable members read the last issue of the *Teachers Journal*, in which there is an excellent article headed, "Cult of the individual is costing us dearly", written by a Mrs. A. G. Pobke, who teaches at the Port Lincoln Primary School and who makes some salient points regarding the quality of teaching and whether we are giving our best to the children being educated in our schools today.

Mr. Evans: The edition before that contained an article by Mr. John Murrie.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes; that was another good article. The article to which I have referred asks in no uncertain terms whether we are getting what we expect from education, and I commend it to honourable members. I do not want to bore them by reading parts of that article now. However, there are some excellent extracts that illustrate the points I am making, one of which is as follows:

The greatest danger of the attractive salary and free university education which goes with our profession these days is that it attracts academics sometimes of great brilliance with little or no vocation for instructing and guiding the young.

She goes on to imply that the cream of the students go into the teachers colleges, and that they are picked absolutely on their academic rating. She refers to one case in which a girl who, although not having a sufficiently high rating on the first occasion she applied, has since been accepted and has romped miles ahead of other academic types who were selected on the first occasion. She talks about the new methods, and says:

We have honestly tried to implement all the new methods and recommendations, at what expense the secondary schools are about to find out. The most stable and lasting innovations are those that grow steadily with the developing needs of a community as opposed to revolutionary, trendy ideas.

She has hit the nail right on the head. She continues:

The young have always needed kindly, but very firm, authority. Where else will they find security? How else will they in turn know where they are going?

When she speaks of "knowing where they are going", she refers to a conference at which she heard a person acting in an advisory capacity say, "I do not know where we are going. My comment on my writing pad as I sat there was, 'Well, God help us.'" If any honourable member wants to read some pointed comments about what is happening in education today, he can get them from this article or, as the member for Fisher said, from reading other articles that appear from time to time in the *Teachers Journal*. Some parents have been encouraged in many instances to be critical about education, without their really knowing much about the quality of education. I suppose I will get hauled over the coals by some people in the community for saying these things. However, I do not think parents really know where they are going in relation to their children's education, and are led by the nose in asking for an extravagant type of education when what they really want are teachers who can teach their children.

We often hear about the poor, unfortunate people of past decades who were strictly disciplined and who learnt parrot-fashion the tables and things they ought to know. Many members of this House are of that generation, and I do not think we are badly adjusted people. Indeed, I do not think we are badly educated, although perhaps we have had a poorer education than many of today's children receive by today's standards. Today, at the age of 13 years, a child has literally to decide what he is going to do with his life, because his education is then channelled into a certain stream. I believe our children are being denied many of the joys of education today, simply because they are not receiving a full kind of education.

I laugh sometimes when I think of the subjects in which I passed when I took my first public examination in Western Australia: I passed in history, geography, geology, music, biology and English. It was a broad spectrum of education and, by some standards, I suppose certain people wonder how I got as far as I did and, indeed, how I got into this place.

Mrs. Pobke says (and I agree with this):

I received a sound education 40 years ago in a lively, active, joyful way at the hands of dedicated, imaginative teachers and I see no reason why children cannot continue to do so, but don't let's delude ourselves into thinking that a TV set, film projector or programmed reading kit will be anything more than an aid to a kindly, lively, imaginative teacher.

There are far too few of them today. Despite all the wonderful training that the students get in teachers colleges today, there are far too few who really give our children that delight in learning and the joy of actual living, which they can get only if the teachers are imparters of knowledge and can teach in a lively, imaginative way. I suppose some of my generation would have qualified in their youth to be called "problem children", for all members know there are problem children in every generation. But it concerns me to see the trend discernible in education today, and I query whether, in spite of the terrific amount that is being channelled into education at the expense of other aspects of Government (such as hospitals, housing and all the other fields that people need just as badly), we are getting out of education as much as we should be getting from it.

Today, with our sophisticated schools, set in beautiful grounds and sports fields, with entrance halls (and so much waste space, on which we could cut down), their fine libraries provided by grants from the Commonwealth Government, the sophisticated laboratories and the lavish equipment (I spoke earlier of the various kits now supplied to children), the quality of education is not nearly as good as it ought to be. I hope that honourable members will read the article to which I have referred. In 1969, 81 per cent of the money allocated to education in the Budget went in salaries, leaving only 19 per cent to be spent on all the other things that go to make a good education. I do not deny that teachers should receive excellent salaries. Indeed, I am glad they do. However, it seems out of proportion that 81 per cent of the education allocation should go in salaries, with only 19 per cent left for the remaining things that are needed. While dealing with education, I point out that the introduction of the television set into homes throughout the world is synonymous with the wave of sex, violence and anarchy that seems to be part of our way of life today.

Mr. Coumbe: The permissive society.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes. John Robinson, a producer involved in the Festival of Arts, and I agreed, when recently discussing the matter

of entertainment, that today one cannot go to a theatre to see a comedy or musical comedy and have a really good belly laugh and get away from one's cares and worries. All we get today is a sordid presentation of life, one production after the other, including all the aspects of sex, violence and anarchy to which I have referred. I was glancing through the paper the other day, wondering whether I might go to the local drive-in theatre at Hectorville, to which I go occasionally, and I saw a huge advertisement, showing suggestive pictures and stating:

Hundreds of cars turned away last weekend. Second big week. A terrifying new look at motor cycle savagery. From the same studios that made "Born Losers". To avenge the death of his girl he faced a savage enemy on a bloody battlefield of open road.

A smaller advertisement appearing the next evening stated:

Motor cycle hoodlums unleash themselves on innocent women.

That was an M film, that is, for mature audiences.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Did you go to see it?

Mrs. STEELE: As it did not appeal to me, I did not go to see it. When we consider how young people have to combat that sort of thing and when we bear in mind that many people say to their children, "Watch television while I go away and do something", we realize that some children do not have much of a chance to see the decent things of life and to appreciate what is good and what is not good.

Mr. Coumbe: Look at the R films advertised in today's paper.

Mrs. STEELE: In today's paper practically every advertisement appearing on the amusement page relates to an R film. I agree with the mother who wrote a letter to the Editor the other day asking why films to which children could be taken were not made today. It is a pretty poor reflection on people our age and on our times that this sort of thing is happening. The film people say that they make the type of film for which there is a demand but, frankly, I think that is a gimmick. They make these films because they can turn them out cheaply and get good box office results and, the bloodier the film, the better the audiences seem to like it.

One of the matters with which I was associated early in my Parliamentary career was the successful introduction of a scheme to transport handicapped children to special schools in the metropolitan area. This gave me much pleasure and pride, because I knew of the

great need in the community for this sort of thing. I hope that the time will soon come when this service will be provided free of charge, if it has not yet been provided.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It has been operating since July 1.

Mrs. STEELE: I am interested to hear that. Actually, I was not in favour of the original scheme at first, because I, together with the committee that worked with me to initiate the scheme during Sir Baden Pattinson's term as Minister of Education, considered that parents would appreciate it more if they had to make a small contribution. We were working on the theory that what people got for nothing they did not appreciate so much. However, I realize that times have changed, and I am indeed grateful that the scheme has been altered.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They wouldn't have done it if we hadn't moved a private members' motion along those lines.

Mrs. STEELE: That is so. I refer now to something that I have sought for a long time while I have been in Parliament, namely, the setting up of a school of occupational therapy. The planning for this school commenced during my first years in Parliament, and I was closely associated with the matter. I expect later to have the great pleasure of introducing a Bill, to which I hope the Government will agree, to register occupational therapists. One of the first committees that I set up as Minister of Education was the committee to investigate paramedical studies, a field which we realized would have to be explored and for which a special area would have to be established so that paramedical disciplines could be taught.

I think it was always intended by the Institute of Technology eventually to establish a paramedical centre on land next to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and I hope that that plan has not been shelved, because we are increasingly realizing that we must establish this kind of paramedical school. The setting up of an occupational therapy school at Glenside last year was the first step in this direction, and the first diplomates will graduate next year. To do them justice, the disciplines concerned really need a separate school of their own, which I hope will soon be provided.

In closing, I wish to correct one or two statements that have been made recently in this place. First, the member for Ross Smith referred the other day to my retiring from Parliament: I assure him (I think he knows) that I have always spoken in this place with

complete honesty and sincerity, and I also assure him that my retirement is completely voluntary, although he suggested that it was not. As I had actually told the then Leader and the Deputy Leader of my Party at the beginning of this Parliament that it would be my last Parliament, they were well aware of this fact. However, I think this information may have been used so that Mr. Dean Brown could announce, long before nominations were called, that he would stand against me in Davenport and in this way, of course, I could be embarrassed and compromised. But, as members know, I came out immediately and made it clear that I had intended to retire at the end of this Parliament.

As a senior member of my Party and of Parliament, I believe that it was my prerogative to choose the time at which I would announce this decision. I am rather loath to correct the second point, but if I do not do it here people may draw their own conclusions: I have absolutely no association (as has been suggested by the member for Gouger) and have had nothing to do with the distribution of a certain pamphlet, and I will explain what happened in this regard. I returned home from Parliament House one night to find a bundle of pamphlets left at my home. I put them inside, and a few days later the President of the Burnside-Davenport Young Liberals rang to ask whether he could see me because he wanted my advice on a personal matter. I do not intend to disclose the nature of the personal matter, because it had nothing to do with anything associated with the subject I am discussing. After I had a discussion with him he asked whether I would write an article for the *Roundabout News* entitled "Why I did not join the Liberal Movement", which I said I would do and which I have done. I noticed that he saw the pamphlets on the stool in my drawing room, where they had been since I picked them up. I said, "These may interest you. Take one (or some) and if you feel, after you have read them, that they are worth handing out, it is entirely up to you what you want to do with them."

That is the extent of my involvement in that exercise, and I want to make that quite clear. I have been put in the position where several people have tried to involve me in this controversy. First, I had a ring from a person I know now to be a member of the Liberal Movement, asking whether I knew where he could get hold of some of these pamphlets. I said that I did not have any,

that I had one at Parliament House, and that I knew there was a post office box number on the bottom of it. I told him I had given some to the young man I have mentioned, and that he might have some more, and perhaps details could be obtained from him. I hardly would have done that had I been involved or had I thought there could be any kind of wrong association with this.

A few days later no less a person than Mr. Mark Day of the *Sunday Mail* tried to trap me into an admission that I had had something to do with distributing this pamphlet. That kind of thing I resent utterly and entirely. What I do or how I answer questions is entirely my own business. I sensed that I was being trapped, and I told him that I had no intention of being involved in this matter and that I very much doubted his motives in having rung me. The outcome of that was to be seen in the article, which read as though the writer was having a bob each way. I want to make that quite clear.

I have said all I want to say on the Address in Reply. Naturally, if this Parliament runs its traditional course, I shall be here for some months yet, but I take this opportunity to thank honourable members for the courtesy that has been always extended to me in this place in the very many happy years I have spent here. Honourable members will find for themselves one of these days, if they have not found out already, that it becomes a way of life. I know that I will miss many of the associations and much of what goes on here, but I want to retire while I still have time to enjoy doing some of the things I want to do. What I ask more than anything else is that I go out of Parliament with people believing in my honesty and my sincerity, and believing that I have been dignified in the pursuit of my Parliamentary duties.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion, and I join with other speakers in expressing my sympathy and my condolences to the relatives and friends of the former members who have passed away since the end of the last session. I regret the untimely death of Sir James Harrison, and I extend to Lady Harrison and her family my sincere condolences. I trust that their lives will in future be happy and healthy at all times. I believe it is only right that we express our regret, to a degree, that four members are retiring from this House. In particular, I wish to mention the mover of this motion, the member for Elizabeth, whom I have found to be a man of honesty. He has a dry wit, sometimes a

sarcastic wit that can be quite biting, but it is a talent that he uses effectively and without offence. He has been a loyal member of his Party at all times, and the people in his area owe him a debt for the service he has given to them and to the State.

Of the gentleman to whom some of my colleagues refer to as "the judge", the member for Alexandra, I say that possibly we differ on many issues, and we agree to differ, but I have found him to be a man of the utmost honesty, the utmost dedication to the cause for which he works, and loyal to his Party and to his colleagues. He was a help to me as a new Parliamentarian and has been so over the past five years. He has been able to guide me when at times I have wanted to go on paths he would not think wise for me to follow.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You certainly needed him.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Education might appreciate the same sort of guidance, if he were willing to accept it. I thank the member for Alexandra for the help he has given me. I reiterate the sentiments of the member for Davenport, who said that, as Minister of Education, she was used by the teachers in this State to be cut to pieces. This refers not to all teachers but to a section of the teaching profession. I believe the action taken at that time was unjust and unfair. There was at that time disruption throughout Australia in the teaching profession, and it was mainly anti-Commonwealth Government action. When the history of that time is written the words used to describe the term of office as Minister of Education of the member for Davenport (then member for Burnside) will be entirely different from those written when she was in office. Very few people could have better withstood in this House the abuse and strong questioning the member for Davenport accepted, and accepted with great heart.

The member for Goyder occupied the room I first used when I entered this building. I appreciate all the help he gave me in the early days. He does not speak often in this Chamber, but when he does there is great common sense and wisdom in his words. It is only when members are going off the beaten track or being dishonest that he is inspired to bring them back to the track of honesty and, perhaps, sincerity. He has represented his area well. I thank all four retiring members for the services they have given to our State. I wish them a long and fruitful retirement, doing the things which they have been unable to do as members of Parliament but which they

would have liked to do, perhaps having a caravan holiday or some other pleasure denied them because they have always been at the will and the want of the people they have represented and of South Australia as a whole.

I express my appreciation of the appointment of our present Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant. He was born and lived part of his life at Mylor, in the Adelaide Hills. The member for Tea Tree Gully has spent some part of her life in the same area. On his return to South Australia to take up his appointment, Sir Mark was rather alarmed to see the development (wise in some cases, unwise in others) that had taken place in the Adelaide Hills. Only a person like the Governor, who has been away for several years and has then returned, can assess the changes. For people like me, who have spent their life there, it grows on us and we do not take offence at it until it is pointed out by people like the present Governor. I appreciate the way that he has operated as Governor, and I think South Australians can be justly proud of the person who represents Her Majesty the Queen at this time in this State.

I now refer to one or two issues that concern me but, in particular, I shall tell the history of a man from when he was 17 years old and shall describe the treatment that he has received from Governments; I do not blame just the Australian Labor Party. His name is Karanewitsch; he was a white Russian and lived in that part of the world until taken from his school at about 17 years of age by German troops in 1942. At that stage he was studying to be a veterinary surgeon (and no doubt that would please our present Leader of the Opposition), but was made to work on a farm in Germany. He considers that he was lucky in being allowed to work on a farm, because many people went into factories and perhaps had to do more unpleasant work. He survived the war and came to Queensland in 1950 to work for one year for the Commonwealth Government in the Postmaster-General's Department. He also worked for a short time as a driver in the tramways. He then moved to New South Wales and conducted a small delicatessen until 1957, when he came to South Australia to work for a construction firm as a builder's labourer.

Mr. Slater: Did he join the union?

Mr. EVANS: I doubt whether he would join a union, because his life had been one of hell, and I do not think he would join anything that had a trait towards Communism.

In 1962, whilst working for the construction firm, he was holding the hook of a crane that touched overhead power lines, and he received a severe electric shock. He was in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for six months, spent a further nine months in and out of St. Andrews Hospital, and at the end of 1964 he had his final medical treatment at Calvary Hospital. He went to Bedford Industries for 18 months on a rehabilitation course, because he was partly crippled on one side of his body. After he was there 18 months it was impossible for anyone to find him work, either through a Government agency or through the Bedford Industries organization. We all know what a wonderful job that organization does to rehabilitate people.

At that time, after paying legal expenses, he had in his pocket workmen's compensation to the value of \$28,000. When he was naturalized in 1962 he was told by those who conducted the ceremony that before he bought land or property he should go to the local council and make sure that there were no restrictions on the use of the land, and to ensure that he was not being led down the path by a shady land agent or by any other person. He visited the Hills seeking a property, and found one at Bradbury, which was outside the Mount Bold water catchment area. The local council assured him (and it was a correct assurance then) that there were no restrictions on this property and that he could keep pigs. He had a love for animals, as his history showed, and this was his one ambition.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Would he like you?

Mr. EVANS: I do not know whether he would or not, and I would not make the sort of comment that has been made by the Minister of Labour and Industry, although some of his colleagues might. This man was willing to work to obtain a living on his own in a business. He developed the property and spent additional money to take the total to \$33,000. He was keeping 400 pigs until November, 1971, when he applied to the council and received permission to extend the pig sties to accommodate 600, and he also paid the building fee. In December of that year the Government introduced a regulation stopping any extensions to dairies or piggeries in that area, because a new reservoir was to be built at Clarendon. He did not start his building construction until January, but inspectors of the Engineering and Water Supply Department moved on to his property, took photographs

of the partly constructed extensions, and stopped further progress.

This man lives in what we may call a hovel of a hut. He is 47 years of age, and has a woman friend he planned to marry, and to build a new home, but he needs 600 pigs to have a viable unit and maintain the necessary standard. We had a deputation to the Minister, but the Minister said that he had no discretionary power because the regulations bound him. Also, the Minister has no power to buy the property, so the man has a property from which he cannot get a living, and society cannot offer him a job. He is willing to work to earn a living without society having to carry him, but he cannot do so. The Minister told him to place the property on the market, and that he has done, but who wants to buy it? It is on the market at \$27,000 and not one person has been interested in it.

What does he do now? I believe that we, as responsible Parliamentarians, should introduce legislation to give the Minister discretion, and that the Minister should accept the responsibility of making decisions, whether he be a Liberal or a Labor Minister, because often individuals are unjustly treated. In cases like this it is the duty of the Government to buy the property and sell it for what it can get. This man would be pleased to move outside the catchment area and start again, although he is partly crippled and past the prime of life, and he does not have enough money to throw \$6,000 down the drain. I believe an injustice exists in this case.

When leaving the deputation to the Minister the man said (and I know his remark affected the Minister as much it did me), "If I were in Germany when Hitler was alive, he would have shot me because I am a cripple. That would be better than what I am suffering now." I believe his words were true and that he really meant them.

I now refer to action that the Government has started to take in respect of the Transport Branch of the Education Department. That branch has developed an efficient system over the years but disaster is looming ahead for it because this Government has decided it will force the department to use all the derelict and antiquated ex-Municipal Tramways Trust Leyland Tiger Mark II buses for the transportation of country and city children. These vehicles, when fully laden and using up all standing room as well as sitting room, will be overweight, according to the law of this State.

Mr. Payne: Is this for children or for adults?

Mr. EVANS: Children, to the best of my knowledge. I wish to clarify this for the member for Mitchell. I have directed questions to the Minister of Roads and Transport asking whether he will make available to me the weights over the rear axles of the M.T.T. buses, but he is not prepared to do so.

Mr. Payne: Why don't you ask him when he is here?

Mr. EVANS: I asked him when he was in his seat. I have asked questions but have received no replies. Last session he said he would think about it.

Mr. Mathwin: What makes you think you are different from anyone else? He never answers anyone.

Mr. EVANS: One comes to appreciate the uselessness of asking a question a second time if the Minister of Roads and Transport does not answer it the first time.

Mr. Payne: You give up fairly easily.

Mr. EVANS: These buses are 8ft. 6in. in width when the width, according to the Road Traffic Act, should not exceed 8ft. 2½in.; so they are too wide. One needs a permit to operate overweight vehicles, even within 30 miles of the General Post Office; that permit must be renewed at least annually and, in some cases, every six months. One of these buses was purchased by the Education Department from the M.T.T. for the beginning of the 1972 school year. It was a good hand-picked one and cost \$4,500; \$800 has been spent on it from the beginning of this year until May to keep it up to a safe operational standard. At present, the M.T.T. is narrowing a bus from 8ft. 6in. to 8ft. 2½in. and completing a mechanical overhaul. One can only estimate the cost of this but, from inquiries I have made, it is known that the bodywork modification, if let to private enterprise, would cost in excess of \$3,000. This, with the mechanical repairs plus the base cost of the bus (\$4,500) means the M.T.T. is outlaying money to the extent of \$8,000 to \$10,000, in order to get back from the Education Department a maximum of \$5,000.

This trial bus is at Salisbury at the moment. It, or a similar bus, has been taken to Mount Gambier and Port Pirie but has not proved successful. It was 15 years old and suffered from metal fatigue and body deterioration. It had covered 450,000 miles and the mechanical wear was great. The Education Department examiner had great difficulty in handling the vehicle. The only time he felt competent in handling it was on a good, wide, bitumen road, and these school buses do not run on good,

wide, bitumen roads. It is difficult to manoeuvre the vehicle within the law. When the Education Department examiner attempted to turn the vehicle right, in the main road in Mount Gambier, it took him 3½ lanes to complete the turn, a dangerous practice in country areas. Flexibility would be lost to the Education Department with ex-M.T.T. buses because the drivers are not specially trained to handle such heavy vehicles and we could not swap such a bus from one area to another; it would create difficulties for the department.

During the year one bus may be operated by five or six schoolteachers, because of illness, transfers or special excursions, where different drivers drive the vehicle. Buses may need to be able to transfer routes and locations according to population and school changes. With a fleet of more than 350 buses, it is important to retain flexibility. The teacher drivers are not professional, full-time, specialist drivers but they are given a very sound training, as both accident and bus service records show. They are good drivers, but there are some women drivers. Can we imagine putting one of these heavy vehicles in the hands of a woman driver on a country road?

The Education Department at present is changing S.B. Bedfords from petrol to diesel to gain six miles a gallon—in other words, to save money. At the moment petrol motors give eight miles to the gallon; by changing over to diesel we can get 14 miles to the gallon; Transway Bus Services (Elizabeth), which has 19 ex-M.T.T. buses, can get an average of about eight miles to the gallon. The weight of the S.B. Bedford used by the Education Department is 5 tons 4cwt., unladen; the ex-M.T.T. Leyland weighs 8 tons 14cwt. The S.B. Bedford fully laden is approximately 8½ tons. If we reckon that each student weighs about 112 lb., which would be a fairly high estimate, with the Leylands they would go very close to breaking the law.

Each S.B. Bedford carries 66 people. To operate the Salisbury bus, even on a trial basis, the Minister of Education had to get special permission for 20 of the students to stand because the seating accommodation was for a maximum of about 44. So the parents in that area had to say, "We are trying out a bus in which 20 of our students will have to stand. The children will have to stand up going to school." Imagine that happening on a country road where they travel 50 miles! The Education Department is selling buses about 10 years old that have covered 100,000 miles: in other words, they travel about 10,000 miles a

year. The department is selling them for about \$2,000 each, at a conservative estimate. Yet the M.T.T. buses are 15 years old, having done 450,000 miles to 550,000 miles and suffering not only mechanical wear but body rust and fatigue. We must be concerned that these buses have already been used for 10 years and, if the Education Department uses them for another 100,000 miles until they are, say, 25 years old, the question of their safety and their condition needs to be watched. The cost involved and resale value will be detrimental to the department. In particular, the children's and the teachers' safety would be disregarded.

At the Institute of Teachers building at an in-service conference on July 21, Dr. Scrafton, Director-General of Transport, made the point that the Education Department Transport Branch was highly commendable and, when considering changes to the public transport system, the Education Department system should be taken into account. Members of the Grants Commission came to look at the Education Department's transport system at Murray Bridge and the use of buses and they praised it and said it was a good system.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They wanted to find out why we had the cheapest bus service in Australia.

Mr. EVANS: Service on these Leyland vehicles requires specialized training and most of the country service stations would not have personnel trained to service such vehicles. The gear box of these vehicles is a semi-automatic vacuum-operated box and, if there are any wrong adjustments (and this happened to the M.T.T., which has trained personnel) the cost of replacement of a gear box is about \$4,500. The following table compares the dimensions of the two types of vehicle involved:

	Leyland	Bedford
Length	37ft.	30ft.
Height	10ft.	9ft.

The Leylands seat 20 fewer passengers than the Bedford.

Mr. Venning: Surely not.

Mr. EVANS: The tyres for the Bedford are 8.25 x 20 and for the Leyland 11.00 x 20, which makes them a much more expensive tyre to replace and the vehicle more expensive to operate.

Mr. Mathwin: Are they all diesel?

Mr. EVANS: The Bedfords are being converted to diesel and the Leylands are all diesel. However, I believe that on narrow country roads on which these school buses operate, the lives of the children and teacher-drivers could

be at risk because of the difficulty in handling such cumbersome vehicles in difficult terrain. Country children should not be compelled to use vehicles now found to be redundant as public transport in the metropolitan area which has been thrown out of use, yet that is this Government's intention in this matter.

I should now like to refer to the visit of sporting teams to this country and to the attitude of the trade union movement, because these topics interlock. It has been said in this House that the trade unions do not make ridiculous claims, but I should now like to refer to a log of claims put forward by a union. We know that such claims are never expected to be granted in full by a court, but I shall refer to this log of claims to show how ridiculous such claims can be.

Mr. Crimes: You do not understand the system.

Mr. EVANS: I realize that, when a log of claims is made, the claims go to an extreme so that they may be dealt with when brought before the arbitration court.

Mr. Brown: Not necessarily.

Mr. EVANS: But we must use common sense in regard to what such a log of claims intends to achieve in the long term. The log of claims of the Shop Assistants and Warehouse Employees' Federation of Australia requests a weekly wage rate of \$300 for all adults, a retiring pension of four weeks' pay for each year of service, a maximum of 30 hours a week, and double time for all shift work performed Monday to Friday, both days inclusive: It seeks treble time for all shift work performed on Saturday, Sunday or a public holiday and shiftworkers who are rostered off on a public holiday are to be paid for such a day at the rate they normally would have been paid if at work, and all shiftworkers shall be entitled to a meal break of not less than 30 minutes, which shall be counted as time worked and paid for at the appropriate rate for the shift. The meal allowance claim for an employee required to work overtime is \$10 for each meal.

Six weeks annual leave is claimed for each 12 months service, provided that the employee shall be paid for such leave at the rate he normally would have been paid if at work, and employees shall be paid an extra week's wages prior to going on leave. The claim for public holidays is for 20 days in each year as paid public holidays, one of which shall be a union picnic day, but I think they are having that at the moment. The claim asks that employees be paid for such a

holiday at the rate they normally would have been paid if at work. The relief period claim is that every employee shall be entitled to relief of 30 minutes duration in the employer's time in the first and second half of his daily work. He is already working only six hours a day, and this takes another hour off and brings the total hours worked a day to five hours. As regards travelling time and board, the employer shall pay for first-class travelling and accommodation and pay \$50 a week spending allowance for the period from leaving home to returning home from work. The compassionate leave—

The SPEAKER: To which part of the Governor's Speech does this refer?

Mr. EVANS: I was speaking of the general cost to this State having regard to the Loan moneys we receive from the Commonwealth Government and the fact that this Government has agreed to increases demanded by the trade unions. The claim for holiday, Saturday and Sunday work is for treble time to be paid for all work performed on those days, provided also that one day's leave with pay shall be allowed for each holiday worked. An employee required to use his vehicle shall be paid 70c a mile, which is more than this Government is prepared to pay tiptruck operators carting seven or eight tons of sand or gravel. Yet members opposite say they support the trade unions, advocating such payment for the use of unionists' vehicles. The claim for severance pay is that employees who retire or who are retrenched will be entitled to severance pay on the basis of four weeks pay at the rate they would have been paid if at work, for each year of service.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Have you ever heard of an Aunt Sally? An Aunt Sally is put up so that you can knock it over and say, "Wasn't I clever?"

Mr. EVANS: The log states that union delegates are to be allowed 40 hours a week for union business, but that means the employers will be paying them 10 hours overtime because the normal working week is 30 hours and if they work overtime they will receive an extra \$50 a week meal allowance! In regard to the claim for the parking of vehicles, a Labor Government should be encouraging more use of public transport, but the log of claims includes a demand for the employer to provide adequate parking facilities for employees' vehicles; in other words, encourage more of us to use more motor bikes. The claim for washing time is for all employees to be allowed 10 minutes washing time before

meal breaks and 15 minutes before knock-off time. That is another half an hour off the five hours left, so they are back to a 4½-hour day, 22½ hours a week. A retirement pension at the rate of 10 weeks for each year of service is called for. Regarding life assurance, employers shall obtain and keep current a life assurance policy for each employee that should return a beneficiary, in case of death, the equivalent of 20 years income of the employee; on retirement the policy would be returnable to the employee. Does any honourable member really say that ridiculous claims are not made by some members of the trade union movement?

Mr. Crimes: Of course they are—for three purposes; you should know them.

Mr. EVANS: Another point I wish to make is in relation to our transport system and the money we spend on entertaining visitors to the State. The Premier's Department (I take it representing the Government) was kind enough to invite me to a reception last Sunday to meet the Chinese table tennis team. I accepted and would have attended if the union strikes throughout the country had not disrupted transport so much that the Chinese team could not travel to South Australia; the reception was cancelled. I am a great believer in sport for its own sake and in keeping it within the sporting field.

I was pleased to read in the *Advertiser* recently that the Premier was reported as saying that the Chinese visitors to this country should be extended every normal courtesy and that he would be attending one of the matches. I should also like to attend one of the matches, and I agree with every word the Premier said. But what did one of his Ministers say on June 23, 1971. He said:

Ban Springboks, S.A.R. told. S.A.'s Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) said in Launceston at the Australian Labor Party conference that he had instructed the South Australian Railways Commissioner not to handle any railway bookings the South African Rugby Union team might try to make if it arrived in Australia at the end of this week. That statement was made by a Minister who is in the same Cabinet as the Premier, who said that we should welcome all visitors.

Mr. Hoppood: In what context did he say that?

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Roads and Transport also said:

At best they will find themselves at Port Pirie, and if they want to walk to Broken Hill from there then that's their business.

He continued with his general condemnation of a visiting sporting team to this country,

but the team eventually played in South Australia. It might be more interesting to read the Premier's comments at that time—the same person who made the statement just a few days ago. In the *Advertiser* of September 8, 1971, the Premier is reported as saying:

However, the Government would not officially recognize the team, nor would it permit special prices to be charged for admission to the Adelaide Oval.

Do members agree that the Premier is continuing in the same fashion, by welcoming visitors to the country? The report continues:

Neither would the Government provide receptions or offer hospitality.

If that is not a hypocritical statement by a person who is supposed to lead the State, I do not know what a hypocritical statement is.

Mr. Crimes: Ever heard of racialism?

Mr. EVANS: I believe that we should at all times recognize sporting teams, regardless of from where they come or how they are selected. Members might like to know that team players are selected on a political basis in some countries, and objections could be raised to that system of selection. I should now like to support a remark made by the member for Florey in this debate. He referred to the Housing Trust and to the availability of trust houses. In his Opening Speech, the Governor said:

The demand for rental accommodation is still at a very high level, with almost 10,000 rental applications being received by the trust in the past year, and in this period the trust has been able to offer rental housing to more than 4,500 families.

One must not automatically consider that the 10,000 applicants were qualified to receive low-rental housing; perhaps only about half of the applicants for these houses end up by receiving one. During the term of the present Government and the recent Liberal Government (I am not playing politics) we allowed people in the early stage of marriage, or those who perhaps had an illegitimate child but were living as single people, to obtain low-rental housing to help them over difficult years.

However, as time goes by they either educate themselves or gain promotion in their work, or perhaps the wife returns to work as, say, a schoolteacher or to other work in which she receives good remuneration. Some of these people have incomes of over \$9,000 or \$10,000 but still rent trust houses at a low rental in comparison to rents paid in the private sector for the same type of housing. I would support any move made to introduce a means test for Housing Trust applicants so that they would have to declare their income. If the

income were over, say, \$7,000 a year for a family with two children, the family would have the alternative of paying rent comparable to rent in the private sector for similar type housing or of building a house for themselves.

Mr. Ryan: What about the rent in relation to salary?

Mr. EVANS: That is a difficult question, but it is fair enough. I might support such a move, but I need to give it more thought. I believe the rental housing situation is worse now than it has been for many years. I do not blame the Government for this, and I am not playing politics. I believe the reason why many people obtain trust houses at low rental is to avoid building their own houses. What interest is charged on finance to build a \$12,000 or \$14,000 house, with land included? It would be cheaper to rent a trust house. That is an unjust position.

Mr. Payne: Why is the interest so high?

Mr. EVANS: If I were to go into that matter I would use up the rest of my time. I stress for the benefit of the member for Mitchell that the cost of administering some of our business practices is increasing every day of every year; that may be one of the reasons. Any person who saves can invest his money at high interest. I am determined, while I remain a member, to keep referring to this matter and to seek to remove certain trust tenants or force them to pay higher rents for their housing.

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

Mr. EVANS: At the dinner adjournment I was about to refer to the statement by the Government that it will establish the office of Ombudsman. That decision pleases me immensely: it is an appointment that should have been made many years ago. In fact, I entered Parliament with the objective of achieving that appointment, and it now seems that that objective will be achieved. Whoever is appointed to this position must be absolutely fair. We all have political affiliations, but the Ombudsman must cast aside completely any such affiliations, otherwise his activities may mean the failure of this office, and such failure would be detrimental to the State for all time. It is important that the people have complete faith in the person who accepts this responsibility. I congratulate the Government on its initiative in deciding to make this appointment soon.

Many Emergency Fire Services teams operate in my district, their members giving their time freely and working hard at training. Most people in the area respect them and appreciate

the service they give. Unfortunately, all councils in my district do not have the same financial resources with which to help the units. The units in the Mitcham council area are fortunate and receive much help from a council that has a good rate revenue return. The Meadows council, a young council in terms of development, is struggling for finance. If it was possible to make an additional allocation to a council such as the Meadows council, that would be appreciated by the people and by the service. In the Stirling council area the services are sound, well supported by the community, and highly appreciated. In the case of Blackwood High School, where the fire occurred last year, the service is satisfied that the improved water main system installed in the school will help it in future if we are unfortunate enough to have another fire, but I hope that that does not occur.

The water rating system, as it affects the Adelaide Hills area, is unjust. I think that the system in the State is outdated and should be changed. The solution will not be easy, but I cannot support the Government's action in not making available the report of the committee appointed by the Liberal and Country League Government to investigate water rating systems. The report of the committee was handed down just before or after the last State election.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you know that the Government hasn't yet seen the report?

Mr. EVANS: If that is so, the Minister has never made that point previously in this House. He stated in reply to a question that the report was made to the Cabinet, and that it was a report to the Government, not to the people at large.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Government has never seen the report.

Mr. EVANS: A report in today's newspaper states that the Adelaide City Council is concerned because water rating on all assessments over \$2,000 has increased by 50 per cent. This means that property holders within the Adelaide City Council area will pay an extra \$390,000 to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. However, Blackwood ratepayers must pay 9½ per cent of the first \$2,000 of the annual assessed value of their property, compared to a rate of 7½ per cent in the metropolitan area. However, in the Stirling council area (in the Onkaparinga water district) people must pay no less than 12 per cent of the first \$2,000 of the annual assessed value. Therefore, although they pay 60 per cent more in water rates, these ratepayers are still

faced with the problem of restrictions in order to protect the Adelaide water supply so that the city has better quality water. They therefore pay the penalty both ways and, when sewage drains are brought to the area, I suppose their rates will be higher than those in the metropolitan area, and that will be unjust.

I refer briefly to the Highways Department and draw a quick comparison between the construction of the Adelaide-Bordertown railway line and that of the Hills Freeway. In 1878 a Bill was introduced to provide for the construction of the Adelaide-Bordertown railway line, and in 1879 Government authorities commenced earthworks. A contract was let in 1880, and the line was completed by 1886. On the other hand, the Hills Freeway (only seven miles long) took 8½ years to complete, compared to the eight years it took to build the Adelaide-Bordertown railway line. Of course, in those days they had no major machinery or jack hammers: they merely had picks and shovels, with a few horse scoops. Although I appreciate the new Hills Freeway and congratulate those who worked on the project on the end result they achieved, I believe that much time and money was wasted on the project. The end result has not interfered very much aesthetically with the surroundings, although it has perhaps affected persons whose properties are close to the freeway.

I should like briefly to refer to Murray New Town, the site for which, as I have said earlier, is ideal. However, other members have disagreed with my view. The May issue of the *Public Service Review* contains an article stating that the site is too close to Adelaide. I said the site was ideal because people would commute between the new town and Adelaide and, indeed, I still believe that. I do not believe that the town will of itself be viable or that we can encourage enough industry to go there to enable it to become viable. If we want a new town to be viable, we must go to a site at, say, the top of Spencer Gulf, which would be close to natural gas and the standard gauge railway line and which would be about 200 miles from the present metropolitan area. If we do not do this, people will commute between the new town and Adelaide. I still believe that the citizens of the new town will commute to Adelaide and no ribbon development will occur along the road as a result of the restrictions placed on subdivisions in the Adelaide Hills water catchment area.

It is important that we build a railway line to Murray New Town on a more direct route. This would involve tunnelling and, instead of taking 19½ miles to reach Mount Lofty, we should be able to do so within 11 miles. Many of the long loops on the present line could be eliminated by tunnelling. I believe it is a feasible proposition that can be implemented in the foreseeable future, and I hope it is considered on that basis. I wish to conclude my remarks by saying that the people of Australia have for many years had a pretty easy life without many industrial or other problems. We have developed an attitude of "She'll be right, Jack", believing that things will always be all right, and that we will always be able to make up the difference and compete with other countries. I believe that that day will now be past unless the average man in the street, as well as the business man and the trade union member, is willing to shoulder the burden, as the member for Hanson stated, and take an interest in the various activities that concern him. We have unions today infiltrated with many Englishmen and Irishmen who have been brought here to do nothing other than cause a disruption, and to do to this country what has been done in England, for instance. We have an indication of that at present in the form of the petrol shortage in this country: this shortage occurred only because people are advocating that the strike should continue.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish! You come up with this garbage all the time.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Education knows full well that his only followers—

Mr. Wright: We gave you the opportunity to fix it up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: —do not support the arbitration system and do not accept the decisions that are brought down.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The strike was deliberately provoked, and you know it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has two minutes to go.

Mr. EVANS: Not many people will disagree with me at present when I say that we have reached a stage of industrial anarchy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Why don't you give your salary to charity, as you promised to do? Name the charities you have given it to!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher has only two minutes to go, and I would like—

Mr. Ryan: Two minutes too long!

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members interject while I am on my feet, I will name them. The member for Fisher has only one minute to go, and I appeal to honourable members to let him be heard in silence for that one minute. The honourable member for Fisher.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member should not deliberately provoke Government members by making statements which he knows are untrue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am appealing to honourable members in this Chamber to try to conduct themselves in accordance with the Standing Orders that they make. The member for Fisher is entitled to have his say. He has only one minute to go, and I will now call on him to finish. I—

Mr. VENNING: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member take his seat while I am on my feet. He is being unfair to his own colleagues. The member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Name the charities—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I will name the charities. I will give the Minister a list of them, if he will do the same for me. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): It is just as well that the gallery is not packed or more people would have seen the disgraceful actions of Government members during the last few minutes when they deliberately shouted in order to waste the remainder of the time available to the member for Fisher.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I want to try to restore order and sanity into this debate, and I ask the member for Alexandra to address the Chair and speak to the Address in Reply. If honourable members speaking would not provoke they would not get interjections, and it would help the Chair. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall address you, Mr. Speaker, and tell you that the Government and its supporters are behaving disgracefully, and no-one worse than the

Minister of Education, who seems to be willing to simply shout a man down. The Minister likes to think that he is good in argument. Obviously, however, he has no argument: he has only the ability to shout. I thought that that conduct was most disgraceful and undignified. I support the motion and those speakers who have criticized the paucity of points in the Speech. I support the remarks of speakers who have referred to members who have died since the opening of last session, and I agree with what has been said about those members. I shall not delay the House by repeating the names again, but we all either knew them or knew of them and appreciated their qualities.

I do not wish to speak to any extent about the unhappy affairs that have taken place concerning Kangaroo Island, but I wish to reply to one or two points that have been made. Almost exclusively, I wish to refer to one matter, and that was the suggestion made by the Premier last week and supported by other Government members that the Leader of the Opposition went to Kangaroo Island uninvited for the purpose of stirring. The word "stirring" was introduced, I think, by the Attorney-General by way of interjection. The Attorney normally takes pride in being accurate in these matters. I tell Government members that the Leader of the Opposition is not a stirrer, but they should know that. They have heard him in action and should be able to appreciate the dignity and industry with which he performs his task. He was invited to Kangaroo Island by several people and went to the island and met the representatives of the farmers and various other persons involved, including the Chairman of the District Council of Kingscote. To give members an idea whether those people thought that Dr. Eastick was interfering or not, I shall read from *The Islander* in a column headed:

Chairman proud of Island's Stand. Cr. D. G. Kelly, Chairman of Kingscote Council, made the following points when presenting his report to the last meeting.

Amongst other things, he said:

With Cr. Beinke met Dr. Eastick, Mr. Brookman, Mr. W. Seager and Mr. W. B. Kelly to discuss the ban. Rang Premier inviting him to come to Kangaroo Island.

He rang the Premier while the meeting was in progress and the Premier went over the next day. I think that my comment may dispose of the argument that Dr. Eastick went to Kangaroo Island uninvited for the purpose of stirring. If anyone has heard about that, it is a pity that he did not attend the meeting

that Dr. Eastick addressed at Penneshaw later that morning, learn at first hand the attitude of the people present, and hear the moderate terms in which Dr. Eastick addressed the meeting. The last comment that Councillor Kelly made in his report to the council may be of interest to this House. He said:

It was "a matter of pride to me to be part of the community which when faced with a choice between principle and expediency chose principle."

That is all I want to say about the Kangaroo Island dispute—or the Kangaroo Island affair, as it is more properly called, because strictly speaking it was not a dispute.

I turn now to the next matter, about which I have a complaint for the Government—the urgent need for immediate and long-range planning to improve the slaughtering system in South Australia. No-one could blame the Government for being a little taken by surprise by the rapid increase in the number of cattle in South Australia, but I think one could well blame the Government for not acting more quickly to see that long-range planning was put into effect. We have at Gepps Cross an abattoir that does more killing than is done in the rest of the State and in many ways much more money should be spent on it, not only in the beef slaughter hall but also in the yards and on the selling facilities.

If I give members a few figures gleaned from answers to questions that I asked on notice last week, they will see that South Australia is killing only half the cattle produced or offered for slaughter within the State, the rest being killed mainly in Victoria. We have a cattle population of about 1,500,000. On a farm of perhaps 100 head all told, 30 head would be sent for slaughter, so it is not unreasonable to suggest that 450,000 are killed annually in South Australia. If we add to that the figure in the answer I got to a question on notice about the number of cattle sent annually to the Northern Territory, South-West Queensland and New South Wales (roughly 100,000 head of cattle) as many as 550,000 cattle are sent or offered for slaughter.

The answer to a further question I asked was that the Gepps Cross abattoir kills 174,000 cattle annually and abattoirs in the rest of the State kill 100,000, making a total of 274,000. That is about half the total number I had estimated as being offered for slaughter. Under those conditions, we are losing an industry which of course is growing, because the meat industry itself is increasing and the slaughter industry should therefore be increasing, too. When we bear in mind that it costs

over \$15 a head in fees for slaughtering, that means about \$4,000,000 a year in slaughtering fees in this instance.

There is an urgent need for long-range planning in the killing of stock and there is, furthermore, an immediate need for improvement at Gepps Cross. I do not say that Gepps Cross is necessarily the place where all future killing should be done. Perhaps there are better sites in the country, but that is not strictly relevant to my argument. I believe that there is sufficient land at Gepps Cross for the purpose. However, an export only abattoir should be planned now, because there is no reason why the Government cannot carry out its policy of co-operation with private enterprise and make facilities available to private enterprise for this purpose.

I have never before found it necessary to mention internal problems in my own Party and I do not like to do so now. This is not strictly a matter with which this House should deal, but it has become relevant because of past references to this matter. This matter has been referred to several times in this debate. The member for Gouger has persisted in bringing the matter of internal Party problems to this Parliament, and on each occasion he has mentioned my name most unfavourably in that connection, and I do not like it. It is not a good thing that it was done. Indeed, I should have preferred to keep our own dispute out of the House.

I do not blame members opposite from joining in gleefully and perhaps stoking the fire occasionally. True, I am aware that, when there is a split in the Party opposite, I look on that with a certain complacency. There have been troubles in the Labor Party and, although such troubles cannot be for the good of the nation, as a politician I admit that it makes life easier if members opposite are squabbling. I take a lenient view of members opposite if they make passing reference to these matters, but I am not so keen on members on this side raising such matters.

This matter started on March 15, this year, when the former Leader of our Party made his speech claiming disloyalty amongst members of his Party. He said he objected to disloyalty on a continuing basis. He further implicated me in that speech by inferring that I alone had known that, if a certain motion was carried by the Party, he would resign. This, of course, was not correct, but it has taken some time for the true story to fully catch up to the bird that flew on March 15. I have

given much publicity to my side of the matter since then.

The truth is that I did what I could to avoid a blow-up on that occasion. Indeed, I made it my business to tell other members what was likely to happen. We had several meetings and did our best to ensure that the blow-up would be finally avoided. We did our best in every way short of abject surrender before what I considered to be an unreasonably dictatorial attitude. I refute the statement of the member for Gouger that he had been subjected to disloyalty on a continuing basis. The member for Gouger, as Leader, had as much loyalty shown to him as any other political leader I have known in my political life has had, and he retained that loyalty until he resigned his position. No-one could complain about a person who chose to resign his position; that is a simple matter. It was deplored, but one could not complain about it. However, subsequent statements have made me complain very much, because my own Party, the Liberal and Country League, has been attacked many times from the public platform and in the press. Not only that, but persons within the Party have been attacked. I have been attacked not only by the member for Gouger but by many other persons.

One honourable member in another place (Hon. Mr. Cameron) wrote that I attempted to mislead the public. I asked Mr. Cameron to apologize for his statement, but he declined to do so. I am not the only one, of course: there have been several others. One I mention is the President of the L.C.L. (Mr. Ian McLachlan), who is one of the most outstanding Presidents the league has ever had. He is a man of vast intelligence and great courage, and he has a record of selfless devotion to the cause of the league. He has been attacked again and again, and fuel has been added to those attacks by some of the press reports.

I remember an occasion when Mr. McLachlan was interviewed and asked at length about various matters within the league. Later, a *Four Corners* programme contained many pictures of stately homes and all kinds of irrelevancies that had little, if anything, to do with Mr. McLachlan. Near the end of that programme he was asked a couple of questions. These kinds of visual impression add greatly to the denigration of such people. I affirm my belief that Mr. McLachlan has done a tremendous job for the league. I have attended many public meetings of the Liberal Movement and have travelled long

distances at times to attend them (uninvited, of course), but I thought I was entitled to attend, they being public meetings.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: To stir the pot!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: To warn people about what I thought was happening to our Party. In some cases my presence was appreciated but in other cases it was not. Whenever I had the opportunity I spoke up and gave my views on why I considered the movement to be a separate political Party, how it sought members from outside as well as from inside the league and, generally, that it performed, in its own words, autonomously, and that I considered it to be a separate political Party.

Recently, I received evidence that the movement has been forming branches—not at public meetings, which seems to have become an unpopular way to establish a branch. I understand that the most recent branch of the Liberal Movement, established in the Mitcham District, was established without a public meeting being held, and its officers were appointed at that meeting. If it is not a public meeting, I do not attend. I do attend some other meetings. The latest reference to me in this matter by the member for Gouger was made in his Address in Reply speech, when he quoted from the pamphlet *As We See It* and said:

It attempts to divide, by using material from the member for Alexandra . . .

Well, it certainly has got some material that I have written and much other material. I cannot really see that it is anything more than a very critical piece of paper but, as I said last week, I am not associated with it in any way. I have received the copy that I have in my hand. I received it in my mailbox and I read it with interest, but it seems to have caused much disturbance in other circles.

I just thought, having been referred to on several occasions in this House and on the first occasion being placed in an extremely false position by the remarks, that it was time I said something to clear up the matter from my point of view. These things lead me to say that the member for Gouger and his actions since his resignation have been somewhat egotistical and, I think, somewhat immature. The Party needs unselfish service, and one of the greatest needs that we have at present is the need to see that our impressive and hard-working Leader, Dr. Eastick, is helped in every way possible.

The Labor Party has nothing to be complacent about in its attitude to this matter.

As I say, I excuse it for being somewhat pleased at the events that have taken place. These events have taken the pressure off the Labor Party, but I see no reason for that Party to have gone to the lengths to which it went to assist the troubles in our Party. By providing the member for Gouger with two rooms in this House, two telephone lines, and four telephone handsets, the Government, in my opinion, has enabled him to set up a command post from which to conduct his own operations. The Minister of Works justified this the other day by saying, I think, that it was the least that could be done for a former Premier. I have seen the treatment given to several other former Premiers of this State in this building, and nothing like that has ever been done for them.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Well, I wasn't able to treat them, was I?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Works has certainly gone beyond what I think are reasonable bounds in intervening in this matter between the various sides of our Party's problems. We will get over these Party problems, do not worry. I have seen the Labor Party in such disarray that it seemed almost unbelievable that it would ever rise again.

Mr. Payne: Have a look now.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Have a look. It's a solid block now.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think many members of the Party would agree with me. Probably the member for Elizabeth will agree with me that there have been times since he has been in this House when his Party has been at an extremely low ebb.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What about the gerrymander? There was no-one here!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Cross-chatter across the Chamber must cease immediately. The member for Alexandra has the floor and is entitled to have the respect of members on both sides.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There has been much talk about the total number of votes for and against the Labor Party and the Liberal Party at various elections. However, I remind honourable members that there were times when the Labor Party received distinctly fewer votes than the Liberal Party, and at those times the Labor Party was certainly in an eclipse. I believe that many of its members could not then see a way out of it. However,

they got out of it all right, and I am saying that our Party is going to get out of its predicament.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Which Party?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am glad that members of the Labor Party generally do not act like some of its members on the front bench. Government members have made many great mistakes in the last 12 months, and those mistakes will catch up with them—probably during this session. However, this will be seen as the Parliamentary programme unfolds. I entered Parliament in 1948, which means that, if Parliament continues until next year, I will have then completed a quarter of a century as a member. I should like now to refer to the following statement made by Sir Arthur Fadden:

When a Party Leader or a senior Parliamentarian begins to think it is time for him to retire, that is the time to make the decision and go.

I did not follow that, because I have thought of it for some years. At the pace at which a member must work, 25 years imposes a strain, and I believe Parliamentary life has become more intense as each year has passed. It was less intense when Party numbers were more stable.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When the boundaries were cooked.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It was less intense when Party numbers were more stable. I remember one election for this House when, apart from a change in pre-selection in the Labor Party and possibly a retirement, there were no changes in the seats of either Party. The entire Parliament was returned as it was before the election except for the changes to which I have referred. However, after the last election I warned a few people in my district to take an interest in politics because I did not intend to continue forever as a member of Parliament. I said that because I was too experienced a politician to put a time limit on it: one should never do that. Indeed, it is a risk to tell anyone that one is thinking of retiring. Nevertheless, from the Party's point of view, the least one can do is think of the future, where possible.

The people of this State do not know how hard members of Parliament work. They do not realize that a member is working when they are often at play. When a member of Parliament attends an agricultural show, or a social, dance or a dinner, he is actually working while they are very likely there for recreation.

A member has to be on guard at all times, perhaps to defend himself or his Party's policy, or perhaps to take note of some business being given him by a constituent. A member of Parliament is under considerably more strain than is the ordinary person.

I would never agree with the criticism levelled by some people that members of Parliament do not do any work, for they do work, and it is work that peculiarly involves a nervous strain. A member can never afford to turn down a constituent's request, whatever the hour of the day or whatever the occasion may be: he has no alternative but to take some notice of that request. Secondly, I do not think people realize just what a high standard of integrity their members have. I think people often take their members of Parliament for granted and criticize them, not looking on them as people of integrity. That integrity is taken for granted, but it is not taken for granted in other parts of the world.

I think Australians generally get good honest government from their members. I am not going to praise members of Parliament unreservedly: it is difficult to generalize when talking about members. After all, almost every member has someone sitting opposite him who is dedicated to finding out the member's faults and expressing them. Members do not like to be placed in the one category, but one can draw several general conclusions. I think one criticism of members is that they accept whatever education they have at the time of entering Parliament and do not increase that education other than by gaining experience in their job. It would be much better if members had the opportunity and the inclination to follow a course of reading not only relating to State matters, Parliamentary Papers and other things that we all look at from time to time but also relating to general matters, in order to keep up with events as they occur. Some members read; some members do not. Those who read do so often because it is their inclination or hobby.

If a member of Parliament wants to read for any great length of time, he has to organize himself in order to get out of some other work, because there is always more work in front of a member than he can handle. Even though a member may have nothing else in life to do but go around calling at the homes of his constituents, he still would not be able to carry out that job, yet constituents would not realize this: they might wonder why their member never made a speech. Also, they like to be called on. Members realize this and,

bearing in mind the competitive type of existence that we lead, they have to pay great attention to their constituencies, sometimes at the expense of continuing their education.

A member also has certain health problems, sometimes as a result of too many free meals. I can only say that as a Minister the number of free meals I received and the quality of them added greatly to my stature. At the same time, I had less time for recreational exercise. This is undoubtedly a health problem that members experience and I think that they should, where they can, undertake some type of recreational exercise, even though they may be the last people in the world who can be expected to play sport regularly on the same day each week. Also, I advise members, particularly the young members who are coming into Parliament, not to become dependent socially on Parliament alone. I have seen members go out of this House with hardly any friends outside Parliament because they have so engrossed themselves in their careers within that they have not troubled to keep up their outside friendships. I believe this could happen to people in their enthusiasm.

Perhaps another criticism one could make of Parliament is that I believe we suffer from a failure to speak plainly at all times. We pick up too many clichés and use the same ones repeatedly. Sometimes we vary them by using them incorrectly. I think I have often heard members say, "We have the ball at our feet" and "See whether we can kick it" and sometimes "If we play it cool". I think I once heard "If we drop it in at the deep end"!

This confusion of clichés does not help us: it bores people and could cause much political strife, because people do not make themselves understood clearly. One problem of political life is that, although it is rewarding and interesting in many respects, many features of it are appallingly dull. We must all be guilty of contributing something to that appalling dullness. It is not all interesting and exciting, and sometimes members of the public do not understand what it is about. They visit Parliament and from the galleries they see the newspapers arrive. I have done the crossword almost every sitting day I have been here.

Mr. Clark: They are too easy now.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, they are not as difficult as they used to be when I first started. I have heard many people say how disgusted they have been at the lack

of attention members pay to the person who is speaking.

The Hon. L. J. King: You sound like a man not standing for election again. You would never have said that before the last election.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is not quite correct. I am trying to help those members who are staying, because they could think about what I have said and perhaps improve on it when they come to their last Address in Reply speech. We have seen the public interest in Parliament change in recent years, and this interest has largely been sharpened by television and other improvements in the media. One should say almost unreservedly that this is a good thing. People understand much more than they used to, but we should not fool ourselves, as people still have a somewhat shallow understanding of many of the Parliamentary matters that they encounter.

I believe that our Parliamentary procedures (and I do not mean the words and forms we use) are in some ways out of date, and something drastic will have to be done eventually. Several times I have criticized the number of committees we have, and I shall refer briefly to that point again. I do not believe the Public Works Committee is justified as a committee of members of Parliament. In saying this, I do not under-value the work done by members of the committee, who are conscientious and do a good job. However, it provides a major distraction for many members of this Parliament. Certainly, they learn some matters of public interest about the State that perhaps they would not otherwise know, but that is about the only good thing to be said for the committee. I believe that its work is not worthy of the time it has to spend on it. The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is important and must be maintained. The other committees are, for the most part, a distraction from the general purpose of Parliament. One day, Parliament will face this whole matter and deal with it more boldly. Possibly, it will use the Auditor-General far more than it does now. He is an officer of Parliament but his work is not properly used now. We are not getting the best value from him. Whether it can be done by forming a committee of the Whole House to interview the Auditor-General or his officers at times, I do not know, but something can be done.

As I know, a public accounts committee is not the solution. I see that there is a case

for a good study of public accounts, but as it operates in the Commonwealth sphere it would not be a good thing here. It would tend to stultify the initiative of members of the Public Service. A public accounts committee necessarily has to fire at random at different departments; it could not examine every department each year. It would have to select them, and I do not know that that would be good. I certainly do not approve of the concept in this State of such a committee as it operates in the Commonwealth. Many members refer to me as a Conservative, which I find strange. No-one likes to be called a Conservative, it seems, yet everyone wants to be called a conservationist. Whether or not I am conservative is immaterial to me; I do not really care. However, here are the thoughts of a true Conservative, Bishop Butler, who said:

Reasonable men will look upon the general plan of our Constitution, transmitted down to us by our ancestors, as sacred; and content themselves with . . . rectifying the particular things which they think amiss, and supplying the particular things which they think deficient in it, so far as is practicable without endangering the whole.

That is a Conservative's point of view. What is wrong with it?

The Hon. L. J. King: Once, when I called you a Conservative, you took umbrage.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not think anyone disputes what Bishop Butler says. The funny thing is that there are as many Conservatives on the Government benches as there are on this side. The Labor Party is full of Conservatives in their own right. Many Labor men like to be active Socialists in a capitalist society. They are like the dog that chases a car: they would not know what to do if they caught it. So it is not so easy to be a Conservative. On the other hand, I do not believe that conservation should be identified with selfishness or some lesser quantities; I do not believe that that is good, but merely to call someone conservative is by no means an insult. I should be happy to call many members sitting behind the Government front bench Conservatives.

The word closely allied to "conservative" is "conservation". I believe I was a conservationist or the nearest thing to a conservationist that a practical politician could have been in the 1950's when conservation was not a popular topic in this House. I could quote from conservation writers to prove my point, but I will not go to that length. However, I was associated with Flinders Chase from about

1950 onwards when I realized that something had to be done in the conservation field, because not nearly enough was being done. Various Ministers then started to take action and the first Minister who vigorously supported conservation in South Australia was the late Mr. Quirke, the Minister of Lands in the Playford Government.

In 1956 there was only one national park in South Australia, the Belair National Park, and that is now not even large enough to qualify for the modern definition of a national park. We had no area large enough to be called a national park and the late Mr. Quirke set about having other areas declared as national parks. He was followed by other Ministers who all did something for conservation. The present Minister of Works, when he was the Minister of Lands, introduced the National Parks and Wildlife Act. I was the subsequent Minister of Lands and one difficulty with which I was involved was to defend the Hambidge Reserve against a public promise made by the Walsh Government who promised to excise nearly half the area. That reserve is now in a flourishing condition and nobody would want to cut it up today. However, one of the worst fights I came across was in my own district after a large fire occurred on Kangaroo Island, when I was under much pressure to see that Flinders Chase was reduced in area. At that time vigorous argument was involved and I had to defend my stand on that matter. I am glad to say that Flinders Chase was not reduced. When I became Minister of Lands some national parks were in the process of dedication and the problems associated with them were left to me by the previous Minister. I had those areas dedicated as national parks as soon as I came to office and, in turn, I left other areas behind me, to be dedicated by the next Minister.

The number of national parks now existing is much greater. However, I have heard criticism that at the time I was Minister we were gathering national parks on an unco-ordinated basis. True, we were, but I wish to pay a tribute to the then Chairman of the Land Board, Mr. Cecil Rix, who was keeping an eye open for every area of land that became available. We were in no position to pick and choose at that time. However, today, the Minister of Environment and Conservation is happily in charge of a large number of national parks and can follow a co-ordinated plan so that he can work things out to the State's advantage.

As this is not likely to be my last speech in Parliament, I will not get too sentimental about it. Members of Parliament must be involved in what they are doing. It is no good their coming here, thinking they can be standoffish and objective about what is going on: they must mix in.

I do not agree with what happened at the Aboriginal "embassy" in Canberra the other day when there was a concerted resistance against Commonwealth police removing tents. I did not agree with the attitude of the crowd, but I was struck by what I thought was the common sense of one of the Aborigines involved. Someone tried to calm the crowd by getting them to sing the hymn *We Shall Overcome*, but this young man pushed his way through the crowd and said, "Stop singing that bloody hymn and stand up and fight." That is not bad advice for a politician, too. If I want a political epitaph it will be "He said what he thought."

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the motion, but I wish we had an Address in Reply at least once a month, because I believe that we would get a better result from the Government, which would then resist the instructions it gets from behind the scenes. I, too, wish to congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his Opening Speech and to express appreciation for the work of the late Sir James Harrison. I had the pleasure to have Sir James and Lady Harrison visit my district. Although now history, Sir James will be remembered among those honoured gentlemen who, having lived across the way, served South Australia in that very high office with love and understanding. At the memorial service conducted by the Rt. Rev. Reed and attended by people from all over Australia, the Rt. Rev. Reed paid high tribute to our departed friend.

I well remember his final remarks to friends and relatives of Sir James: "May time and memory bring peace out of sorrow." I, too, express regret at the passing of Mr. Lin. Riches, Mr. Bill Quirke, Mr. George Bockelberg and the Hon. William Walsh Robinson, M.L.C. Mr. Riches, who held the seat of Stuart for many years, was also the Mayor of Port Augusta for a long time. Mr. Riches was a gentleman. During the time he was member for Stuart he must have seen a significant decline in the standard of his own Party. I believe that the present trouble created in South Australia would make him turn over in his grave several times.

Mr. Quirke saw politics on various sides. He started as an A.L.P. member and, after

several years, became an Independent and finally finished up in the Liberal and Country League. So, it is not where one starts off in life, but where one finishes that counts. I pay tribute to the late Mr. Quirke, who held the portfolio of Minister of Lands. I, together with many others, paid a final tribute to him at Clare among many of his friends. Mr. George Bockelberg represented a rural area and his services to that district are acknowledged. The circumstances surrounding Mr. Robinson's passing were most unfortunate, to say the least. As has been acknowledged by His Excellency, Mr. Robinson was a member for Northern in the Legislative Council for 18 years. He was one of nature's gentlemen and the sadness in the House when we learnt of his death was very much in evidence.

It was my good pleasure to succeed Mr. Robinson in the duties of the Secretary of the Rocky River District Committee about 1946. Mr. Robinson gave me some good advice at that time. We had been attending various functions together, he as member for Northern and I as President of the North-Western Agricultural Society, and on this occasion we were attending a smelters dinner in Port Pirie. It was during the Second World War and, as a consequence, whereas the dinner was normally held at Crystal Brook, on this occasion it was held at the Memorial Oval. At the function we were talking about several things and he gave me good advice on how to drink beer. "Howard," he said, "the way to drink beer is to leave your glass full."

Several honourable members have contributed to this debate. The member for Elizabeth has moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and he, like my colleague the member for Kavel, was a schoolteacher before entering politics. I wonder what the honourable member's thoughts would be if he looked back over the period since he came to Parliament or if he again became a schoolteacher for a period. I wonder what his reaction would be in that profession. I am sure that he has seen a big change in that period.

It is significant that this afternoon the member for Davenport, in speaking of education, mentioned a report in the latest edition of the South Australian Institute of Teachers journal in which a primary school student from Port Lincoln comments on education at present. I should like to add to that a statement in an earlier publication of the journal by Mr. John Murray that it is becoming very

evident amongst many of our deep-thinking teachers that all is not as it should be regarding teaching and the methods used at present.

The report in the journal contributed by Mr. John Murray is headed "A case for conservatives. Many teachers increasingly disenchanted with aspect of new education." When I saw that report, I remembered the stand that John Murray had taken when he was at Darwin. What was the reaction of the Government that is in office at present? It appointed a Royal Commission to deal with this fellow and spent about \$75,000 on that Royal Commission. Those involved in it were only too pleased to get out of it.

Mr. Gunn: To sweep it under the carpet.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. I express my appreciation to the member for Elizabeth for what he has done as Chairman of the Public Works Committee. When anything involving my district was being dealt with, he would tell me in good time so that I could arrange to be in my district to meet the committee, although I was not a member of it. He gave me the honour of being present and hearing the discussions on whatever project the committee was investigating.

The honourable member is a remarkable fellow and a gentleman, but at times one hears some caustic remarks from him. One would almost think that he had had a blood transfusion from a man named Virgo or a man named Broomhill and that at times, when the blood circulated through the system, we would hear sarcastic remarks that did not seem to be in keeping with the member for Elizabeth. He will be remembered as a quietly spoken gentleman who contributed much to the Labor Party.

Some of my colleagues have announced their retirement, to take effect at the end of this session. The member for Alexandra, who has just resumed his seat, made a most interesting speech this evening and gave much advice not only to younger members on this side of the House but also to honourable members opposite. He will be remembered not only by his colleagues but also by Government members. Only this evening, I saw the honourable member enjoying a get-together with one or two Government members, on whom he was having some influence. He will be remembered as a tenacious debater in Opposition.

The member for Goyder has had the respect of all honourable members in this House. Only recently have I fully appreciated the Ferguson quality, as displayed by the honourable member. Last week, when he made his Address

in Reply speech, he outlined the advancements that had taken place in his district during his term in Parliament. He spoke of the rural scene, the development of the wheat industry and the change in deliveries in relation to the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited system. He did not, however, refer to a matter to which I wish to refer: in speaking of the advancement of silo construction in this State, he did not say that money was provided interest free by the State's growers.

Mr. Gunn: \$33,000,000 worth.

Mr. VENNING: It was more than that, and no interest was payable on the loan made to the bulk handling company to enable it to establish these facilities. With the member for Goyder, I acknowledge the advancements that have taken place in this aspect of the industry. The member for Davenport, who has also announced her retirement to take effect from the end of this session, had some nice things said about her—even by honourable members opposite. Not only has she the distinction of being the first woman to become a member of the House of Assembly: she has represented her district in a most capable manner. It appears that it will take one of some nine or 10 people to fill the position she vacates. Our sincere best wishes go with her in her retirement.

When thinking of those honourable members who may not be with us after the next election, I look at the Government's front bench. It appeared to me a few days ago that the member for Port Pirie would be the only member of the Government's front bench remaining after the next election but, after what has happened in the last few days, I am not so sure about him either. It appeared that he would be the only member of the front bench remaining and that, therefore, he would become Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber after the election.

I noticed that in his Speech His Excellency referred to the State's rural sector. It appears that the Government acknowledges the late start to the season because of the lack of rain. His Excellency was so correct when he referred to the spectacular increase in beef cattle numbers in most agricultural areas as producers seek to take advantage of the increasing world demand for beef. It was said to me last week by an authority in the meat industry that the value of beef exports would soon reach that of wool. Although we do not have the latest figures, I point out that in 1969-70 the value of meat exports from Australia was \$292,100,000, as against

\$683,500,000 in respect of wool exports. In 1970-71, the value of meat exports was \$428,500,000, while that of wool exports was \$543,800,000. I imagine that when the figures for the last financial year are available we will see that the value of meat exports will have surpassed that of wool.

However, many frustrations confront producers, and we know that the weather is one such frustration. In addition, I point out that the inadequacy of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board (other than by working overtime) to handle the volume of stock presented to it has resulted in a high cost of slaughtering to the detriment of producer, wholesaler and everyone else concerned. As the member for Frome said that he would leave the abattoirs situation to the "member for Rocky", I shall have something to say especially about our export abattoirs, bearing in mind that the member for Alexandra this evening touched lightly on some of the details relating to abattoirs in this State.

Under such pressures as are being exerted at the abattoirs at present, men are working six and seven days a week, and it takes only a minor incident to result in industrial trouble. As members know, last week at the abattoirs the men went on strike as a result of a problem that arose in the boning room. It was recommended that the people concerned go back to work, but we know that a delay lasting from Wednesday to Monday results in added expense to producers and wholesalers. The future of the abattoirs has been exercising producers' minds for many years. I believe that some definite policies must be outlined by this Government, or its successor, in relation to the abattoirs. I know that the Minister of Agriculture is not so sure that a Government should be involved in such an enterprise and that it is thought that this should be left to private enterprise. I was amazed to hear Mr. George Joseph, the Chairman of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, say to a meeting of the United Farmers and Graziers at Jamestown about a month ago that no Government has ever had a policy in relation to that abattoir.

Various committees have been set up from time to time to investigate the activities of the board, but to what effect? As members know, a few months ago the Minister said he had instructed Mr. Ian Gray to prepare for him a report on the abattoir, but he did not say what were the guidelines for Mr. Gray to follow. Through the Minister representing the

Minister of Agriculture, we have tried to ascertain when this report will be available and what the outcome will be, but we have learnt that the report will be a verbal one to the Minister and that nothing will be tabled. As a consequence, I think the whole thing will be a fiasco. I believe that, because of the nature of the board, the Government should have made increased grants to bring these works up to a standard that will cater for the required volume to be handled during normal working hours. Until now, all payments have been made by loans, which have to be repaid and are, at the same time, bearing interest. When considering the last financial statement of the board (for 1970-71) it is interesting to observe some of the costs. Board fees are a small sum of \$9,700, but annual leave, sick leave, public holidays, and long service leave require \$752,830, and the interest charge on borrowings is \$89,743. In 1970 the Treasurer of South Australia advanced \$1,850,000; there was a grant from the South Australian Treasurer in 1958-59 of \$30,000, and a grant from the Commonwealth Government in 1959-60 of \$58,867.

These payments have been loans, so that there must be a reckoning day coming and, in addition, the killing costs have increased markedly. It was suggested to me that recent retrospective payments to employees cost the board about \$300,000, but by the time the board has repaid this loan it will have cost \$800,000 on a long-term basis. It is well known that slaughtering charges were increased by 20 per cent for local trade and by 30 per cent for export trade in order to meet the repayments to the Government. The board is trying to operate another beef hall and to extend the mutton chain, but the sum required for these projects would add another burden to the operation of the board.

The sum of \$200,000 was the figure bandied about earlier as the amount the Government would lend the board for the new meat hall, but this would be only chicken feed compared to the amount required to complete the hall, as \$600,000 or \$700,000 would be nearer the mark. In addition, there would be the capital cost to extend the mutton chain. Since I have been a member questions have been asked constantly of the Minister concerning the board, and warnings have been given about the explosion of cattle numbers in this State. But all of this to no effect. Two years ago, during the glut of lambs delivered to the abattoir, I asked the Premier whether he would

visit the abattoir to see for himself the chaos that existed at Gepps Cross, but precisely nothing happened.

Mr. Payne: We had just got into office.

Mr. VENNING: Since Easter men have been working six and seven days a week at the abattoir to try to handle the stock coming forward, although the busy period has not yet started. Many suggestions have been made about what should be done in South Australia to overcome for all time the problem of high costs and lack of facilities to handle stock being brought forward for slaughter. It has been suggested that private enterprise should have another abattoir set up in South Australia to handle stock for export. Having considered the question of establishing an abattoir in a country area, I am convinced that the proper place to set up another works would be in an area not far from the present works, because such a works could cater for the whole State in lieu of a section of it. It would be close to the Adelaide stock market, the Bolivar sewage works and shipping, and there are many minor points that add up to some significance.

The loss in returns to growers by the downgrading of values by wholesalers having to take into consideration loss of weight through stock having to wait around for days has robbed the primary producers of this State of many millions of dollars over a period of years. But who cares? The high cost of killing stock at Gepps Cross has also robbed the primary producer of many millions of dollars by the inability of wholesalers operating in South Australia to fulfil contracts with South Australian produced stock. These contracts in the main are being filled with stock produced and slaughtered in other States of the Commonwealth. It was brought to my notice recently that wholesalers were able to purchase cattle in Adelaide, rail them to Victoria for slaughter and then bring back the carcass meat for boning and at the same time show a profit on the exercise as against a local set-up.

I believe it is about time the Minister of Agriculture came forward with some constructive thoughts and actions to rectify some of the abattoir problems I have mentioned. True, the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture in another place, has given notice that he is to introduce a Bill concerning abattoirs in South Australia. I hope that what the Minister brings forward will be of assistance to our problems and not create

more. This I am rather fearful of. His Excellency, when opening Parliament, mentioned that officers of the South Australian Railways, together with a group of consultants, were preparing a master plan for the new standard gauge railway to link Adelaide with the existing Australia-wide network. This is of particular significance to me, as it will link into the Australia-wide network at my home town, Crystal Brook.

From the little information I have been able to glean and from my observations, it appears that the new railway line will leave Redhill and follow along the old stock route to Crystal Brook. Many years ago when the plans came out to extend the railway line from Redhill to Port Pirie via Merriton, Wandearah and Nurom, that line was finished and opened in July, 1937. I remember being in a deputation to the then member for Rocky River, the late Mr. Jack Lyons (1926-48), in an endeavour to influence our member to bring pressure to bear on having the plans altered to do what now appears will be the route of the new standard gauge rail line through Crystal Brook. I was then about 22 years of age. So it is significant that back in 1936 we urged that the railway line be constructed where it now appears that the new standard gauge line will be built. I remember, when I attended on the deputation to the member for Rocky River, we put our case fairly well and, after we had finished, the member put his hand in a drawer and pulled out from it the list of points he had prepared, and he had a reply waiting for us.

I believe that the bringing of the new standard gauge line *via* Crystal Brook to the destination, whether it be the west or east, will be of a vast improvement to all traffic movements, whether it be live or dead traffic. I believe, also, that Crystal Brook will become a centre for stock movements, and I expect that our stock firms will build a new complex of yards for regular markets and probably facilities for resting and spelling stock in transit. His Excellency also referred to the work being undertaken by the Government in improving port facilities in this State. However, I remind the House again that South Australia is suffering from a lack of sufficient deep-sea ports. The Australian Wheat Board is having difficulty in securing vessels of a suitable size and in sufficient numbers to remove grain from our shallow ports. Indeed, it may mean that grain might have to be shifted by both road and rail over long distances to feed ships at our deeper ports, namely, Port Giles and Wallaroo.

True, work is proceeding at Port Lincoln on the construction of a super terminal and South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is building additional storage facilities to tie in with that terminal. About a month ago I was in Port Lincoln and inspected this project. The people undertaking the silo construction were making excellent progress and I was amazed to see how much work had been accomplished by private enterprise in 5½ months. However, I was sorry to learn that the work on the harbour side of the project appeared to be lagging and I have since learnt that the completion date at this early stage has already dropped back 12 months and that the work is not expected to be completed before 1975.

I should hope that the Government does everything possible to make finance and material available to keep the completion date of this project to, at least 1975, and I will be waiting with much interest to see how much the Government is prepared to make available in the Loan Estimates allocation for Port Lincoln, because this will indicate just how genuine the Government is when it goes into raptures about what it is doing for the primary producers of this State. So far, on every side, it has been just a matter of lip service. Even the member for Stuart endeavoured to pull the wool over the eyes of members on this side by saying what he and his Government were doing for the primary producers of this State. Even our friend the member for Florey did a similar exercise when speaking in this debate last Wednesday. He said:

As usual, the Government indicates every desire to continue to assist the man on the land and people generally within the rural community. This Government has been castigated by previous speakers for doing nothing for the man on the land.

That is true, too. He continued:

This Government is tremendously concerned about the financial viability of every man on the land (every rural worker and every rural producer). We have demonstrated this fact time and time again, and we see a further indication of it in the Governor's Speech where His Excellency said:

My Government has already initiated action to provide subsidies on the movement of stock and fodder in areas adversely affected by the seasonal conditions and further help under the provisions of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act will be afforded as, and it, this is found to be necessary.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I don't understand why you don't walk off your farm?

Mr. VENNING: I am only one of many farmers.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It would take you about four days to walk off your property, because it is so big.

Mr. VENNING: It all depends on how the petrol supplies are. I asked a question on notice last week about the amount of finance the Government has given as assistance for the shifting of stock to suitable pastures and the provision of grain to assist drought-stricken stock. The reply given me today states:

Although a number of inquiries regarding freight rebates on the transport of fodder and stock in drought-affected areas had been received by the Lands Department by July 25, no formal claims have been lodged; consequently, no rebates have yet been paid.

Thus far the Government has done nothing. It has done nothing by way of paying subsidies on freight to assist primary producers. The Government continues to say what it is doing. It harps on a fact (it must have a record it listens to every now and again) and comes forward with it at the appropriate time. The actions, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, of your Government in paying over \$7,000 was brought about by Mr. Dunford's not understanding the problems of the Kangaroo Island farmers. This point was highlighted by the member for Florey, who said, "We did not understand their problems, but now we can sit down and talk matters over." The member for Florey went on to say, "I am convinced that there will be no more trouble." Quite an expensive exercise, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, do you not think?

I was concerned when I heard the member for Florey speak about the Kangaroo Island dispute. He said, in effect, that a meeting had been held and agreement reached on certain points to be discussed with the island's primary producers. He led the House to believe that agreement had been reached on these points when the primary producers returned to the island. However, it has been confirmed by officers of the United Farmers and Graziers that this is not correct. The U. F. and G. agreed to take the points back to the primary producers on the island, not necessarily recommending that they be adopted. Those points were not adopted, so a discrepancy exists regarding the feeling of the meeting, which was attended by members of the Stockowners Association and U. F. and G. members.

Regarding succession duty and probate problems, I visited the Treasurer several times to discuss specific problems in connection with bread-winners who, having died prematurely, had bank overdrafts as well as the additional liability of iniquitous death duties. The

Treasurer said he could do nothing other than consider waiving the interest payments. Some of these amounts may have been overdue for payment. I wonder how the hearts of some of these people must have bled when they heard that the Treasury had paid out over \$7,000 for something with which it had nothing to do. If the Labor Party or the unions wanted to assist Mr. Dunford, the money should have been paid from union funds. If the Treasurer had made money available to the people to whom I have referred, he would have been of more assistance. Recently, when the Leader of the Opposition to the Leader of the Opposition asked a question regarding—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Burdon): I draw the attention of the House to the fact that interjections are out of order and I ask honourable members to observe the Standing Orders. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. Last week the Leader of the Opposition to the Leader of the Opposition (the member for Gouger) asked the Treasurer whether he would act to relieve the burden of this iniquitous capital taxation measure, and the Treasurer replied:

From time to time, proposals have been put to the Government concerning alterations in succession duties in South Australia, and each of these proposals has been examined on the basis of the cases submitted. While it is true that not inconsiderable sums are paid in succession duties on properties in South Australia, our payments are still significantly below the comparable per capita payments in death duties in the standard States of Australia, even taking into account a lower base of taxation in this State. Any retreat from the succession duties area would require an expansion of taxation in other areas and, so far, my discussions with those who have put forward a proposal of this kind have shown that they find alternative forms of taxation much less palatable. If the honourable member has special cases he wishes to put to me showing difficulties and anomalies, I shall be happy to examine them and to discuss them with him.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I should like to know what change there would be in the Treasurer's decision when he looked at these cases: I believe that he would do precisely nothing. I say that because I have been to him previously with specific cases of families in my district who have been in trouble and, in the meantime, portions of their properties have had to be sold to pay this iniquitous capital taxation.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How long has it been operating? Who put this iniquitous tax on?

Mr. VENNING: If during the time I am a member of this House I can do nothing more than improve legislation and remove the iniquitous taxation measures that have existed for many years, I will have achieved at least something for the rural people of this State.

The matter of daylight saving in this State is now under review and I consider that the Government will go along with daylight saving merely because New South Wales and Victoria are going along with it. However, I understand that numerous petitions have been submitted by people from all over the State not only direct through their members of Parliament but also through the United Farmers & Graziers of South Australia Incorporated. Will the Government take no notice of these approaches by people throughout the State? Am I to believe that the Government will be led by other States? It is about time this Government stood on its own feet. This decision will indicate just how sympathetic or otherwise this Government is to people in the country areas of this State.

I was disappointed that the Government did not switch its support to deep drainage, as against a common effluent scheme, for Clare. The Clare people have had many difficulties with the sewerage situation there, having had to pump effluent on to the street. They have tried to get an effluent scheme operating but there have been great difficulties with contractors, some having withdrawn their tender and others having gone into liquidation. Up to the present, no progress has been made. It was suggested that the Government should accept a sewerage scheme in lieu of a common effluent scheme. I refer, for instance, to Angaston, which is a similar type of town to Clare. I was disappointed that the Government, and particularly the Minister of Local Government, did not agree that Clare should have a deep drainage system. The Clare council has again called tenders for a common effluent system for the town.

It will be most appropriate if I refer now to the new high school being built at Gladstone. This should be an excellent building because, under my Party's administration, plans for the school were well and truly scrutinized. Indeed, when the Labor Party came into office in 1970 the plans were more or less ready to enable building to proceed. However, because of the change of Government planning was retarded another year, and the school will not now be

completed until 1973. Last weekend, I was asked by the Chairman of the Gladstone District Council to examine a few aspects of the new high school. Work on the school was proceeding; it appears, therefore, that Gladstone will have a nice, new high school, planning for which commenced in 1938. Its site is adjacent to the Gladstone town oval and, with the facilities that are being provided, together with the Samcon construction and planning of the general layout, it appears that, when completed, this will be a fine school. The high school, together with other improvements including a new courthouse and policeman's residence, will be of much assistance to this important town. I can also report progress on the new hospital for Port Broughton. I hope that there will be a line on the Loan Estimates for a new hospital at this important country holiday resort.

Mr. Allen: There are plenty of fish there.

Mr. VENNING: That is so. I was there only yesterday, when I inspected many holiday shacks. This town is certainly going to be the Victor Harbor of the North soon. With the new Engineering and Water Supply Department main going to Port Broughton, the town will have additional water supplies, which will be beneficial to lawns planted around the shacks. It will, therefore, be only a matter of time before Port Broughton and Fisherman's Bay merge and become one town. I point out to members the significance of the development taking place at this northern country resort.

Many metropolitan residents go to Port Broughton for weekends or during holiday periods, and some even become permanent residents in their shacks. Much development is therefore taking place in the district. I support the motion.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I also congratulate His Excellency the Governor on the way he delivered his Speech opening Parliament. I add my condolences to those extended to the relatives of the late Sir James Harrison who, I believe, carried out his duties as Governor of this State in a way befitting that office. Sir James was a man of the people and kept himself above the political issues of the day.

Mr. Venning: He had a hard job, though, didn't he?

Mr. GUNN: He certainly did. I offer my condolences also to the relatives of those members who have passed away since this House last met. I refer especially to the late

George Bockelberg, who was one of my predecessors.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're lucky he's not in his hey-day, or you wouldn't be here.

Mr. GUNN: I will completely ignore the Minister. Indeed, it was the late Mr. Bockelberg who encouraged me to become active in the political field and who suggested that I should consider standing for Parliament, so I appreciate his encouragement. The Government has told us little in the Opening Speech of its intentions. It has either tried to sweep everything under the mat or sprinkled a little sweet with the sour, except that most of what we have seen from this Government in the past has been sour. I refer, first, to the petrol situation in this State. Just before entering the Chamber a few moments ago, I received a telegram from one of my constituents in Andamooka, referring to the critical situation existing at present in that town and stating that many people are out of fuel and that neither petrol nor diesel fuel is left for the motors that operate the lighting plants.

One agent, who has 2,000gall. of petrol in storage, is not permitted to supply petrol to anyone, so people are having to cook their meals on barbecue fires. I sincerely hope the Minister responsible, if he is listening, will consider this matter seriously, because it has not been considered seriously by the people administering the scheme. There are not many areas in this State not connected to a 240v power supply.

I commend the Leader of the Opposition on the way in which, as Leader, he made his first contribution to the Address in Reply debate. I am sure that the people of South Australia realize that the Leader is a man of outstanding qualities who will be a great asset to his Party.

Mr. Venning: And to the State.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, and he will soon become Premier of the State. I am proud to be associated with Dr. Eastick, as I know are all loyal members of the Liberal and Country League in South Australia.

Mr. Slater: Are the others disloyal?

Mr. GUNN: I have made no comment on that matter and I do not wish to dwell on that subject any further. I should like now to comment on the activities of certain unions in this State and, indeed, in Australia. Wherever I have travelled in my district over the last few months, people have complained to me about the irresponsible actions of certain trade unionists. I am not complaining about the trade union movement as a whole, because

I believe in unions, as does, I think, every member on this side. However, it is my opinion (and I think this can be documented without much trouble) that it is the sole intention of certain people to cause strife in this country and to hold the general public to ransom. It was interesting to hear what the member for Adelaide had to say recently in the debate concerning the Kangaroo Island situation. I was fortunate, when travelling down to Adelaide last Sunday evening, to stop at a roadhouse at Port Augusta, where I happened to pick up a copy of the *Transcontinental*, which is printed at Port Augusta. In a letter to the Editor, a gentleman states:

The lies, deceit and hypocritical remarks and actions arising out of the distasteful Kangaroo Island dispute make one ashamed to admit to being a member of the Australian Workers Union.

Mr. Payne: Is that the *West Coast Sentinel*?

Mr. GUNN: No, it is the *Transcontinental*.

Mr. Payne: With a U. F. and G. subsidy.

Mr. GUNN: No. The letter continues:

Australian Workers Union members in Port Augusta do not have any control over their own affairs and are, therefore, dictated to by people whose right to represent this union is extremely doubtful.

I could read another section, which is critical of the member for Adelaide and the A.W.U., but it highlights the type of activity that concerns me.

Mr. Payne: Don't hide it: bring it out into the open. The member for Adelaide would be glad to hear about it.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member can read it, although I am sure the member for Stuart would draw his attention to it. An editorial in the U. F. and G. newspaper seems to cover the present situation. In this editorial nine points were made.

Mr. Payne: If you didn't use a newspaper article you couldn't make a speech.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is not aware that members on this side are different from members on the other side: we can think for ourselves and are not dictated to.

The Hon. L. J. King: Why not do it sometime?

Mr. Payne: Put it down and say something from the heart.

Mr. GUNN: I will do that, but first I shall quote from the editorial. I did not intend to speak for any length of time, but if the honourable member wants me to do so as a result of his interjections I could do it. The nine points given in this editorial were first printed in May, 1919, in Germany and

put out by the Communist Party in that country. The first point states:

Corrupt the young, get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

We have had similar examples in this State. The Attorney-General and the Premier are pleased to allow pornographic material into this State.

Mr. Payne: You used that material in a question the other day, I remember now.

Mr. GUNN: I did not.

The Hon. L. J. King: Do we act on orders from Moscow, or from Peking?

Mr. GUNN: I did not imply that, and the Attorney is taking me completely out of context. The seventh point in this editorial states:

Promote unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of the government towards such disorders.

We have that situation in this State, with the Premier telling people that, if they do not approve of a law, they should break it.

Mr. Jennings: What about Millhouse?

Mr. GUNN: I am not responsible for any of the actions of the member for Mitcham; I cannot accept any responsibility there. But we in this State have seen Mr. Carmichael, acting on behalf of the trade union movement, setting out to hold to ransom the people of this country. The attitude of the movement is to destroy the whole economy of this country for its own political advantage.

Mr. Payne: You don't hear us interjecting, so you know you are hanging yourself.

Mr. GUNN: We know the attitude of the member for Mitchell: whatever his trade union bosses tell him to do, he does.

The Hon. L. J. King: You have been reading Jack McLeay.

Mr. GUNN: I have read a rather interesting document put out by Mr. McLeay, and I could quote from it.

The Hon. L. J. King: You had better quote from it inside the House: it would be rather dangerous to do so outside.

Mr. GUNN: I was going on to say that the trade union movement in Australia has endeavoured to treat the people with utter contempt. The population at large has the right to be protected against the actions of these irresponsible people. I thought the trade union movement was formed to protect the interests of the workers, not to promote the political ego of one or two people or perhaps certain Communist elements that had worked their way into the unions. I favour the trade

unions endeavouring to get better conditions for their members and trying to assist the people they are supposed to represent.

I will now refer to one or two matters in His Excellency's speech. The first one concerns the rural scholarship scheme, which I hope will assist outback children. A few years ago the member for Frome, the Minister and I attended a conference at Port Augusta with parents from outback areas. I think the Minister of Education will admit that they made one or two forceful recommendations to him. The scheme outlined briefly in the Governor's speech is not, I hope, another one of the Minister's endeavours to foist his opinions on people without taking into consideration all the problems that exist in those areas. Whilst we were at that conference, special concern was expressed from one or two quarters, and they asked us to take their problems into consideration. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that it is difficult, and in some cases impossible, for children at, say, Tarcoola or any of the stations in the outback areas, to have any chance of receiving a proper secondary education. For all children in South Australia it should be not a privilege but a right.

In many cases, parents go to great personal hardship and expense in an endeavour to give their children a limited sort of education, and in most cases the only action they can take is to send the children to some private school in Adelaide, because they are the only institutions that provide the necessary boarding facilities and supervision, so that the parents are assured that their children are being professionally supervised. Even before the children reach this stage, if the mother has several little children and it is necessary to employ a governess, most governesses cost between \$20 and \$40 a week. They must also pay for keep, and for travelling expenses two or three times a year. I believe that in any case where a governess is employed the State Government should provide at least \$400 a year to assist. Many station managers receive only \$90 a week and are hard pushed to pay out up to \$40 a week from their salaries. Indeed, a station hand employed on these stations may receive only \$50 a week, and it is completely out of his range to provide any reasonable education facilities for his children.

I sincerely hope that when the Minister eventually introduces his scheme it will afford genuine relief to the people in these areas. These country children should have, as a matter of right, the same opportunities as are

open to children elsewhere. Indeed, I was pleased to see in the last issue of the publication put out by the Institute of Teachers that the President said that he believed that all children should have equal opportunity for education without a means test. We often hear members opposite referring to the abolition of the means test, but they refer to this only to suit their own purposes.

Mr. HOPGOOD: What is important is what we put in its place.

Mr. GUNN: I do not intend to be involved in that argument. I was pleased to see that this Government was continuing with the sealing of the Eyre Highway.

Mr. SIMMONS: We are looking after you.

Mr. GUNN: This Government has been given so much assistance by a generous and capable Commonwealth Government that it is having difficulty in spending the funds available. No other Government has ever been treated so generously.

Mr. PAYNE: Look in *Hansard* and check the figures.

Mr. GUNN: I am not relying on anything that the member for Mitchell has said. I should be happy to check the figures, because I know that they would verify what I am saying. I know that this Government has no alternative but to seal the Eyre Highway, because of the generous assistance it has got from the Commonwealth Government. I refer to the Highways Department schedule for this year.

Mr. PAYNE: Look at the table for the last 12 years regarding Western Australia and South Australia. See what answer you get there.

Mr. GUNN: That is another question.

Mr. MATHWIN: They are only trying to draw red herrings across your path.

Mr. GUNN: The first page of that schedule shows that the Government received over 50 per cent of the money from the Commonwealth Government as a direct grant under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. Other finance for roads comes from vehicle registration fees. We are aware that this Government has increased registration fees, especially for trucks and other heavy vehicles, and this, too, is just another stab in the back for the primary producer and people involved in the free enterprise system, especially road transport operators.

Mr. PAYNE: It hasn't happened anywhere else, has it?

Mr. GUNN: I am interested in what happens here. If the honourable member

wants to criticize the actions of the Western Australian Labor Government, that is up to him. I am not referring to that. The Government has increased motor vehicle registration fees, which has brought it more money. However, one thing that the Minister of Roads and Transport has said little about in recent months is the M.A.T.S. plan—

Mr. Coumbe: Anything on transport.

Mr. GUNN: — because we know the mess he has got himself into. It is interesting to see on page 11 of the Highways Department schedule that \$6,657,000 is to be spent. What is it to be spent on? I say unequivocally that it will be spent on the M.A.T.S. plan, and I challenge any Government member to disprove it.

Mr. Payne: What does it refer to?

Mr. GUNN: It refers to the acquisition of land for the construction of roads and bridges. The member for Florey lauded the Minister of Roads and Transport on the way in which he had saved the people of this State from the M.A.T.S. plan. However, the Minister has made so many conflicting statements about the plan that I do not think he knows where he is going; one has only to read the nonsensical report of Dr. Breuning, which only clouds the issue even more.

Mr. Payne: You're extremely well qualified to criticize him!

Mr. GUNN: I do not think that anyone must be well qualified to look at what the Minister is trying to pull over the eyes of the people of this State: it is one of the greatest confidence tricks ever attempted.

Mr. Mathwin: You're talking about the \$12,000 novel?

Mr. GUNN: That is an apt way of describing it. When the member for Florey was lavishing praise on the Minister, it occurred to me that the Minister was the most arrogant and vindictive Minister on the front bench.

Mr. Payne: Why do you always criticize him while he's absent from the Chamber?

Mr. GUNN: It is not my fault that he is absent.

Mr. Langley: Why do you have to be personal?

Mr. GUNN: Because, in common with other Opposition members, I have had to suffer his abuse for the last two years. The member for Torrens has even been told to shut his mouth. On opening day, I asked the Minister a question about the M.A.T.S. plan, and he twisted it around and abused me about the M.A.T.S. plan. Obviously, he did not want to discuss

the matter, because he has made so many conflicting reports that he probably did not want to put his foot in it any more. I believe the Minister is not very popular, and that is easy to understand. I was perturbed to read a headline in the press to the effect that members of the Transport Workers Union in the State intended to move a resolution to have withdrawn certain obnoxious legislation that the Minister of Roads and Transport dropped like a hot potato after he visited the South-East and became aware that, if he proceeded with it, he and the member for Mount Gambier would both lose their seats. Of course, I believe that the Minister will reintroduce the legislation by means of a back-door method, little by little, because I realize that the Labor Party has no love for road transport, which is vital in areas such as my district. Anyone who thinks that legislation such as was introduced last session will be in the best interests of country areas has not considered these areas at all, because people at Andamooka, Coober Pedy, and other places distant from Adelaide, particularly in the western part of the State, rely totally on road transport, particularly in transporting stock and perishable goods.

The restrictions on hours of driving and the present 35 m.p.h. speed limit puts these people at a considerable disadvantage. I consider that the speed limit on all transports, as long as their braking systems are proved to be adequate, should be a flat 50 m.p.h. Modern trucks are as safe as or safer than most motor cars, and in my opinion it is not the truck driver who is causing danger to the people of the State.

Last year the Railways Commissioner saw fit to make what I considered a rather unfortunate statement. I do not want to be particularly critical of that gentleman. I know that he has a difficult task to perform, but I think that statements of this kind do not do relationships between the rural industry and the South Australian Railways any good. Several comments in that statement are not absolutely correct and have caused much resentment, particularly in my district, because the people think that the Railways Commissioner was trying to have a shot at them.

The first point he made was that growers at Poochera were delivering grain to Port Lincoln. On checking the records, it was found that not one grower delivered wheat or barley from Poochera to Port Lincoln in the 1971-72 season. I could deal with several other points in relation to this matter, but

I do not think that would serve any good purpose. However, one thing that the Commissioner implied was that, if all the grain in South Australia was carted by the railways, their financial position would be improved greatly. This statement is not correct. If the railways received all the grain cartage in this State, their financial position would not be improved greatly. There would be only a marginal difference, and I consider that any action to force the graingrowers of this State to cart to the nearest rail point would have a detrimental effect on the grain industry, as the growers of South Australia must use every avenue to cut their costs, because of the spiralling wage increases and other increases in costs that are taking place, particularly in capital taxation.

Members on this side know that the Australian primary producer is the most efficient in the world, and we should be proud of this. The primary producers of this State still play an important part in the development of this State and of Australia. Many members opposite seem to think that primary producers are wingeing cockies, that they are after more hand-outs and subsidies. This is the attitude of the member for Whyalla, who has made several irresponsible interjections, particularly as he represents an area that depends on subsidy for its very existence. If it was not for subsidy paid to the shipbuilding industry, there would not be any shipbuilding.

At the present time the rural industries of this State still provide more than 50 per cent of our export earnings. One problem other than capital taxation is the tariff protection afforded to industries in this country.

The Hon. L. J. King: Are you blaming the Government for that?

Mr. GUNN: I am not blaming this Government for that. I know that we should have a diversified economy in Australia, that we must have both primary industry and secondary industry, but members, particularly those who claim to represent the working class people of this country and the people employed in industry, do not realize that, but for the tariff protection afforded to more than 90 per cent of secondary industries in this State, those industries would not exist. Therefore, logical arguments can be advanced why primary producers in certain areas should receive special consideration, because industry is protected in every way.

Mr. Venning: \$2,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. GUNN: I think it is nearer \$3,000,000,000. I wanted to make one or two

comments regarding the problem of capital taxation.

Mr. Hopgood: What about the tariff? You would concede that it discriminates against the smaller States, would you not?

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member wants me to discuss that matter, I shall be happy to do so, because I have one or two opinions regarding the present tariff structure.

Mr. Venning: What about your addressing a meeting of the Labor Party?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Burdon): Order! I suggest that, if the honourable member for Eyre wishes to discuss private matters, he should do so after the House adjourns.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Sir. I will abide by your ruling. I was linking up my remarks because, in the first paragraph of his Speech, His Excellency outlined in detail the problems facing the rural industry. I was just about to discuss some of the problems caused by capital taxation. I am proud to be associated with my Party's policy to abolish rural land tax, which would alleviate to a small degree some of the problems facing the rural community. The Premier and Deputy Premier have both made many statements on this matter. I suggest to honourable members opposite that, if the funds were handled in a far more prudent manner and some proper administrative decisions were made, the State could afford to abolish this form of taxation. However, the vexed problem in relation to capital taxation is State succession duties. This is a problem that every primary producer and small businessman in this State has hanging over his head.

If the people of this State and of Australia generally want the small farmer and businessman to remain viable and to continue their operations, this form of taxation will have to be reviewed, and in many cases these people will have to be given special exemptions, as it is impossible for a person with a reasonable sized holding to meet the demands that succession duties at present place on him. If one must organize one's affairs in order to protect one's family, one is forced to make considerable payments to insurance companies. Although I realize that this is a kind of investment, the rural industry is facing serious economic problems, as a result of which many people are not able financially to meet these commitments. Therefore, if something happens to the breadwinner (an aspect to which the member

for Rocky River referred), a family may have to sell the best portion of its farm, in which event the farm may become uneconomic.

The States and the Commonwealth Government have arranged a rural reconstruction scheme, which is encouraging farm build-up. On the other hand, there are two forms of taxation—first, State taxation and, secondly, Commonwealth estate duties, the latter of which is having a reverse effect. All Governments should examine this problem and take steps to alleviate the problems facing people with a property worth, say, up to \$100,000. I use that figure, because it is not a big farm today that is valued at less than \$100,000. If a person had a farm worth only \$70,000 or \$80,000, he would in many areas find it difficult to make a living. I challenge anyone to disprove that statement.

Mr. Simmons: That's a lot of nonsense.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Peake is a man who is on record in this House as saying that he does not believe in our present economic system. He supports a socialistic system, and that means that no-one in this country has the right to own any private property. The member for Rocky River has in his possession, and has just handed me, a copy of a speech which the honourable member made, stating:

This country would be better served by a socialistic economic system, and I make no apology for saying that.

I make no apology for saying that that is a deplorable statement. It would not be in the best interests of the people of Australia if that sort of theoretical left-wing attitude were adopted; indeed, I am sure it would always be rejected by the Australian people. My constituents have no doubt where their interests are best protected, and that is why they strongly support the L.C.L. I wish to make one or two comments on the fishing industry.

Mr. Allen: What about the Haslam jetty?

Mr. GUNN: It is a pity that the Government has seen fit to demolish part of this jetty and other jetties in South Australia, bearing in mind that many of the small coastal towns and resorts throughout the State are potential tourist areas. I am fortunate to have in my district most of the western coastal area of the State, where the tourist potential is unlimited. I recently received from members of the South Australian fishing industry a copy of submissions they had made to the Minister of Agriculture, and I believe that the Minister and the Government would be acting in the best interests of the people of this State if the three major submissions in question were

adopted. Bearing in mind that the South Australian fishing industry is our fastest-growing primary-producing industry, I believe that the three submissions deserve the support of every member of this House.

Mr. Rodda: Do you think the Minister can understand them?

Mr. GUNN: I hope he can although, judging from the statements he sometimes makes, one wonders about that. The member for Flinders and I are aware of the tremendous development that has taken place in the fishing industry in the last few years, and we know that a need exists for Government assistance.

Mr. Harrison: Keep going and you'll be here until 3 o'clock in the morning.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I am privileged to represent the opal-mining communities of Andamooka and Coober Pedy, although we know the attitude of the present Government to opal miners in those areas. Recently, a group of responsible citizens of Andamooka formed a committee to promote tourism in that part of the State. I have forwarded a copy of the submissions of that group to the Minister in charge of tourism. I believe they are worthy of support, and I submit that South Australia should do everything in its power to promote the tourist industry. The Government should consider seriously the transport arrangements operating in these areas so distant from the city. At present Andamooka and Coober Pedy are served by a reliable and efficient airway service, and the charter operators do not receive any subsidies. If these areas are to be served by an improved airway service, legislation should be passed to protect these operators from unscrupulous people who operate second-rate services and who do not enhance the future of the tourist industry.

I noted with interest when reading the Governor's Speech that the Government and the Minister intend to consider conservation in this State. I strongly support any conservation measures. When I fly from the Adelaide Airport and look down at the sprawling metropolitan area I see what a shocking mess it is. One is aware of the tremendous need for redevelopment in the metropolitan area. If we allow subdividers and developers to continue in their present manner, we will be forced into a most untenable position. The first thing to rectify the tremendous strain on our economy is to reduce the number of immigrants coming into this country, and the policy of assisted immigration should be

considered seriously and perhaps stopped at present.

Immigration has played an important part in developing this country, and I appreciate what the new settlers have contributed to our way of life and to our society. I pay a tribute to the member for Glenelg for having the foresight to become involved in such an enlightened Party as the Liberal and Country League. We place too great a strain on the economy of this country by continuing to bring in large numbers of people. I have strong feelings on this matter and am pleased to be able to put forward my views on it. I have pleasure in supporting the motion and commend the member for Elizabeth for moving it. I support one or two of the remarks made by the member for Stuart. However, concerning the Labor Party's centralist policy for schools and commissions, we know that this would set up a centralist bureaucracy that would take away the rights of the States in relation to education, and is a complete contrast to our policy in which we believe independent schools should be given as much autonomy as possible.

The attitude of the Government and its members who support that line places the people of this State in a deplorable position. In an excellent article, the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science disposed of the myth of this policy. I strongly commend him for doing so.

The honourable gentleman commented on the problems we are having with the Aborigines. I was interested to hear what he said. I appreciate the position of Aborigines in this State. In many ways, we have never tackled this problem as we should have. We have deprived the Aboriginal of his way of life, his culture and his dignity, and have endeavoured to force upon him our system and way of life with no regard for his feelings and without considering whether or not he wants to be pushed into the twentieth century. Our first task is to endeavour to create a situation where the Aborigines set their own pace for their own development. They should be provided with the necessary assistance to do this but we should not take much notice of those people in the community who, in many cases, are not familiar with the problems of the Aborigines and allow their hearts to govern their minds. In conclusion, I strongly support the member for Alexandra. Since I have been a member of this House, I have come to regard him as a person of wise judgment, someone that all members of Parliament should look up

to because he has given us so much encouragement and assistance.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): The member who has just resumed his seat reminds me of a question that was asked—"What is the difference between a Church of England parson and a Methodist minister?". The reply was that, when the Church of England parson says, "In conclusion", he concludes, but the Methodist says "Lastly", and he lasts. The previous speaker has now concluded, and I assure the House that I shall finish my speech before 11 p.m.

I am happy to rise in support of the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor. I am sure that every member of Parliament, and indeed every South Australian, is happy to welcome back Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant to this, their home State, after an absence of many years abroad, when no doubt in that absence they promoted this country of ours. Like other members, I am sorry it was necessary to appoint a new Governor, because I am sure that those of us who were closely associated on occasions with the late Governor were distressed at his sudden passing, because he had endeared himself to us all and had shown that he was prepared to go out and meet the people of this State and learn at first hand what was going on.

I trust that His Excellency and Lady Oliphant will live for many years to enjoy happy occasions with their people here in South Australia and that we shall have the privilege of having the Governor open Parliament on many more occasions. Already, Sir Mark has been into my area and, as I thought he would, he chose to speak on water and water pollution. We appreciate very much his thoughts on the matter. I also mention those members who have died since we last met. I knew the late Mr. Riches well and I am aware of the other areas in which he served; that of local government and his church. He was a man who had widespread interests in the community and he was indeed a faithful servant of every responsibility that he accepted. I was also privileged at one stage to be a constituent in the district represented by the late Mr. Quirke, whom I found to be most eager and meticulous in attending to the smallest detail of his work. He was a dedicated man and did much for the people in his district. Although I did not know the late Mr. Robinson or the late Mr. Bockelberg, I am sure, because of the tributes paid by other members, that both those gentlemen

were well respected in this House and served their constituents faithfully and well.

I believe that, of the five Address in Reply debates in which I have spoken, this debate has seen members covering more issues and topics than any other. The debate provides members with an opportunity to canvass many subjects and I do not believe that any area has been neglected. However, the contribution I most enjoyed was that by the member for Playford, and I have taken the trouble to re-read his address. In fact, I have cut out a copy of his speech so that I may refer to it in the future. The honourable member gave one of the most level-headed contributions on any subject that has been raised in this debate, and I wish to thank him for it. His remarks were particularly appropriate, because we could be in a time of transition when many people are dissatisfied with our present system of arbitration. I hope that we will never depart from the arbitration system, although it may be reformed or updated because some groups wish that system to be altered. However, I hope that we will not find ourselves adopting the American system of collective bargaining. The member for Playford was clear in pointing out that he hoped we would not become involved in future in collective bargaining here.

It was interesting also to hear the comments of the retiring members. The member for Elizabeth, Mr. Clark, moved the Address in Reply and gave all members advice based on his years of experience in this House. The member for Alexandra told us of the trends he noticed in his 25 years in this House, and gave us also some practicable hints. Although I have always appreciated the member for Alexandra, I have not always agreed with him by a long way. He is a hard worker who always works conscientiously in preparing his material. He is one who one might say errs on the side of conservatism, depending on the emphasis one puts on the word. I have found him to be a man one does not easily get to know. However, as with all such people, the closer you get to him the greater faith you have in his judgment. Such people think before doing much talking, whereas many people tend to talk first and think later.

I much appreciated the contribution made by the member for Davenport. People at Tailem Bend are delighted at the success of a bus system, introduced when the member for Davenport was Minister of Education, to replace a train that had quite a history of antics and pranks. The

students at Tailem Bend are now well served by this bus system. The long-awaited brand new \$1,200,000 Murray Bridge High School came about when the member for Davenport was Minister. She will be interested to hear that only a matter of weeks ago the students moved from its 41 prefabricated classrooms into a brand new solid-construction school, with considerable ease. This reflects great credit on the teaching staff, particularly the Headmaster, and on the students, too. The students, by means of a series of trucks, transported most of the equipment from the old school to the new school; certain old equipment was left behind. As Chairman of the school council, I am delighted to visit the new school, for which the Commonwealth Government provided almost \$100,000.

Mrs. Steele: It doesn't do anything!

Mr. WARDLE: It is often said that the Commonwealth Government makes no contribution. However, not only did it provide \$100,000 for the library complex: it also provided \$350,000 for the science laboratories. A fortunate aspect of the library complex is that the entrances to this marvellous building are not for use only by the school: they can also be used by the general public after school hours and at weekends. This is a great step forward because, after all, taxpayers' money has been used to provide such a facility, and it would seem strange to lock it up at mid-afternoon.

I also wish to thank the member for Goyder for his friendship over the last 30 years. One of the things to which I looked forward in coming to the House from the east was to link up with a great friend from the west, and it has been a delight to carry on my friendship with Mr. Ferguson after many years.

I wish to add a few comments to a subject opened up by the member for Fisher, who outlined in detail a case of hardship whereby the Government had decided to zone land for a water supply; no provision was made for compensation. I wish to refer to something that is happening beside the Murray River, and I am sure that there are several of these cases. A gentleman who has spent just over \$6,000 up to the present time to build a piggery is now in the position that the back of the shed is 305ft. or 306ft. from the river, which means that the bulk of the shed is within the watershed limit. He is prohibited from adding to the shed to complete this particular project. The accommodation at present is for 30 sows but he needs accommodation for another 30 to make the unit

viable. He is halfway through his investment in promoting this piggery and he finds that the project must now stop and that he is expected to move. This is physically impossible, so I guess he is expected to demolish the building worth \$6,000 that is about 300ft. from the watershed and build it on another site.

Mr. Coumbe: What does he get for that?

Mr. WARDLE: He does not get anything. I hope that the Government will take up this matter and I intend to ask several further questions in the House about it. I hope that it will be possible to introduce a deputation to the Minister and that something in the form of compensation can be paid. I am not even certain that compensation is necessary, if a man such as this can guarantee that not one drop of water will escape from his establishment. All the washing down of the whole of the pens runs through channels into a large concrete receptacle pit, and he is willing to pump it half a mile out into the middle of his paddock.

There is no possibility of one drop of water getting within 220ft. or 230ft. of the river. If this guarantee is given (and what I am saying is obvious on inspection), I fail to see that this arbitrary figure of 300ft. from the river should be insisted on. There is no pollution danger. I think this requirement is unduly hard and that it does not face up to the circumstances of life. We must take a new look at this situation and be sensible about it.

I want to deal also with a matter that other speakers have dealt with, namely, the speed limits for commercial vehicles, and to place on record some information about these limits over the last 30 or 40 years. I understand that the original speed limits were placed on commercial vehicles in 1934, when the limit for vehicles of less than three tons was 20 m.p.h. and that for vehicles of more than three tons was 16 m.p.h. In 1935-36 these speed limits were amended so that vehicles of less than seven tons were permitted to travel at 35 m.p.h., those from seven tons to 15 tons at 25 m.p.h., and those over 15 tons at 20 m.p.h. These speed limits for commercial vehicles were amended again in 1935. A vehicle of less than seven tons in weight was then permitted to travel up to 40 m.p.h.; a vehicle of between seven tons and 13 tons was permitted to travel at 30 m.p.h.; and any vehicle of more than 13 tons could travel at only 25 m.p.h. I believe that no amendments to those speeds have been made since 1955. It must, of course,

be admitted that vehicles have changed tremendously since 1955; in this respect I refer to power steering and tremendously improved and increased braking systems.

Mr. Coumbe: And road construction.

Mr. WARDLE: Road construction has also improved out of sight. Every time one of these operators breaks the speed limit, he is given three demerit points. Only last week an Ansett driver, after 19½ years driving experience, was convicted for the fourth time for speeding and was taken off the road. When experienced drivers are taken off the road for exceeding these speed limits, less experienced drivers are getting on to the road in large vehicles. Having formerly been an ambulance operator, I appreciate all the courtesies semi-trailer drivers pay to motorists. Very few of them are unco-operative and discourteous. Having travelled many times on the most dangerous and difficult section of road in South Australia through the Adelaide Hills (although perhaps it is not since the opening of the new freeway), I have some appreciation of the courtesy of these people. I therefore hope the Government will see fit this session to alter these speed limits or that it will at least agree to a private member's Bill to alter them. Operators would like to see a flat speed limit of about 50 m.p.h. on the open road and 30 m.p.h. in townships and built-up areas. It will be interesting to know the view of engineers on whether modern vehicles are causing as much damage to roads as was previously thought. It is obvious when one follows these heavy vehicles through the Hills that they are doing the sort of speeds that I suggest should be lawful anyway. It therefore matters very little.

I believe our modern road-making techniques are more able to cope with these sorts of load than they were in 1955, when the present speed limits were enacted. It is difficult for some of these sophisticated motor vehicles, which have an enormous range of gears and tremendous braking systems, when they are restricted to a speed limit of 30 m.p.h. when they weigh between seven tons and 13 tons and to 25 m.p.h. when they weigh more than 13 tons.

In previous Address in Reply debates I have referred to tourism, and I will mention it again. I hope that one day a proportion of motor vehicle registration fees will be channelled into the development of tourism throughout the State. This suggestion is probably not very exciting for or acceptable to the

automobile group in South Australia. However, I believe this system has operated in Victoria for some time, where about 2 per cent of motor vehicle registration fees is used for this purpose. This percentage in South Australia would produce about \$500,000. The Minister of Local Government will realize just what local government bodies could do with another \$500,000 to be used to promote tourism and for purposes such as constructing short stretches of road, erecting signs, building public toilets, and perhaps sealing roads into look-out areas. All of these undertakings require much money, which small councils cannot afford. We realize just how much this sort of money would help councils to promote tourism in their areas. Tourist activity along the Murray River is growing considerably, and I am sure that, if more money were allocated to river councils for the purpose of developing the tourist potential and expanding the facilities that exist in their areas, this would be most acceptable.

I believe that the land on which the Gepps Cross abattoir is situated would be a wonderful real estate proposition. Indeed, I should like to see this abattoir phased out, for I believe that the sale of this site on the real estate market would produce sufficient money to establish a new abattoir in the Lower North that would handle the necessary quantities to be slaughtered for the metropolitan area. I believe that more and more meat will come from country abattoirs into the metropolitan area. The abattoir in my own district is a good example of what can be done by private enterprise in connection with the slaughtering of stock. I believe that an abattoir in the Lower North would adequately serve the farmers of this State, at the same time meeting the demand for meat in the metropolitan area. I hope that private enterprise will eventually be granted a permit and that we shall finally be able to phase the Gepps Cross abattoir out of existence completely. His Excellency referred in paragraph 14 of his Speech to mining, and I wish to refer to the Kanmantoo mines.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the bunyip?

Mr. WARDLE: I am sorry that I will not have time to deal fully with that subject. However, I point out that the bunyip attraction in Murray Bridge which cost between \$4,000 and \$5,000 has more than half paid for itself since the end of January through the 20c pieces collected. In fact, over a weekend a few weeks ago the Town Clerk had to go down to the

attraction on a Sunday afternoon because, instead of coming up out of the water, making the appropriate noises, returning into the pool, and repeating that procedure once more, as it is supposed to do when each 20c is inserted, the bunyip kept repeating this procedure over and over, because the container for the 20c pieces was full. Anyone who goes anywhere near Murray Bridge (even people from all over Australia) wants to see the bunyip. I am not sure whether the Minister has seen it or whether he is waiting for the local member to provide the 20c necessary to get it working.

I think it is important for the people of South Australia that the Kanmantoo mines are now coming right back into production. The mines employ 146 people, and many farmers in my district, who have had to do something other than farming in order to earn a living, have found employment there. Kanmantoo Mines Limited was formed in 1970 with a nominal capital of 10,000,000 shares of \$1 each, held by the parties in the following proportion: Broken Hill South Limited, 51 per cent; North Broken Hill Limited, 19½ per cent; Electrolytic Zinc Company of Australia Limited, 19½ per cent; and Dr. P. G. Hall of Canada, 10 per cent. Overburden removal commenced in August, 1970, followed by the first blast in waste rock in October, 1970. Construction of facilities was also commenced for commissioning in the second half of 1971. The Kanmantoo district is situated about 40 miles east-southeast of Adelaide, near the main Adelaide-Melbourne railway line.

The village of Kanmantoo, three miles north of the copper deposit, is located on the main Adelaide-Melbourne sealed highway, and is 35 road miles from Adelaide. The proposed Adelaide-Melbourne freeway system will pass a short distance to the south of the copper deposit, and will link with the present highway near Callington, which is two miles east of the copper deposit. The area is on the eastern margin of Mount Lofty Ranges and is drained by the Bremer River which flows intermittently within a broad south-trending valley into Lake Alexandrina further south. Copper was first found in this area in 1846, and it was opened up then by the old South Australian Company. However, in 1875 mining had practically ceased. Although several further attempts to exploit the deposit were made in the following years, no ore tonnage of any consequence was produced.

The scheduled production rate at this mine is 750,000 tons a year, and this ore contains

1 per cent copper. Apparently in 1875, because of the percentage of copper, it was uneconomic to mine it with the methods used in those days. For the next eight years there will be an open pit at the Kanmantoo mine, and it is envisaged that this pit will be 1,500ft. across at the top and shaped like an icecream cone. After 10 years the pit will be 750ft. deep. At that time, because the seam of copper is almost vertical, underground mining will be carried out. It is interesting to note that this 750ft. level will be the sea level. The total quantity of rock in the pit is 39,000,000 long tons, and about five tons of waste must be removed for every one ton of ore. The pit will be methodically advanced and deepened by a series of 40ft.-spaced benches. At present, while mining is still partly above natural ground slope level, the mine has the appearance of a quarry.

In my opinion, Murray New Town is the important subject referred to in the Governor's Speech. It has been asked why we need a new city, but the answer is that in the next 25 years some thousands of people will have to be syphoned off for the development of Adelaide, and it is desirable that they be placed in a new town. It is important that we do not forget that probably in the next 25 or 30 years only one-quarter or one-third of what would have been the natural increase of Adelaide's population will move to Murray New Town. Local Government needs tremendous financial assistance. When the site is known, I should like each council within 10 or 15 miles of it to receive \$250,000 from the State Government. It is necessary for the purchasing of additional areas of land.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. WARDLE: This would also enable them to make improvements that will prove in the long term to be the playground for the population of the new town. A most important matter is the upgrading of the railway system to Murray Bridge. The railway line is about 62 miles long, and the roadway is 52 miles. The town could probably be reached through a tunnel system in 42 miles, or even less. It will be necessary either to have a second railway line to Murray Bridge or to have a mono-type railway system that will do the 42 miles in less than 42 minutes. To expect people to travel by train and take two hours 20 minutes when it is so easy to make the trip in an hour in a motor vehicle is ridiculous. It is obvious that the railway line will have to be upgraded.

One of the most interesting things about the new town is land tenure. Will it be freehold or leasehold? Will there be some portions of the town, such as the private housing areas, that will be freehold while the industrial areas are leasehold? As an incentive for everyone who goes to the new town, will the Government say, "Well, the block of land is yours, provided you build on it within two years, at a rental of \$1 a year"? I do not think the Government would spend much more than \$1,000,000 in purchasing 25,000 acres of land. It is not a very great hardship for any Government that wants people to inhabit the new town to say, "There is a 50-year lease (or maybe more) on that block of land for \$1 a year rental". It will be necessary to offer some good inducements to people to go into the new town, and it will take vast amounts of Commonwealth money to help promote it. Economically, the scheme is not very enticing. It will cost a large sum of money, but perhaps the economic considerations are completely outweighed by fact that we are developing a completely new area and, therefore, saving some of the sprawl of the metropolitan area.

The crunch, of course, will come when the Government will or will not be able to attract sufficient industry to the new area to make it go. This must be done fairly quickly from the commencement of the town. I hope the Government will say fairly soon where it will be, because many farmers have cancelled orders for machinery, and people have told builders they will not repair or renovate their houses within 20 miles of Murray Bridge because it will be pointless in the long term. I urge the Government to make the site known as soon as possible.

Concerning green belts, the administration of the town, the conservation of natural areas, the pollution of water and the fact that all liquid waste can be put into the forests—only about 4,000 acres of forest for a town of 150,000 or 200,000 people, which is not a big forest—in fact it would be good to see 4,000 acres of forest spread out in the various areas among the 25,000-acre town. We were told recently at a meeting at Murray Bridge that it would be possible for 5,000 acres of forest to absorb every drop of liquid waste from a town of 150,000 people. Those are but a few thoughts I have about Murray New Town, and I hope that in future we shall see it viable and attracting people in South Australia, and that it will grow as an experiment that will be an example

to people in other States who are trying to promote a new town. In fulfilment of the undertaking I gave to the Leader of the House, I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor has intimated

that he will be pleased to receive honourable members at Government House tomorrow at 2.10 p.m. for the presentation of the Address in Reply.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 2, at 2 p.m.