

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

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

PETITION: FRANCES POLICE OFFICER

Mr. RODDA presented a petition signed by 116 residents of Frances and surrounding areas who prayed that, because the nearest towns in which police officers were stationed were about 30 miles (about 48 km) from Frances, because the township had no banking facilities, with business proprietors and managers having to hold money privately, and because the floating population of the town varied greatly, the request of the petitioners that the decision of the Commissioner of Police to terminate the stationing of a resident police officer within the township be reviewed and that reinstatement of the position be made immediately so that the community would enjoy the same protection and welfare as it had experienced in past years.

Petition received and read.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I give notice that tomorrow I will move that I have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1969, as amended, and that I have leave to introduce a Bill for a Bill of Rights—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may submit only one notice of motion at this stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, Sir, on Wednesday the member for Goyder was allowed to give two notices, one after the other, at this stage.

The SPEAKER: As far as the Chair is aware, on that occasion only one notice of motion was submitted. The honourable member will have an opportunity later to give notice on the second matter.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit with great respect that I gave two notices of motion on the occasion that has been referred to.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham is not being deprived of any of his rights. Two honourable members rose to give notices of motion. I gave the honourable member for Mitcham the opportunity to submit one of his notices of motion, and the other honourable member will now get the opportunity to submit his notice of motion. Then, the honourable member for Mitcham, in accordance with Standing Orders, will get his further opportunity.

QUESTIONS

MONARTO

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what is the time schedule for the development of the new town of Monarto? On June 19 the Premier told me that he had applied to the appropriate authority in Canberra for \$14,600,000 as the first instalment required to undertake this development. Further, it was believed that the recommendation for that sum had been accepted by the Commonwealth Government and that, in due course, South Australia would receive that money. Following a site inspection of the area on November 17, 1972, a report in the *Advertiser* of November 18 stated that South Australia's new city near Murray Bridge would be named Murray and that it was expected that the first housing project would begin within three years. Subsequently, the name was changed, but to my knowledge there has been no comment from the Premier concerning any different time schedule for building houses. On Friday evening last the A.B.C. news bulletin stated:

The new General Manager for the Monarto new city project (Mr. A. W. Richardson) said he expected the first people would be living at Monarto in four or five years. Mr. Richardson, who is now with the Commonwealth Department of Housing in Canberra, takes up his new position in September.

I draw attention also to the fact that the advertisement for the General Manager for Monarto indicated that the appointment would be for a six-year period. Mr. Richardson's appointment was advertised on July 5 in the *Advertiser*, and it was announced that he would take up the position in September. Will Mr. Richardson still be the General Manager of the organization when houses are being built for occupation? There seems to be a tremendous conflict of dates and times in the statements from the Premier, and it is on this basis that I ask for clarification on behalf of the people of this State, because of their grave concern at the differences in information permeating through to them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This concern can be only in the Leader's mind, because he has tried to make a discrepancy out of nothing: that is because he has not terribly much else to do.

Dr. Eastick: That does not answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will answer it if the honourable member will listen.

Mr. Gunn: We are waiting.

Mr. Venning: Get on and answer it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

Mr. Venning: I am being abusive!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have a thin skin.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the attention of honourable members to the fact that, in Question Time, questions only will be permitted. I will not tolerate interjections or a member's seeking further information by an interjection. If members persist, I will not hesitate to order that Standing Orders be complied with, and I will name honourable members. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I pointed out that we could expect house building to commence in about three years time, but that does not mean that houses will be completed in that time. If the Leader will consider the normal development of house building, he will see that there is no discrepancy between Mr. Richardson's statement and mine. In succeeding weeks I shall be bringing to Parliament several reports of studies on various aspects of Monarto development, and I will let the Leader have them. There has been absolutely no discrepancy in the planning of Monarto. We are still ahead of every other State in the necessary planning of this submetropolitan development area.

Dr. Eastick: Does that mean we will get the money?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was going on to say (and this is not an answer to any interjection) that our proposals to the Commonwealth concerning finance for Monarto have met with success, and we will receive assistance from the Commonwealth Government during this financial year in the acquisition of land and in the planning of Monarto.

Mr. HALL: In view of the publication "Monarto, Summary of a New Town Site Selection Report", which the Minister of Environment and Conservation has had distributed to members, and in view of the apparent high priority of this project in the Government's planning, why has the Minister not been able to satisfactorily explain how the environment surrounding this area is to be protected and how the quality of the Murray River is to be protected

in the face of the forthcoming construction of the new town? The first part of the report does not touch on this matter: it is merely a repeat of the Premier's rather bland statements on this matter. However, I refer to the paragraph dealing with drainage, as follows:

The elevated country between Bremer and Pallamana escarpments has a natural drainage pattern.

However, there is no satisfactory statement as to where the drainage will be taken from the existing natural drainage pattern. There is also a reference to quarrying, which will be proceeded with at Monarto. I refer to the widespread complaints about quarrying in the Adelaide Hills, and I express my concern that quarrying will take place within the Monarto site itself.

I now refer to that section of the report regarding sewerage, as follows:

The disposal of sewage will require detailed study to avoid eutrophication in the River Murray and salinity build-up in the irrigated areas adjoining the river.

Again, no solution is given: only the statement that study is required. Is sewage to be returned to the Murray River? I am concerned about many other similar matters from the brief references included in the report but without any substantive reference to solutions regarding the disposal of garbage and similar problems. Further reference is made to the use of the Murray River for recreation, yet nowhere in the report is there a statement regarding the direction of drainage from the underground water table, which is an underlying factor of this proposal. Is proper safeguarding of the ecology being undertaken in the planning of Monarto? Why has the Minister and his department failed to give the answers to the questions he has so cleverly disguised in this report?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot comment.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am surprised that the honourable member is not supporting the Government in its intention to establish—

Mr. Hall: I will not support you in polluting the river.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In recent months—

Mr. Hall: When will—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Government has on an earlier occasion made announcements concerning the establishment of the new city at Monarto, including that from the first stages of construction no pollution from the development of this site would find its way into the Murray River—

Mr. McAnaney: What about—

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: —or the surrounding area. This was one of the first statements we made regarding the establishment of this town site. Indeed, it was one of the reasons why the site was selected.

Mr. Hall: Can the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder had a glorious opportunity in asking his question. The Minister shall be heard in silence and, if the honourable member wants to persistently disobey Standing Orders I shall have no hesitation in naming him. The honourable Minister of Environment and Conservation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No doubt the honourable member has been so busy in recent months that he has not taken the care that other members have taken in respect of the announcements the Government has made on this issue. However, I assure him and all other members

that the Government is concerned not only to see that the environment of the area is kept clean from any pollution (including the river and the lakes), but also to ensure that the general surroundings of this area will be attractive in all stages of development.

ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation consider using vantage points in the hills and foothills for spotting gross examples of atmospheric pollution on the Adelaide Plains? Motoring last Tuesday to the opening of Parliament, I noticed several examples of atmospheric pollution from smoke stacks on the plain. I believe that it would not be too difficult for a Health Department officer, equipped with field glasses, a map and possibly a stop watch, to detect examples of industry violating the black smoke regulations.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As I think the honourable member's suggestion has merit, I shall be happy to consider his suggestion.

DIAL-A-BUS

Mr. COUNBE: Will the Minister of Transport say what were the findings and recommendations made following the investigation undertaken by Professor Potts, of Adelaide University? Also, what was the cost to the Government of this investigation? Professor Potts is highly regarded in his discipline and his investigations concerned the operations of the dial-a-bus system in metropolitan Adelaide.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Professor Potts was a member of a committee appointed by me to advise the Government on the possibilities of the dial-a-bus system. That committee submitted to me a report, which is now with the Director-General of Transport and his staff. On numerous occasions requests have been made for this report to be released, and I have persistently given the reply I give today: that is, it is purely a report by an internal committee sponsored by the Government to obtain information for the use of the Government. I have not with me figures of the specific cost, but I suggest that, if the honourable member reads *Hansard* or listens to the reply I shall give the member for Mitcham to a Question on Notice, the figures will be included in that reply.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister has said that the dial-a-bus project cost the Government between \$3,000 and \$4,000, whereas Mr. Barry Wood is reported in the *Advertiser* of July 26 as saying it would cost the State Government about \$7,000. Can the Minister now say what will be the exact cost to the people of the dial-a-bus project?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member, like the member for Torrens, waits until I reply to a Question on Notice from the member for Mitcham, he will receive a reply to his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister say whether Dialabus Proprietary Limited, having given up the dial-a-bus experiment will be given any advantage in its new business as a charterer? It has been reported that the company that experimented with dial-a-bus is now transferring its operations to the field of bus chartering (if that is the proper phrase to use). I have been approached by another company which conducts this type of business and which is alarmed to know whether, because of what happened before, the dial-a-bus company will be given any advantage in going into this business. It has been represented to me that it would be unfair for the dial-a-bus company to be given such an advantage. For that reason, I put the question to the Minister, hoping to get an assurance that the new company will not be given such an advantage.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have had no requests from the proprietor of the dial-a-bus company seeking any advantage in the light of—

Mr. Millhouse: But—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —what has happened, and if and when he applies for a bus service his application will be treated in the same way as would any other application.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What assistance has been given to Dialabus Proprietary Limited by the Government?
2. What has been the cost to the Government of such assistance so far?
3. What is the total estimated cost to the Government?
4. What has been the cost of investigations by the Government into proposals for a dial-a-bus system for Adelaide in each of the years 1970-71, 1971-72, and 1972-73 respectively?

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

1. (a) Technical help in the form of access to data held and numerous discussions with the Director-General of Transport and an officer on his staff who had studied dial-a-bus transport in conjunction with consultants.
(b) Chartering the service for the experimental period as a Government research project.
(c) The use of public relations consultants' time for planning the publicity that was to accompany the opening on August 1. A sum of money was expended on advertising before it was known that the company was unable to continue.
2. \$3,713.
3. \$6,000.
4. (a) 1970-71—Nil.
(b) 1971-72—\$15,700.
(c) 1972-73—\$9,700.

SWEDISH DRY TOILETS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has studied the Swedish dry toilet system to determine whether it would work in South Australia? My question is prompted by a letter that appears in last Thursday's *Advertiser*, inserted by the Secretary of the Soil Association (South Australian Group). It is stated that this system was perfected in 1939, is inexpensive and solves the sanitation problem without the use of water. Further, the product of the system is without the usual smell or possible disease problems. Because of the type of soil in some areas, problems arise through the use of septic tanks, especially with effluent water, where it is necessary to pump out septic tanks sometimes several times a week during certain times of the year.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report and bring it down for the honourable member as soon as possible.

LAND TAX

Mr. NANKIVELL: As land tax return forms are now being sent to landholders in areas where it is intended to undertake revaluation, will the Treasurer consider making available an officer of the Valuation Department at certain prescribed places at certain times so that persons who have to complete these forms and return them to the Valuation Department may consult with the officer on any aspects of the form about which they are unhappy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the question to the Valuer-General.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department plans to provide specialist physical education teachers in primary schools, as are provided in secondary schools? If it does not, will consideration be given to doing so? For obvious reasons, physical education plays an important part in the curricula of secondary schools and, for the same reasons, I believe that we should have physical education teachers in primary schools.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The need for physical education teachers in primary schools is recognized. At present, we do not have enough physical education teachers to staff all the secondary schools in this State effectively. It takes some time through our teachers colleges to build up the total number of physical education teachers in South Australia. Through recruitment in North America, we have supplemented the number available, so that the present position is much better than the position was a few years ago. However, the immediate prospects are that it will be some years before we can proceed, to any significant extent, to staff primary schools with physical education teachers.

NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier sent a letter of protest to the Ambassador for the Republic of France in Australia, conveying the Government's distaste for the tests being carried out in the atmosphere in the Pacific and, if he has, has he added to that the support of the Liberal Movement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; the letter is in draft at the moment, and I expect it to go tomorrow.

CAMPBELLTOWN ROAD

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport ascertain whether the Highways Department intends to widen Church Road, Campbelltown, and, if it does, when will this work commence?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to investigate the question and to bring down a reply for the honourable member.

GLIDING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Transport give approval to the organizing committee of the 1974 world gliding championships placing about 20 signs between Gepps Cross and the Victorian border just prior to the commencement of the event so as to indicate the venue for the benefit of foreign visitors? It is expected that there will be a large influx of visitors from many overseas countries, and these signs would be readily recognized even if there is a language difficulty. The sign would be about 3ft. by 3ft. (91.5 cm by 91.5 cm) and similar to the emblem on the letterhead being used for the championships. I could give the Minister a sample of this sign on the letterhead. If approval could be granted to the organizing committee to proceed with the preparation of these signs, it would benefit many foreign visitors who might not be completely *an fait* with the English language.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If signs were required (at this stage I cannot say whether they are or are not), I should have expected the body responsible for the championships to make an official approach. Although I do not know that it has done so, I can only assume from the tenor of the honourable member's question that it has not made such an approach. I suggest that, in the first instance, it should communicate its requirements to me. However, I will certainly need to confer on the matter with the Minister of Environment and Conservation because, as the

honourable member will know, there is now a very different attitude in the community to placing signs all along our highways. Secondly, I would certainly want to be satisfied that erecting such signs did not create a road hazard. Taking all these factors into account, I think that the obvious step for the organization concerned to take is to send me a letter setting out the details of what it intends, including a reference to the size of the signs and their proposed location, and I shall be pleased to have the matter considered. However, I could not at this stage indicate whether approval would be granted.

WORKER-PARTICIPATION SCHEME

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what progress has been made towards establishing a worker-participation unit within the Labour and Industry Department and whether a research officer, an executive officer and a project officer have been appointed?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The executive officer and the research officer have been selected and the appointments should be made soon. It is hoped that they will commence duties early in September. I have asked the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council and certain executive officers of the Chamber of Commerce to discuss the establishment of a worker-participation scheme. I have also asked a member of the committee that reported on the private sector of industry to have discussions with them and I hope that a meeting will be held early next week between senior officers and other representatives of the staff of the Labour and Industry Department for the purpose of setting up a worker-participation scheme within that department. I have also received encouraging remarks from the members of the private sector of industry who have indicated their interest and have already set in motion worker-participation schemes within their companies.

CALLINGTON AREA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question on a water supply for the area around Callington?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Investigations have been made into a scheme for supplying the country lands between Callington and Strathalbyn, including the areas of Hartley and Woodchester. A basic scheme incorporating three minor variations has been designed and estimates of cost and revenue statements have been prepared. However, in view of the small return of about 0.4 per cent on the capital cost of over \$750,000 involved, a detailed survey of likely benefits to be obtained from the scheme is presently being carried out. It is expected that a proposal for reference to the Public Works Standing Committee will be ready by the end of this year.

PENSIONERS' GAS PRICES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General direct the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs to intervene in a problem facing pensioners who use more than 30 therms of gas a month? Pensioners pay a reduced tariff if they use less than 30 therms but, if they are unfortunate enough to use over 30 therms, they have to pay the full price not only for the quantity used over 30 therms but for all the gas they use. Pensioners, more than anyone else, need to be kept warm during the winter months, and this charge is a hardship to them.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the matter.

M.V. TROUBRIDGE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport acknowledge my correspondence of June 18 concerning certain requests to the Highways Department in relation

to m.v. *Troubridge* bookings? On June 18 this year I sent through the Highways Department to the manager of the operations of the *Troubridge* a letter in which I cited a detailed example of an unsatisfactory liaison between a customer and the Government booking agents and in which I requested a report on the position. When I telephoned the Highways Department officer (Mr. Maxwell) a few days ago, I was informed that he had been clearly instructed not to reply to questions of a member of Parliament and that such answers would be provided by the Minister. As he also informed me that my correspondence and an accompanying report had been directed to the Minister's office, I ask the Minister for that reply.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has raised two points. First, he has implied in his explanation that recently there has been a change in procedure and that henceforth replies to members from the department can be made only through the Minister. I think that was the clear implication in the honourable member's explanation, and I should like to clear this up. For the honourable member's information, I assure him that the practice to which he refers has operated throughout my term as Minister; in fact, it was carried on from the former Liberal and Country League Minister of Roads and Transport. I think that all other Ministers follow the same procedure. Regarding the other part of the honourable member's question, as I recall signing a letter I am a little at a loss to know why the honourable member has not received it. I will check the position and see whether the letter has gone astray; if it has, I will see that the honourable member receives a copy.

SCHOOL SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education say whether he has approved of Swinburn Poolmaster prefabricated swimming pools being used within schoolgrounds? Apparently, several schools have applied to use this type of pool, which evidently costs only about half as much as the accepted concrete type of pool that is erected in schoolgrounds. As a school committee in my district wishes to install a swimming pool at its school, I ask the Minister whether permission will be granted for this type of pool to be erected.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that at least one pool of this type was erected last year at the Meadows Primary School (the member for Heysen will remember this). As we will certainly want to see how that pool has stood up, I will check on the latest position and bring down a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

FESTIVAL THEATRE BOOKINGS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier obtain a report explaining why the Adelaide Festival Theatre continues to advertise seats for the Leningrad Kirov Ballet when, in fact, some of the seats advertised are not available? About three weeks ago a constituent of mine, in reply to an advertisement in the daily newspaper, sent a cheque as payment for a season ticket for specific seats in the first balcony. The advertisement in the newspaper of July 28 states:

This may be your last chance to book for this magnificent programme. Tickets selling fast. Book now by mail. Season booking form. Save \$5. All two programmes for \$15.40.

Seeing that these seats were still being advertised as available even at that stage, my constituent telephoned the theatre and was told that all first balcony seats and some other seats as well had been sold, having been taken up

by preferential bookings and by the old friends of the theatre trust (of course, the trust is not very old). This is misleading advertising. As my constituent has now received, in another section of the theatre, seats in a classification for which he did not originally apply, will the Premier obtain a report explaining why seats that are not available are still being advertised?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask the Chairman of the Festival Centre Trust to let me have a report.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say what effort the Government is making to provide the same long service leave provisions for South Australian Railways employees as those that apply to the private sector of the community? Recently, a railways employee (and I think that this would apply to other branches of the Public Service), who terminated his services with the Railways Department after 10 years, received no long service leave payment, even though he left of his own accord and with a good record. State legislation provides that in the private sector every worker who lawfully terminates his service or dies or who has his service terminated by the employer for any cause other than serious and wilful misconduct after completing seven years but less than 10 years continuous service is entitled to a pro rata payment in lieu of his long service leave entitlement. As I believe an inconsistency exists between the two provisions, will the Minister clarify this matter for me?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the long service leave provisions in the South Australian Railways and the Public Service are identical, long service leave in both is generally the same. The long service leave provided by the South Australian Railways and the Public Service is generally far superior to that provided in most cases by private enterprise. In fact, only over recent years has long service leave applied in private enterprise and then, in most cases, it has come about only after a long and bitter struggle between the trade union movement and the employers concerned. When the honourable member raised this matter previously (and if my memory is correct he was a little astray in what he said about the time factor), I told him that if he gave me details of the specific case to which he was referring I should be delighted to look into the matter. I still have not received those details.

ODNADATTA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to provide an additional water supply for the township of Oodnadatta, in the Far North of South Australia? Doubtless, the Minister is aware that that township is supplied with water from an artesian bore. This water is pumped from the bore to an overhead tank about a quarter of a mile (.4 km) away. It is reticulated to the town but the houses are not metered. During 1972 difficulty was experienced in providing sufficient water for this township. In fact, at times there was insufficient water to maintain essential services. In the township of Oodnadatta, the progress association has planted many trees and everyone is trying to grow a lawn. Many air-conditioners are installed, and they use a large quantity of water. The Engineering and Water Supply Department did provide new pumps to try to overcome the difficulty but this did not have any marked effect on the supply and eventually it was discovered that corrosion had occurred in the first 50ft. (15.25 m) of the main, and this seriously affected the flow of water. This has now been rectified but it is considered that the bore, in its present state, will not provide sufficient water for the town in future; hence

my question whether the Government intends to provide another bore.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's question. It is accurate in detail and only yesterday I approved expenditure of, I think, \$40,000 to put down another bore to augment the supply of water at Oodnadatta. Certainly, yesterday afternoon I signed a docket in which this approval was sought and I will check the figure for the honourable member and also get him information about the timing of the work.

TORRENS RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. COUMBE: My question refers to the recent trouble at the Adelaide Zoological Gardens in disposing of water. In view of recent complaints about pollution of the Torrens River because of the discharge from the Adelaide Zoo, a matter that I and other members have raised in this House previously, will the Minister of Works say what action, if any, the Government has taken in this matter or whether an investigation is planned? Further, why is the Minister reported to have stated that this nuisance to which I have referred is entirely a matter for the Adelaide City Council, when the Adelaide Zoo is under Ministerial control? Further, is the Minister willing to have the problem investigated by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Health Department, and any other departments concerned, with a view to remedial action being taken by the Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I made perfectly clear to the press this morning, when journalists asked me questions, that I considered that this matter was entirely the responsibility of the Adelaide City Council. I have said that, because the part of the Torrens River affected is under the council's direct control. The council should have taken the initiative in this matter and should have gone to the organizations or people causing the problem, seeking their co-operation in solving it. The Adelaide Zoo, as the honourable member is aware, is administered by a board of trustees. Certainly, there is a Ministerial head, but the board is competent to act administratively within its discretion. I consider that the Adelaide City Council is competent to approach that board and ask it to do something without coming to the Government or to anyone else. I do not think that the honourable member can disagree with that line of approach. If the Government can assist the Adelaide Zoo regarding the problem and how to treat it, it will give that assistance, but at least we would expect an approach rather than that we would have to take the initiative constantly. It seemed to me that the Adelaide City Council was complaining about the problem and then trying to unload the problem on to the Government. I was not going to have that, because I considered that the council should have been taking the initiative in the matter, for the reasons I have stated.

CANNERY FINANCE

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to ascertain what progress has been made in having converted from a loan to a grant the advance that the Commonwealth Government made available to canneries in South Australia in respect of the 1971-72 crop? I understand that the Government is examining this matter, and I should be grateful for any information available.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take the matter up with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

MOUNT BARKER CORNER

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Transport ascertain whether the Highways Department intends to link the Adelaide road at Mount Barker with the Princes Highway by a direct road and, if it does so intend, when the work will be carried out? At present the detour road wanders through Mount Barker and there is a dangerous corner at the intersection of the highway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have the matter investigated and bring down a report.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on the Engineering and Water Supply Department's intentions regarding the sewerage of Grove Street and part of Radar Street, Modbury? Because of the wet weather and the type of soil involved, the underlying soil in this area has become impervious to continuous volumes of effluent, and so there is an effluent seepage on to the road and the adjoining blocks. This is causing an offensive smell as well as creating a possible health problem. In summer the effluent water lies stagnant in the gutters and attracts young children. The people in this area have a real problem in this regard and, at their request, I have inspected the area. It is obvious to me that the problem can be solved only by installing deep drains, and I ask the Minister to obtain a report on the matter.

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

JUVENILE ASSESSMENT FACILITIES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General say what progress has been made in establishing assessment facilities for juvenile offenders and whether further progress has been made in providing a permanent home for either the juvenile court or the assessment centres? As we all know, one of the cardinal principles in introducing juvenile aid panels was that, where necessary, young offenders would be given the facilities for full examination by social workers, by psychologists, and by psychiatrists where indicated. A shortage has always existed of psychiatric and psychological help in the department, and I am concerned to learn what action has been taken by the Government in this regard.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The assessment panel programme is now operating. Boys are remanded to Windana, where the assessment takes place. Girls are remanded to Vaughan House where, in the remand section, the assessment takes place. Where the juvenile is on bail, or there is an adjournment and the juvenile is not in custody, the assessment takes place at the headquarters of the Community Welfare Department in Adelaide. So far as can be gathered, arrangements are working satisfactorily and judges of the juvenile court have appreciated and are satisfied with the assessments they have been receiving. Plans exist for a permanent home for the juvenile court: it is expected that construction will commence later this year, and it is hoped that the court will have its permanent home at least by the end of next year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say where the juvenile court is to be built, and what use is to be made of the block of land on the corner of Wright and King William Streets: I know that for many years legislation has laid down that the juvenile court should be in a building apart from any other court but, for one reason or another, we have found it impossible to provide separate accommodation. The other part of my question concerns the block of land on the corner of Wright Street and King William Street which some years ago was sold to the Commonwealth Government for use as court buildings.

However, it has been derelict for several years and is now in a disgraceful condition, as I am sure the Attorney-General would acknowledge. I made representations to the former Commonwealth Government about this land without the slightest result, and I hope that the Attorney-General and the South Australian Government will make representations to the present Commonwealth Government (after all, the present Commonwealth Minister for Works is a South Australian) to ascertain whether something can be done about using this site, perhaps for the building of a juvenile court.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The juvenile court will be situated on the southern side of Wright Street, to the west of King William Street. It will not be part of the present court complex, but will be some distance to the west of it. The block of land on the corner of Wright Street and King William Street has been the subject of correspondence between me and the previous Commonwealth Attorney-General (Senator Greenwood) and the present Commonwealth Attorney-General (Senator Murphy). The correspondence arose from indications given by Senator Greenwood that the then Government did not intend to proceed with a Commonwealth superior court. This block of land had been earmarked by the Commonwealth Government for that purpose, but I was never able to secure from Senator Greenwood an agreement that the land would be transferred back to the State. I stressed that if it were not needed for a Commonwealth court the State should have it back, as it was an integral part of the court complex, and that it would be a pity if buildings unrelated to the courts were erected on that site. Apparently, Senator Greenwood did not consider that he should commit his Government to the proposition that there would not be a superior court, although his personal inclination was against it. The present Government has decided to proceed with the superior court, but I do not know whether it has finally decided whether the building is to be erected on this site. It is apparent from my discussions with Senator Murphy that until that is finally decided there is no prospect of the State getting the land back. I should imagine that the present thinking in the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department is that a building to house the superior court will be constructed on that site.

NATIONAL COMPANIES ACT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney-General say whether any progress has been made concerning the introduction of national companies legislation? During Question Time on June 27, when I indicated to the Attorney-General my interest in this matter, he said that he would attend a meeting in Western Australia at which this matter would be further considered. As he also indicated that it was the Government's opinion that the measure should be introduced, I would appreciate any information he might have concerning the recent discussions.

The Hon. L. J. KING: At the meeting of Attorneys-General in Perth, the Governments of Western Australia, South Australia, Tasmania, and New South Wales indicated that they were willing to refer the necessary powers (or to ask their Parliaments to do so) to the Commonwealth Government to enable national companies legislation to be passed. The Government of Victoria was unwilling to do this, and the Minister representing the Minister for Justice in the Queensland Government indicated that his Government had not decided this matter. At present, that is where the matter rests. If the Victorian Government does not change its mind, or the Queensland Government is unwilling to refer the powers, it will be necessary I imagine, for

the Commonwealth Government to decide how far it can go by the exercise of its present constitutional powers. I think it can be said at present that the ball is in the Commonwealth Government's court and that time will probably be needed to ascertain whether the Governments of Victoria and Queensland can be persuaded to fall into line with other States. If they do not, I imagine that the Commonwealth Government will introduce national companies legislation going as far as its constitutional powers permit it.

EGGS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he ask the South Australian Egg Board to reverse a recent decision to increase its cost of handling eggs from producers who send consignments of 30 dozen eggs or less to the board? I have received a letter about this matter from a constituent in which he included a small red tag from the Egg Board that had been sent to him with his last quota of eggs, stating that on and after July 23, 1973, consignments of 30 dozen eggs or less would be subjected to a small consignment charge of 30c in addition to the normal handling charge for these eggs. It is known that producers at present are not receiving a lucrative return and, if producers of small quantities of eggs are to be further penalized by this extra charge, they will find conditions most difficult. It has been suggested that these producers be allowed to dispose of their eggs other than through the Egg Board, but I believe that, generally, people do not wish to break down the present system of egg marketing. I ask the Minister to confer with his colleague, so that the producer of a small number of eggs may be treated the same as producers of large quantities are treated and so that an orderly system of marketing eggs can be maintained in this State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do as the honourable member has suggested.

COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRES

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my recent question on the establishment of community welfare centres?

The Hon. L. J. KING: In January 1970, the Community Welfare Department had nine district offices and four branch offices. On March 15, 1971, Cabinet adopted as Government policy a plan for the provision of a comprehensive decentralized system of community welfare for the State, and implementation of this policy commenced. The district offices of the department vary in size in terms of facilities and staff, while branch offices are manned by one or two operational staff in most cases. The services provided are almost wholly of a social-work nature, including counselling and supportive services to families, young people and other individuals. The physical set-up of such offices allows little other community involvement, and the location of district offices and branch offices is more suitable to office accommodation than to community activities. The concept of a community welfare centre is much wider. It is planned that such a centre will have both the physical and manpower resources to provide a broad base of activities and involvement in the local community. There will be facilities for other services of the department, at present dealt with on a centralized basis, to be handled at the local level, for example, legal services for deserted wives and financial assistance payments. Accommodation will be available for other specialists such as community development officers and Aboriginal task force staff and for volunteer aides. Meeting rooms will be provided both for departmental needs, for example,

juvenile aid panels and for local consultative council meetings and other meetings of community groups involved in welfare in the community.

There have been recent negotiations with the Commonwealth Government regarding the possibility of some of their centres, thus moving towards the future co-ordination of welfare services for the public. The facilities for the public in a community welfare centre will be designed to be attractive and comfortable and to create, so far as possible, an atmosphere which is accepting and helpful to any person seeking assistance. The community welfare centre is a place easily identifiable in the community and is intensively used by all sections of that community involved with the well-being of people there (the department, clients themselves and many other authorities and organizations co-operating in that effort). The centre will be not over large but big enough to be flexible to meet new development and the demand for new services as they are identified.

Associated with the development of community welfare centres is the establishment of community welfare consultative councils. These councils offer an opportunity for concerned citizens to join together in regular consultation to consider local welfare needs and the action necessary to meet those needs. It is proposed to establish 21 such councils. Public meetings have been held in seven areas, and steering committees have made recommendations to the Minister for the appointment of persons to each of those councils. A further seven public meetings will be held during July to October 1973, and seven more during February to May 1974. It is hoped that all 21 consultative councils will be operating by June 30, 1974.

The number of the various offices operating at June 30, 1973, and those planned to come into operation during the next 12 months are set out in a table and, as the table is of a statistical nature, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

COMMUNITY WELFARE OFFICES		
	Operating at June 30, 1973	To be established during 1973-74
1. Community welfare centres	2 { Elizabeth Salisbury	4 { Campbelltown Enfield Adelaide Port Augusta
2. District offices	{ Adelaide Enfield Port Adelaide Woodville Campbelltown Modbury Christies Beach Brighton	5 { Coober Pedy Nuriootpa Maitland Amata Indulkana
	17 { Mitcham Norwood Port Augusta Port Lincoln Port Pirie Whyalla Berri Mount Gambier Murray Bridge	
3. Branch offices	{ Mansfield Park Marion	3 { Hindmarsh Thebarton
	5 { Oodnadatta Leigh Creek Ceduna	{ Henley Beach

FISHING RESEARCH

Mr. GUNN: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Fisheries, I ask the Deputy Premier whether the State Government has yet made available any of the research funds announced by the Minister of Agriculture, who was

formerly in charge of fisheries. These funds were to be granted to fishermen engaged in research activities. One of my constituents, who is carrying out research work into prawn fishing in the Thevenard area, has encountered serious financial problems. It is difficult to locate prawn in this area and, as this person has only a limited licence, he has applied to the Fisheries Department for assistance and has been told that his application is being considered. In view of my constituent's serious financial plight, I wonder whether the Deputy Premier can say what progress has been made in allocating these funds.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Fisheries. Was the honourable member's constituent directed by the department to do this work, or did he elect to do it and then get a licence to do it? I know that some people in the industry from time to time have, on their own initiative, opted to search areas for prawn and have received a licence to do that. If that is the case here, the person concerned can hardly now come back to the department and say, "I'm going broke because I tried to do something," and then seek funds from the department concerning a venture that may not have been considered by the department to be a proposition in the first place.

FRANCES POLICE OFFICER

Mr. RODDA: Will the Attorney-General confer with the Chief Secretary regarding the stationing of a resident police officer at Frances? This matter was the subject of a petition presented to the House earlier this afternoon. I should like the Minister to bring to his colleague's notice the special circumstances that exist at Frances, which is situated on the Victorian border practically midway between Naracoorte and Bordertown. Frances is served by a main highway and, although a police officer is stationed at Goroke, in Victoria and another at Keith (a distance of 160 km), they are too far away to be of any service to Frances. As Frances is the centre of a large community where people congregate, it is considered that a police officer should be stationed there to serve this large community. As there is no bank at Frances and as considerable sums of money are kept there to service wage earners from a large area covering a radius of 15 miles (about 24 km), people of the district are concerned that the police officer should be taken away; indeed they believe that the presence of an officer would be a deterrent in the case of an ugly situation developing in the area and would provide a valuable service in this expanding rural area.

The Hon. L. J. KING: No doubt the removal of the police officer from Frances is a tribute to the law-abiding qualities of the honourable member's constituents there. However, I will speak to the Chief Secretary and draw his attention to the matters referred to by the honourable member.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say what actions the Government will take to ensure the future economic existence of dairy-farming enterprises in South Australia? The Commonwealth Government has recently indicated that subsidies at present paid in respect of Australian dairy products will cease shortly. In addition, I believe that it is this Government's policy to increase the quota of margarine for sale in South Australia. This State's dairying industry is of great economic importance, the net value of production in 1970-71 being about \$30,000,000. In that year, 41,000,000lb. (18 597 600 kg) of cheese and 14,000,000lb. (6 350 400 kg) of butter was produced.

South Australia is now the major State regarding the export of cheese, and any threat to the dairying industry would adversely affect our exports of that product, particularly to Japan. Agricultural scientists have informed me that the policies of this Government and of the Commonwealth Government severely threaten the economic future of the dairying industry.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Agriculture.

LEGAL FEES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier say whether there is any set criterion by which fees charged by legal practitioners are arrived at? I understand that certain legal fees fixed by Statute come under the Supreme Court Act, the Local Courts Act and the Real Property Act and that other fees vary as between legal practitioners and firms. In view of the Premier's statement on Wednesday, July 25 (page 28 of *Hansard*) concerning doctor's fees. I ask him when the Government will undertake a similar inquiry into fees charged by the legal profession.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Fees charged by the legal profession have been controlled in South Australia for, I think, 130 years, and will remain so.

TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department has considered introducing transcendental meditation into South Australian schools and, if it has, what conclusions have been reached on this matter? A letter that I have received from a constituent states, in part:

On Saturday, June 9, the *Advertiser's* journalist exposed mindbenders. A very laudable move in order to eradicate such dangerous groups, which are also out to fleece the public. But the biggest shock of all was to read in Monday's paper (*Advertiser* June 11) on page 8 that a plan "will be proposed to the Education Department to train about 1,000 people, including teachers, to teach transcendental meditation in schools. The fee will be between \$70 and \$120 . . . and teachers in South Australia would be drawn from anyone interested in undergoing a 66-hour training course, which would cost between \$70 and \$120."

This person would like to know who was proposing this scheme to the department and whether the parents (if it is intended to bring in such classes) will be consulted. My constituent then continues:

As I gain more knowledge and experience of the Education Department I am beginning to ask if we parents want to expose our children to the Education Department itself. I do not believe the department will bring in such a course, but I pass on my constituent's question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I guess I can understand now why the member for Goyder and the member for Mitcham left the Liberal and Country League, if they had to put up with that sort of garbage.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member knows full well what the answer to the question is.

Mr. Evans: I do not know.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If he cannot work it out, I do not think I should waste my time and honourable members' time in dealing with a question which is plainly ridiculous and which is something that the department would not consider.

Mr. Evans: Thank you, I have got my answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, it is obvious. Really, one would have to be a prime idiot not to work it out.

TERRITORIAL WATERS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Marine say whether the waters of Backstairs Passage between Kangaroo Island and the mainland, and the seas from Yorke Peninsula to Cape Northumberland in the south, are under the jurisdiction of the State or the Commonwealth and whether there are any special circumstances applying to this area in respect to the State control of shipping and fishing by arrangement with the Commonwealth? Although it is generally recognized that the State's control ordinarily extends to the waters within three miles (4.8 km) of the State boundaries, is the Minister aware that many square miles of water lie to the north of Kangaroo Island and south of Yorke Peninsula which are clearly outside this limit?

Fishermen want to know whether persons holding a Commonwealth licence are able to work those waters, which are generally recognized to be outside the State's control. It is important that this section of the community know where it stands regarding fishing in that area. In the interests of fishermen it should be determined whether or not these waters are Commonwealth waters and, if they are, whether the Commonwealth fishing licence enables them to fish those waters and unload at the ports in this State for the purpose of selling the fish caught.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The whole question of the control of offshore areas is the subject of the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill before the Commonwealth Parliament and of negotiations which have been proceeding between the States and the Commonwealth for some time. The legal position, apart entirely from legislation, is necessarily somewhat doubtful following a decision in the High Court in a case (*Bonser v. La Macchia*) relating to Tasmania's offshore waters. Prior to that it had been considered generally by lawyers in this country that the States had control in specific internal waters. South Australia is in a somewhat different situation from the other States, because it has more indentations of its coastline than the other States have, and has in its Letters Patent specifically included in its area the gulfs and the waters of them, the islands adjacent to the shore, and the seas adjacent to those islands. It was considered until that case that in addition to those internal waters the States had control of the territorial sea a league to the seaward of the shore line of the States and their islands. The High Court in that case called the matter in question although it was not argued before the court, and the Chief Justice in his judgment, concurred in to some extent by Mr. Justice Windeyer, took the view that the States had never had any proprietary rights to the seaward of low-water. Those were retained by the Crown and did not transfer to Provinces or States, but they had been transferred to the Commonwealth by virtue of the Commonwealth's attaining dominion status, under the provisions of the Statute of Westminster, and under a number of other pieces of legislation to which he referred, and the provisions of the convention on the continental shelf under which it is accepted that the Commonwealth has this control, at least from the edge of the territorial sea to the edge of the continental shelf at the 200-fathom mark. The question of where Commonwealth and State limits lie is still a matter of considerable legal contention, and it was the subject of a petition (on which this State appeared) to get a more definite decision on the law from the only body which could give an advice at large on the law and which had jurisdiction to do so, namely, the Privy Council. The High Court does not have jurisdiction to give an opinion at large on the law. However, that

matter has not been resolved, so I cannot answer the honourable member. It remains a matter of contention.

What is also a matter of some contention is the rule to be applied in deciding what are territorial waters, and in this State there is a considerable degree of confusion about that matter, because international law has applied numbers of differing criteria to the determination of that particular question. The State has a very lengthy opinion from Professor O'Connell pointing out the various lines that could be drawn off shore, including a varying line which could be drawn in relation to Backstairs Passage, in order to determine what are the internal waters of the State that are undoubtedly under State jurisdiction. Our requests to the Commonwealth for a joint commission to determine these matters and obtain agreement for offshore limits has not yet met with approval from the Commonwealth. That Government has not complied with our request. This request was put to the previous Commonwealth Government, and the then Attorney-General brushed it aside as being a matter which he considered the Commonwealth had already determined adequately. The Attorney-General for this State and I pointed out that this was just not the case, that there was still an area of confusion to be decided and that the only satisfactory way was by agreement and by having a commission to look at each separate area and draw the line by agreement on agreed criteria. At the moment, in relation to fisheries negotiations are proceeding with the Commonwealth to try to determine an area of effective jurisdiction as between the State and Commonwealth licensing provisions, but right at this moment no definitive answer can be given to the honourable member in relation to Backstairs Passage.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I appreciate the lengthy address that the Premier gave.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Premier say who is taking control of the Backstairs Passage waters while the dispute is in progress? May the fishermen catch fish in the area under dispute during the interim period? We can only assume from the Premier's comments that the waters could be Commonwealth waters. Fishermen holding Commonwealth licences ordinarily can catch fish from known Commonwealth waters and sell those fish in nearby State ports. For example, a Victorian fisherman has been and still is fishing in these waters and selling his fish in South Australian ports, but he is clearly operating under his Commonwealth licence.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: In Backstairs Passage?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, using his Commonwealth licence he has also fished in Western Australian, Victorian and Tasmanian waters. Members can appreciate the concern of local fishermen, who are confused about their rights. Can the Premier say whether the fishermen can operate in those waters and sell their fish until the dispute is settled?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The waters of Backstairs Passage itself are generally conceded to be part of the State of South Australia, but there is slight confusion about the line on the map. Let us take the line from Cape Jervis to Kangaroo Island; water on the seaward side is quite possibly Commonwealth water, but water on the gulf side is State water. The precise definition of the area is very difficult to establish; that is why we are having negotiations with the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Particularly about licensing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The negotiations about licensing of fishermen are proceeding, so that we can

get some sort of definition. However, following the case of *Bonser v. La Macchia* it is very difficult to say precisely what the law is. One of the difficulties of the whole operation initiated by Mr. Gorton is that, if one is to have the matter decided by litigation, it may be 25 years before it is decided. There was certainly a long delay in the United States Supreme Court in the tide lands dispute. We are endeavouring to reach agreement with the Commonwealth Government so that we can cover the situation regarding fisheries. I cannot give the honourable member any more definite information than that.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what continuing action is being taken by the Government, in concert with the Premiers or appropriate Ministers of other State Governments, to discuss further the subject of water beyond the low-water mark? It has been stated that this subject is likely to be dealt with again during the next session of the Commonwealth Parliament. When it was dealt with previously in the Commonwealth Senate, consideration of the matter was delayed for three months. The legislation before the Commonwealth Parliament, having asserted rights to submerged lands, proceeds to introduce a schedule for a mining code. Further information indicates what royalties will be apportioned to the States adjacent to the submerged lands concerned. As this situation has far greater implications for the States than merely knowing whose water it is, especially in relation to any future mining that may take place and the monetary benefits that will flow to the States, I should like the Premier to indicate that the matter is continuously being discussed and reviewed in the interests of the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no continuing discussion in relation to the question of the Commonwealth Government's asserting a position of sovereignty off shore; it is simply, in legislative form, expressing the view enunciated by justices of the High Court in the case I have referred to in my previous answer. In other words, in legislation the Commonwealth is endeavouring to assert in legislative form what some judges, including the Chief Justice of the High Court, say is already the law.

Dr. Eastick: It goes further.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It then proceeds to develop the corollary in relation to mining legislation. There has been a discussion between the States and the Commonwealth, and between the Prime Minister and me, as to the administrative results that necessarily flow from such a position and as to a whole series of areas in the law relating to land below the low-water mark. Discussions have taken place and provision has been made to the Commonwealth of legal opinions concerning the difficulties that could arise in administration from the simple assertion of a proposition of throwing the whole question to the courts to decide one way or the other how far State law applies or whether it applies at all. The Commonwealth is currently considering the submissions we have made with a view to some provision of law using the Commonwealth law to assert State law off shore as was done in what is called the Worthing exercise, which was a case also in which the High Court decided at one stage that several State laws did not apply on Commonwealth property; it was then necessary for the Commonwealth to pass specific legislation applying State law to Commonwealth property in the States. It may be necessary for the Commonwealth to do this in relation to land off shore and in matters such as torts, workmen's compensation, criminal law, and the like, and this is being examined currently by the Commonwealth.

COOPER BASIN

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to seek a permanent agreement with the Queensland Government on the future exploitation of the waters of the Cooper, in the North-East of South Australia? This question derives from an article that appears in the *Advertiser* of Friday, May 25, 1973, accompanied by a photograph of the Deputy Premier relaxing on the waters of the well-filled Cullamurra waterhole. The article states:

For more than a century, men have dreamed and schemed about harnessing the waters of Australia's inland rivers to make the desert flower. The more grandiose ideas have had these rivers—the Cooper, the Diamantina, the Warburton, the Mulligan, the Strzelecki—watering great inland cities and even being piped as far south as Adelaide. This week's visit by the Minister of Works (Mr. Corcoran) to the Cullamurra waterhole, 10 miles east of Innamincka, has brought history back into the headlines. He talked about "investigating ways of storing water in the Cooper basin," a catchment area equal in size to the State of Victoria. He warned that exploitation of the River Murray and of Adelaide Hills water catchments is approaching its limits.

Further on, the article states:

In 1961, the Queensland Irrigation and Water Supply Commission proposed to divert some of the waters of the Cooper to Lake Yamma Yamma, in South-West Queensland. South Australia strenuously and successfully resisted the proposal on the ground that its pastoral industry could be severely damaged. But this potential threat from Queensland remains and the South Australian Government may have to seek a permanent agreement with its Queensland opposite number on future exploitation of the Cooper.

Further on, the article continues:

The oil and natural gas industry may yet demand more substantial water resources, especially if the Commonwealth Minister for Energy's national gas pipeline grid becomes a reality . . . then there is the intriguing proposal for a series of great solar power stations in Central Australia outlined in the *Advertiser* (12/5/73) by Professor I. O'M. Bockris, of Flinders University's Institute of Solar and Electrochemical Energy Conservation. The waters of the Cooper and other channel country streams might well be crucially important to the viability of such schemes in the twenty-first century.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I well recall the trip I made to Innamincka, which was an interesting and enjoyable experience. It certainly opened my eyes, particularly when we flew from Innamincka over the Cooper Basin and saw the extent of the basin, which was flooded at that time. It gave me a better appreciation of the huge quantities of water that come down the Cooper.

There is no current negotiation with the Queensland Government about any permanent agreement on the water that flows down the Cooper in times of flood, but I assure the honourable member that, if any move was made by the Queensland Government to interfere with the normal function of the catchment area, which, as I have said, is equal in area to the size of the State of Victoria, the same steps would be taken as were taken, successfully, by Sir Thomas Playford in 1961. The water resources of the whole State, as the honourable member is aware, are currently being investigated. The question of an agreement with the Queensland Government will probably be considered when our Government has completed its plans to draw up, introduce and legislate for a measure dealing with water resources. I hope that will happen during the next session of Parliament, when it will be seen to be one of the most important steps taken in this State for the control of its total water resources, both underground and on the surface, from the point of view of both quantity and quality. At that time, this sort of move would be looked at. In view of the question

asked, I will discuss the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief to see whether it is important, in timing, that we commence negotiations with the Queensland Government now. I will let the honourable member know the outcome.

MEATMEAL

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to inquire into the high prices of protein sources for stockfeeds and in particular the price of meatmeal produced by and sold from the Government Produce Department at Port Lincoln? Protein sources are essential requirements for feed rations when rearing livestock under intensive conditions and, as such, are an important part of operating costs. When these costs make it impracticable to operate a unit efficiently, many producers are forced out of business. This reduces overall production. Consequently, supply does not meet demand and the cost to the consumer has to be increased to encourage further production. My concern at the price of meatmeal comes from five consecutive monthly statements, which showed increases from \$6.25 a bag to \$10.20 a bag. As there are many intensive pig producers who are severely affected by these costs, will the Minister ask his colleague to investigate?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

TEA TREE GULLY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education find out for me what the Education Department intends to do about retaining or not retaining the school residence which is a separate building situated in the grounds of Tea Tree Gully Primary School? In the last six weeks this building has been redecorated, but a rumour is current that this building will be demolished. Now the new Tea Tree Gully Primary (Replacement) School has been completed and occupied. The Minister will be aware of my previous letters to him about the retention or otherwise of the century-old Tea Tree Gully Primary School building. This matter has not yet been finalized, but this is a separate building from that building, and I have not referred previously to this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up this matter for the honourable member and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

HEALTH EDUCATION

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Education say how many graduates in health education are at present being employed by the Education Department and whether those graduates who last year were engaged in general teaching duties are now participating in the current health education programme?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not aware of any graduates who specifically graduated in health education who are employed by the Education Department. The people who are to be employed as teachers in the health education course will inevitably have various qualifications. For example, there are areas within the health education course where physical education diplomats from Adelaide College of Advanced Education can be used quite successfully. I will check the position, but I think it can be appreciated that, if we waited until we had enough health education graduates, we would have to wait until next century.

GLENELG INFANTS SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say when it is expected that the bituminizing of the school-yard at the Glenelg Infants School will be completed? The yard to the north of the buildings, which is not yet sealed, is used as a playing area by the children. As the ground holds much water, this is a problem for mothers and children; in fact, some of the holes are such that the children might be able to fish in them.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL COURT

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry heard suggestions that the powers and functions now exercised by the State Industrial Court are to be transferred to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Court? Can he say what is the Government's policy in this connection? Will he give an assurance that the jurisdiction, powers and functions of the State Industrial Commission and Court will remain intact and not be transferred to the Commonwealth court?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It has been suggested that there is a possibility of the transfer of jurisdiction, but I do not think this will occur soon. We are watching the situation and are in continuous consultation with the Commonwealth Minister. Although I do not think it is likely to happen soon, the matter is being considered.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier make every effort himself and use his good offices with his Ministerial colleagues to make sure that he and they are ready to go on with the debate on private members' business either on the same day as a matter is introduced or on the following Wednesday, at the latest?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There are now on the Notice Paper several notices of private members' business. I have given a few notices and, because of certain developments with regard to the Constitution Convention early in September, the introduction of the State Budget, and so on, they have been scheduled to be debated before those events occur. Although it is customary for Ministers to reply to matters of private members' business on the Wednesday after they have been introduced, often that is not done, a fortnight or more passing before a Minister says he is ready to proceed. In many cases, that defeats the object of the exercise.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Ministers are not in kindergarten; they know about these tactics. The object of the debate is defeated because time passes; this is a neat way for the Government to sidestep a motion. I ask that this not be done. For that reason I ask the Premier my question in the hope that we can receive an assurance that private members' business will be dealt with speedily by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I appreciate the honourable member's deep perturbation in this respect, we will do what we can to assist him.

WHEAT SILOS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government has any plans to zone farmers to the silo closest to their farm? The Governor's Speech stated that the Bulk Handling of Grain Act would be amended, and a report of the South Australian Railways Commissioner recommended that silos should be zoned. I think that the

Minister is anxious to put some of these recommendations into practice—at least those that do not affect the trade union movement, which he would not be game enough to affect. Has the Government any plans to zone farmers?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter is being considered by the Government, and in due course the honourable member will be informed.

HEYSEN DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Education say what are the present plans for a new building at the Norton Summit school and for replacing the primary section of the Oakbank Area School? The people at Norton Summit were assured that there would be a replacement in the reasonable future. The primary section of the Oakbank Area School is the worst conglomeration of buildings that I have seen during my five years as a member of the Public Works Committee. Because a new subdivision is being developed at Balhannah, there will be a demand for additional primary facilities at the school.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the matters referred to and bring down a reply.

ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr. HALL: Does the Premier intend to introduce in this session a redistribution of House of Assembly electoral districts, to be effective before the next election, and, if he does, does he intend to take into account the remark of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris in another place that first-past-the-post voting could be associated with voluntary voting, a principle with which I do not agree? Further, does the Premier intend to implement first-past-the-post voting at the same time as he implements a redistribution?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of a redistribution is being considered, but the Government does not intend to tie matters included in the Electoral Act with an alteration to the Constitution, nor does the Government intend to introduce voluntary voting.

BEACH SAND

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether all the sand for replenishing the beaches at Seacliff, Brighton, Somerton and Glenelg is to be obtained from the same place? The replenishment of the beaches is now under way, but the sand being used is grey or dark grey, causing a discolouration of the water along the coast. In the past we have been proud of the colour of our beach sand. Can the Minister say whether any other source of sand for replenishing the beaches has been considered?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: All of the sand in the current programme will be obtained from the same source, Taperoo. We are looking for alternative sources of sand for future improvements to the metropolitan coastline, because the current programme is only part of the overall programme of replacing sand on metropolitan beaches. The sand being used at present has been washed up at Taperoo over past years and is identical in grain size and quality to the sand existing on the beaches. True, it is discoloured because of the way it has been left in recent years, but I assure the honourable member it will be washed clean by the waves.

MEMBERS' PARKING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is any payment being made for the parking of members' motor cars on the Torrens Parade Ground?

2. If so, to whom is such payment being made, and how much?

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

1. Payment of \$600 a month is being made for the parking of members' motor cars on the Torrens Parade Ground.

2. Payment is made to the Commonwealth Department of Services and Property.

DISTRICT OFFICES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the cost, so far, of establishing district offices for members of the House of Assembly?

2. What is the total estimated cost of their establishment?

3. What are the total estimated annual running costs, including salaries of staff, of these offices?

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

1. \$76,000.

2. \$171,000. However, the establishment of offices in members' districts is expected to reduce the cost of providing adequate accommodation at Parliament House from at least \$4,000,000 to \$1,700,000.

3. \$333,000. The salaries of staff, estimated at \$207,000 a year, would have been incurred had similar staff been provided at Parliament House, as would the expenses for such items as lighting, heating and telephones.

STATE FUNDS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): What are the details of forward commitment of State funds for this and the next seven financial years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not possible to say specifically what is the commitment of State funds for 1973-74 and future years. If we take the word "commitment" to mean the cash payments necessary for people actually employed now, the costs of various contingency items that must be met as a result of that employment and the payments to be made under contracts actually let, it can be said with confidence that the inescapable commitments in future years will clearly be within the increasing sums of money becoming available within both Revenue and Loan Accounts. If we interpret the word "commitment" more broadly to mean the costs of all the services and facilities the Government must provide in greater measure and at improved standard to meet the needs of the community, it must be said that there will be great difficulty in meeting those commitments, within the funds likely to be available. In an endeavour to plan those forthcoming commitments as effectively as possible having regard to prospective funds, the Government approves guidelines for Loan programmes for three years ahead, and revises those guidelines each year. It is more difficult to indicate formal guidelines in respect of the Revenue Budget, but Treasury maintains contact with departments, particularly the larger ones, and gives informal advice as to prospective funds in future years.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): What is the amount of grants received or expected to be received from the Commonwealth Grants Commission for: (a) the financial year 1972-73, and (b) the financial year 1973-74?

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

(a) In the financial year 1972-73, South Australia received from the Commonwealth Government a special advance grant of \$13,500,000 as recommended by the Grants Commission. Early in 1974-75, when the commission has completed its review of the finances of the States

for 1972-73 and has made its recommendations to the Commonwealth Government, South Australia may expect to receive a completion grant in respect of 1972-73. It is not possible to forecast with any confidence what that completion grant may be.

(b) In forwarding financial information to the Commonwealth Government prior to the recent Premiers' Conference, the South Australian Government assumed that an advance special grant of \$15,000,000 would be made in 1973-74, following a recommendation by the Grants Commission. The Commonwealth Government has not yet advised what the commission's recommendations are for 1973-74 and, until we receive that advice, we propose to continue working on the assumption that the advance will be \$15,000,000.

HEALTH SCHEME

Mr. Rodda for Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What investigations have been made by officers of the Health Department on the probable effects of the Commonwealth Government's intended national health scheme on private, church and community hospitals in South Australia?

2. What conclusions have been reached?

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

1. I am informed that the details of the Commonwealth Government's health insurance programme have not been finalized, although certain general proposals related to the programme have been presented for public information and debate in the report of the Health Insurance Planning Committee to the Minister for Social Security, published in April, 1973. Preliminary discussions have taken place between the Minister for Social Security and my colleague the Minister of Health on the overall hospital situation in South Australia.

2. No firm conclusions are possible at this stage. Investigations and discussions can be conducted only on an exploratory basis, as (a) the Health Insurance Planning Committee's report is still subject to possible variations before adoption; and (b) it is not possible to predict with accuracy the number of persons likely to elect to continue in private insurance schemes covering hospital charges (*vide* paragraph 3.55 of the report).

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 25. Page 44.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion moved and seconded by the members for Elizabeth and Semaphore respectively. In doing so, I record the Opposition's appreciation of His Excellency's continuing involvement in the affairs of the State of South Australia and of the information His Excellency has been able to give the House on this occasion.

Because a problem in the first session of this Parliament prevented honourable members from debating His Excellency's Speech opening that session, I record, on behalf of the Opposition, our regret at the death of the late Speaker, Mr. Reg Hurst, and of Mr. B. I. W. Kearney, who had been a member of this House from 1930 until 1933. I repeat the statements I made previously regarding the sterling service given to this House by Mr. Hurst, particularly in the time that I have been a member.

I also refer more specifically to the death of the two persons referred to in the Governor's Opening Speech on this occasion, namely, the late Harry Kemp, a former member of another place, whose death occurred so recently

(and I have previously made comments in the House about the late Harry Kemp) and the late Mr. Roy McLachlan, who was member for Victoria at an earlier time and who was known to me casually. I appreciate the work that Mr. McLachlan undertook on behalf of the community that he represented and I know full well that, on his death, the people of Naracoorte, which area he represented in this House, gave due recognition of his service to the community.

To the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, both of whom have been elevated to their respective positions, I offer the congratulations of members of the Opposition. We are not at all pleased about the circumstances that caused the Speaker to be elected on this occasion, but we assure him of support in the deliberations and conduct of the business of this House in the period ahead.

It is not exactly by way of congratulation that I welcome the two members opposite who have entered this House since the Parliament from 1970 until 1972. I certainly congratulate them on the fact that they have been elected to Parliament, and I suppose that, having regard to the areas they represent, it was a foregone conclusion that, when they gained preselection by their Party, they would be elected to this House.

Of course, they would appreciate, as would some people in Western Australia at present, that gaining preselection for what might seem to be a district that their Party would always win would be no assurance that they would be elected. In fact, at present we have not any information that shows clearly what is the position in Western Australia.

I congratulate the member for Semaphore on his maiden speech in this House. He showed clearly that he appreciated the requirements of the community he was about to serve. Several times during his speech he highlighted the requirements of the District of Semaphore and he commented on his predecessor in this place, stating, as has been stated earlier, the effect of the late Reg Hurst's service and the respect in which he was held in that area. The suggestion of a memorial to the late Reg Hurst is one that can generally be supported, although supporting it at Government expense may create a dangerous precedent. I say to the new member for Semaphore, "Welcome to the House," in anticipation of the obvious contributions he will make on behalf of his constituents. However, I am unable to say the same thing to the new member for Elizabeth. But for the fact that *Hansard* indicated that he was the member for Elizabeth, he failed to indicate to members or to anyone else during the whole of his dissertation that he was interested in being the member for Elizabeth and representing his constituents.

Mr. HOPGOOD: He has another 40 years to do that.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, and I hope that in the not too distant future (not having done this during his maiden speech) he will convey the grave concern of the people of Smithfield Plains at the idiocy of constructing a low-grade housing complex on a transport corridor. As this project has not made the people in that area at all happy, I hope that the member for Elizabeth will support the efforts of the people he represents to have the scheme set aside. Obviously, the plan would create a ready-made slum, and make second-class citizens of many people the honourable member represents. I would have thought that, knowing full well that a number of people of Smithfield Plains had made representations to the honourable member, he would see fit to protest in the House on their behalf. Likewise, he would have been more appreciated in the Angle Vale area, which is part of his

district, if he had conveyed to the House the concern of the people in that area at being unable to obtain a worthwhile water supply.

The social and economic problems that arise from the Government dictate, the situation that prevents a person from obtaining even a household supply of water without going to the costly expense of installing a deep well, although the overall effect may be fully appreciated, do not make those people particularly happy. They had been given to understand from comments made by various authorities in the State over a long time that a water supply would be made available to them. However, it is still being denied them. Representations may well have been supported by the Minister of Works on behalf of those people. The member for Elizabeth took the opportunity to indicate that the Leader of the Opposition had made certain comments over the radio. Clearly, the information, which is contained in *Hansard* and which relates to an interview I had with the Reverend Keith Seaman, was somewhat difficult to find documented. It certainly does not appear in the publication *Transmission*, which gives a summary of the discussion I had with Rev. Seaman. I certainly acknowledge the fact that pointed out that foreign interests were at work that had played a part in the debacle at the James North glove factory, at Whyalla, and I also indicated that certain influences were connected with the argument concerning the Adriatic terrazzo firm which was proceeding at the same time.

Mr. Duncan: To which foreign interests were you referring regarding Whyalla?

Dr. EASTICK: It was the left-wing influence and, as the honourable member well knows, he has now aligned himself in this regard. I point out that the statement he made to the House has not been documented anywhere other than in the way in which he presented it. No transcript of the programme is available and, in the absence of a clear transcript of the whole programme and of the context in which the honourable member's remarks about my contribution were made, it is unfortunate that such a comment was made during this debate. The honourable member will have considerable support from the people he represents in the Elizabeth area when he sees fit to align himself with their problems. Perhaps the honourable member can tell me whether low-rental housing will actually be created in the transport corridor at Smithfield. As part of this corridor is up for sale, one wonders whether the short period for which the houses are to be provided in the area will extend into a longer period.

This afternoon, the Premier gave members considerable information on the perplexing problem of sovereignty of the seas and of the various associated factors, such as fishing, mining, marine, etc. Unfortunately, he was unable to indicate that he was pressing on with representations with the other States, that a meeting was to be held, or that he had attempted to initiate a meeting with the other States so that the matter could be taken a step further before being considered in the Commonwealth Parliament. The long-term effects of such legislation on the State could have a deleterious effect on our future finances. If we are fortunate enough to have minerals found offshore, we will be tied to a royalty that will be given to us by the Commonwealth Government, with no clear indication that the royalty will remain at a given percentage or the possibility of its being increased. These problems are of grave concern to the whole of the State's population; they go hand in glove with the concern felt by many people in the State (as, indeed, it was felt by the people in Western Australia at last Saturday's election) at the continuing

move to centralism, supported in one way or another by the action taken at Surfers Paradise recently, whereby it was decided that certain of the areas of State Government responsibility would be handed over progressively to the Commonwealth Government.

If we group this with the overall fear of people that, as regional councils are developed, the States will be bypassed, we see that more and more power will be in the hands of fewer and fewer in Canberra, almost to the stage that one could project a short way forward to the complete elimination of the States. This will not be so far in the future, if the type of activity to which the Premier has given support in the statements he allegedly made at Surfers Paradise is developed. We cannot in any circumstances accept a situation in which the Leader of the State ceases to recognize and fight for the continued responsibilities and sovereign rights of the State. There has been no clear indication from the Premier yet that he will adopt any attitude other than the one he adopted at the Surfers Paradise conference.

The Opposition welcomes the Public Service inquiry. I have had the opportunity of discussing matters with Professor Corbett, who has already shown that he has a strong grip of the problems confronting him and who is willing to come face to face with the reality of the mighty Public Service problem. I look forward to information being given to him from Government sources, the Opposition, and others in the community that will clearly eliminate the future possibility of empires being built in the Public Service, whether by Ministerial direction or some other means. It is important that, if the number of public servants is to increase at a cost to the State, it must be for a good purpose. I know that that particular aspect will be considered, because it is important that the Public Service should be able to fulfil its responsibilities.

I have referred before to the grave difficulties experienced by many people because of the almost indeterminable delay at the State Planning Office and the Lands Titles Office as a result of legislation passed in November last year. I appreciate that the required increase in the number of staff has not been made and that, in many cases, details have to be provided by other departments such as the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Highways Department, or the Agriculture Department. I have said before that, if additional loads are placed on public servants, the number of officers must be increased so that there can be a normal flow of work.

Many people in this State, particularly young people, have contracted to build a house but are waiting for documents to be completed so that construction can begin. Because of the marked increase in the cost of house building (it was suggested that there was an 18 per cent increase in 12 months), these people have been placed in a most awkward position. They are denied access to their properties because of delays experienced in Government departments. I am not reflecting on individual officers: I am reflecting on the situation in which support has failed to be given where it is needed. The same situation has applied to professional officers who have undertaken research and investigation on behalf of the Government.

These professional people are often called upon to read papers at conventions and at professional association meetings, but have had difficulty in having their manuscripts typed. In one case, for 35 professional officers two typists are available to do this work. To provide supporting staff for these officers will increase the cost of administration, but releasing the details that these people have researched can benefit other departmental officers and the

public. It is most important that this information should be available to the public, because it is eventually of financial benefit to this State.

All members are aware of the present inflationary trend in Australia and particularly in this State. The chance was given to the Premier, through my request, to hold a round-table conference comprising members of the Government, industry, commerce, trade unions, and the Opposition. However, the Premier saw fit to say that any Opposition suggestions would be considered, but that he would not accept that this matter should become a political football. With that statement I completely agreed, as the offer was made in sincerity and for the benefit of the people of this State. The media were not informed about the nature of the letter that was sent to the Premier. The letter was in my name on behalf of the Opposition, and was hand-delivered to the Premier's Department last Thursday week.

However, to this moment it has not been acknowledged, either publicly or privately. No indication was given of its content because, as I suggested, in the sincerity with which the offer was made, there was no point in making this matter a political issue. However, I quote the contents of that letter, because I believe it is important for the people of this State to know what opportunity was given. Dated July 19, and addressed to the Premier, it states:

I refer to publicity which has been given to a meeting which I proposed yesterday between parties interested in the current inflationary spiral. It is my contention that the utmost co-operation is required by all responsible groups and in this category I include Government, Opposition, commerce, industry and the trade union movement.

I believe a worthwhile starting point for discussion would be a consideration of the papers prepared by State and Commonwealth Treasury staff following the special Premiers' Conference on May 10. Whilst it was clearly indicated at the time that the findings of the detailed inquiry would be tabled at the Premiers' Conference in June, the public (including groups other than Government) have not been acquainted of the contents. Since calling for a discussion the announcement of the 25 per cent tariff cut highlights the urgency of the leaders in this State initiating responsible discussion for the ultimate benefit of the community which we all serve. I await your advice as to when such a meeting can be held.

I repeat that, although this letter was hand-delivered to the Premier's Department on that day, it has not been acknowledged.

Mr. Coumbe: There was a very smart challenge made.

Dr. EASTICK: It was an immediate challenge from the Premier that we indicate the matters in which we could help. That letter indicates two matters in which the Opposition could help in the deliberations that would benefit this State. It is all very well for the Premier to say that South Australia is the most likely to be affected by the 25 per cent tariff cuts, but he has given us no chance for a worthwhile discussion on the whole matter. Nor has he given any opportunity for a discussion of the documents prepared by Treasury officials throughout Australia to be used for the benefit of the people of Australia in reducing the cost spiral. Not one of those documents is available. This is certainly an area where the whole community must co-operate and where we on this side have given our pledge to co-operate, but there has been a complete denial of any opportunity to do so. The people of this State, as elsewhere, will not accept this as a very reasonable approach by the Premier, more especially after his request for the areas involved to be identified.

Apart from my earlier comments on transport corridor housing, I note from the Governor's Speech that housing occupies a high place in the Government's plan. In paragraph 3, and again in paragraph 16, comment is made

in relation to the South Australian Housing Trust and its involvement in housing. I was interested in a question asked in this House last week by the member for Florey. On July 25 he asked:

Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government intends to initiate a fourth course of bricklaying at the Marleston Technical College and, if it does, can he give details of people eligible to undertake this course?

The Minister of Labour and Industry gave the following reply:

Because of the extreme shortage of skilled bricklayers in the building industry, the Government, after discussing the matter with the unions involved and the Master Builders Association, decided to launch a further course of concentrated training in bricklaying. The course, originally set up for young men aged between 18 years and 20 years, is not open to adults except ex-servicemen. The course is to begin about the middle of August, and I understand that there are more applications than can be catered for at Marleston. Everyone who has attended this type of course has been successful, and all those on the course that is to finish shortly have been offered jobs.

Some relevant information has been compiled by the Economic Research Department of the Housing Industry Association. I intend to quote a number of extracts from that report, and in due course I shall ask leave of the House for certain statistical material to be incorporated in *Hansard*. The report states:

Unless the current shortage of bricklayers and, to a lesser extent, of carpenters, is quickly corrected, expected productivity gains could be to some extent nullified, at least in the short term.

The article goes on to show a table giving estimates of the numbers of workers in the various categories needed to meet the projected demand for new dwelling construction work in 1975 and 1980, and points out that the figures contained in the table are conservative. I ask leave for these figures to be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

ESTIMATED NEEDS FOR WORKERS, BY TRADES, IN THE

	HOUSING INDUSTRY, AUSTRALIA				
	1972	1975	Increase*	1980	Increase*
Carpenters . . .	23,100	26,000	2,900	28,900	5,800
Bricklayers . . .	14,000	15,750	1,750	17,500	3,500
Painters . . .	11,300	12,700	1,400	14,100	2,800
Electricians . . .	2,600	2,900	300	3,200	600
Plumbers . . .	10,000	11,250	1,250	12,500	2,500
Roof Tilers . . .	3,700	4,200	500	4,700	1,000
Plasterers . . .	5,600	6,300	700	7,000	1,400
Other.....	9,700	10,900	1,200	12,100	2,400
Total . . .	80,000	90,000	10,000	100,000	20,000

* From 1972 figures.

Dr. EASTICK: Later in the document we find the comment that the future needs for tradesmen could be affected by changes in the types of housing built, by changes in materials used, and by changes in methods of construction. The article points out that these three overlap, that changes in types of housing often involve different materials, and the use of different materials often involves different methods of construction or different skills, and some instances are given. A most important question is then asked: can future needs be met? The reply needs to be considered in two parts—short-term problems and long-term prospects. Unless a sufficient number of apprentices is already in training and coming forward shortly, the sharp increases in labour needs expected by 1975-76 are not likely to be met from traditional sources.

The total number of apprentices in training in the building trades for the whole of Australia, excluding electricians, at June 30, 1972, was 14,346. The average

number completing apprenticeships over the past five years was 3,900 a year. This supply must meet the needs of all building construction, not merely housing, and not considering those who go into other industries and specialists in certain fields not directly related to the building industry. The article further points out that although there is this deficiency of apprentices, who are, as it were, the home-produced article, there has been in the past an urgent need to consider the skills available from migrant tradesmen. Under the heading "Migrant tradesmen" the article states:

In the past, migrants have provided a large part of the apparent supply of tradesmen in the building industries.

Table 6 sets out the figures for the past 10 years of indentures completed in the building trades and the number of settler arrivals classified as skilled building tradesmen. The report shows that in 1970 Australian apprentices represented 321 new entries to the bricklaying trade, while migrants accounted for 1,152. In 1971, the figure was 231 from local sources and 786 from among migrants, while in 1972 it was 231 apprentices and 620 migrants. In the same three-year period the apparent supply of bricklayers has been reduced by more than 600, and it seems obvious that the reduction in migrant intake is a major factor in the present acute shortage in this trade. The document then gives a further table and I seek leave to have that table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

INDENTURES COMPLETED AND SETTLER ARRIVALS

Year	Indentures completed building trades	Settler arrivals skilled building trades
1963	2,767	4,064
1964	2,893	4,571
1965	3,017	4,966
1966	3,243	4,897
1967	2,665	5,589
1968	3,253	6,138
1969	4,048	6,493
1970	4,845	5,684
1971	3,514	4,217
1972	3,962	3,100

Dr. EASTICK: Under the heading "Demand/supply summary" the statement is made that the foregoing analysis indicates a gross annual need of about 5,500 workers entering the housing industry alone between the present time and 1975. Allowing for semi-skilled and non-skilled trades, this would mean a need for just under 5,000 skilled tradesmen a year. Unless those people are found and enter the housing industry to relieve the situation, it will not be possible to keep up with the present supply, let alone the requirements of an increasing need. The number of apprentices completing training in Australia averaged 3,900 a year over the past five years, but the big problem is that the intake of migrants in the skilled building trades has declined substantially over the same period.

I ask this Government, and indeed the Australian Government, what action is being taken to ensure that skilled workers in this most vital area of the housing industry are covered in the migration policy of the Australian Government, and what representations have been made by the State Government to ensure that increased numbers of workers are available to carry out the work mentioned by His Excellency. How will this work be effectively undertaken unless the Government has some way of increasing the number of workers in this area?

The article then gives two methods of approach: it refers first to the short-term solution wherein special measures

will be needed to meet short-term needs. It refers to the possibility of enticing some members in the trade to defer their retirement until replacement tradesmen are available. However, all members will realize the limitations of that suggestion, which runs contrary to the best interest of worker participation and involvement. Further, tradesmen may be attracted to the housing industry from other industries, but few tradesmen from other industries have the skills to make the change worth while. In summarizing the short-term approach the following statement is made:

In the short-term, then, it is recommended that the following policies be implemented, to increase supply of tradesmen:

- (a) Every effort be made to recruit building tradesmen overseas, and they be given assisted passage under the migration scheme.
- (b) Priority be given in adult training and retraining schemes to building trades.

I refer to replies given by the Minister of Labour and Industry as recently as last week that the opportunity does not exist for adults other than ex-servicemen. The summary continues:

- (c) Every effort be made in design and methods to economize in use of trades in short supply.
- (d) Support and assistance be given to private training schemes in operation, for example, "crash" programmes for bricklayers being conducted in Western Australia; subsidy scheme for employers in Victoria.

Obviously the scheme under way at Marleston does not fall within the crash programme phase, but falls along similar lines. What is the Government doing in support of this programme to ensure that this vital housing industry is protected, and to ensure that some positive action is taken to increase the number of tradesmen skilled in this field?

I now refer to the long-term prospects and again say that action needs to be taken to increase the intake of apprentices in the industry. Investigations need to be made into the possibility of economies being effected regarding the use of tradesmen in short supply. The summary continues:

One problem above all requires solution. The low number of new indentures granted is apparently not the result of lack of applicants for apprenticeship.

It is pointed out that there are 10 applicants for every indenture given. The article further states:

It appears also that there is a serious shortage of training facilities in technical schools in most States.

Therefore, I ask not only the Premier but also the Minister of Education what action is being taken to upgrade and increase the technical facilities at schools to ensure that apprentices, who are so vital in the overall housing programme, are available to the industry and the community generally. The matter of housing is vital and the Opposition will support all necessary moves to solve this problem.

I wish now to discuss the matter of local government. The Minister of Local Government has announced the creation of a Royal Commission into local government boundaries. Unfortunately, this inquiry is proceeding at the same time as suggestions and recommendations from Canberra that councils group themselves into regions for the purpose of applying, subject to the approval of the appropriate Minister, for funds from the Loan Council and the Commonwealth Grants Commission. This is indeed a desirable carrot to place before local government, because it provides the opportunity of direct representation to these Commonwealth Government bodies to obtain funds. However, there are several unfortunate features, which have not been clearly outlined in the statements

emanating from Canberra. They have certainly not been spelt out in the statements I have seen regarding local government in this State. What is to be the basis of the regional group? Will there be more than three or four regional groups in South Australia? What will be the individual voice of a council in South Australia in any approach to the Commonwealth for funds? Indeed, what happens if a claim for \$1,000,000 on behalf of 15 councils to the Grants Commission or the Loan Council is approved only to the extent of \$750,000?

Is the reduction to each of the local bodies in the applicant group to be of the same proportion? If so, will the amount to be taken from the individual applicants within the regional group mean that the programme they have put forward is no longer viable, simply because funds are not available? These could be funds that local government cannot supplement from other sources. These are matters of vital importance. It has been promoted that, as far as the Commonwealth Government is concerned (the Government of which we hear so much, the Government which would provide all the funds for all projects before it came into office and which now cannot fulfil its commitments), the funds allocated to this area will be applied on a regional basis throughout Australia. In the Eastern States it is being debated that the only local government bodies to obtain funds on a regional basis will be those grouped together in the western regions of Melbourne and the western regions of Sydney. Can the Premier or any Minister indicate that this is not so? Can the Government say that these funds will be equally available to every council in Australia, dependent on need? Or are funds to be available only to the groups in those two areas, the western suburbs of Sydney and the western suburbs of Melbourne? Answers to these questions are vitally necessary.

Local government (that important third tier of Government), and its administrators, needs this information to put its proposals into perspective, and it is confusing and causing concern to many people involved in this field that regionalization of local government bodies may be superimposed into the scheme of redrawing local government boundaries. This will not prove to be helpful in the interests of the community in South Australia. We want to know more clearly what the Government is going to do and what representation it has made on behalf of the people of this State to the Commonwealth Government. True, the Minister of Local Government as the Minister of Transport has clearly pointed out that the South Australian programme for public transportation is only just around the corner. He has been saying that now for almost 3½ years. He indicated as recently as last Friday or Saturday that we are to embark upon an electrification system that was initiated in the late 1950's and the early 1960's by Sir Thomas Playford. He has also indicated, although he is not sure, that we may have double-decker trains. There was a guarded statement that the work would be done in this State. It was not made clear whether those double-decker carriages would be built in South Australia or elsewhere.

How does this line up with the statement in the Lees report, which I have no doubt Opposition members will refer to during this debate? That report clearly indicates that the present expenditure incurred at Islington produces little return of value to the State. If there is any doubt about this new method of transportation or these new carriages being manufactured at Islington, let the Government say so now so that we do not further run down the State's finances. We need a clear indication whether the State is going to

use the available facilities and produce these carriages or whether we shall benefit by phasing out what is stated by the Lees report to be an unprofitable operation for the State.

For a long time in this House we have had the situation spelled out by the Minister that it was the Commonwealth Government that was holding up the completion of the Tarcoola to Alice Springs line and the Port Pirie to Adelaide line. The Minister's own Party has been in power now for over seven months (almost eight months) and it is becoming clear that the delay has not been because of the Commonwealth: it is because of the State Government.

There are several other measures about which I could talk but they will be dealt with by other speakers. There is, though, one matter that I wish to draw to the attention of this House. By public announcement on several occasions and indeed in reports that have been given to this House, the Premier has tried to usurp the right and the authority of Parliament by indicating that he would use retrospective legislation to correct a situation that was not to his liking. He has indicated that in relation to several matters, but in particular to land transactions and commercial and industrial activities in the western suburbs. I stress to the Ministers and to all members of the Government Party that any claim of this nature by the Premier of what he is going to do, as if he had a divine right to do it, over and above the wishes of Parliament, will be argued at every step. If the Premier or any other Minister wishes to bring in any legislation for retrospective or retroactive (as it is sometimes called) action, I point out that the legal presumption is against retrospectivity, unless by express words or necessary implication it appears that retrospectivity was the intention of the Legislature. This was stated back in 1870, in a case known as *Phillips v. Eyre*, which was heard before Mr. Justice Willes, who said:

Retrospective laws are, however, *prima facie* of questionable policy and contrary to the general principle that legislation by which the conduct of mankind is to be regulated ought, when introduced for the first time, to deal with future acts and ought not to change the character of past transactions carried on upon the faith of the then existing law.

I think all of us, if we have any regard at all for the Parliamentary system and true justice, will appreciate that those last few words are of considerable and particular importance—"the character of past transactions carried on upon the faith of the then existing Law". That is clearly in contradistinction to some of the claims or attitudes expressed by the Premier that, if something does not suit his purpose—not Parliament's purpose but his purpose—if a decision of the court does not accord with his requirements, then he will bring in retroactive or retrospective action to correct the situation. In making this pronouncement, the Premier has done Parliament a grave injustice.

Mr. Nankivell: And the courts.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. If it is suggested that he and his Government are above the law, can do just as they like, completely disregard the Parliamentary system and try to hoodwink the people of this State and of the Commonwealth—that he can do as he likes when he likes—I point out to him that the attitudes now expressed by the Premier will be resisted by members of the Opposition in the name of the people they represent.

By all means, if a situation arises where some grave injustice has been done, as has happened in the past with problems associated with actions taken during war-time,

then consideration will be given to retrospective action being required by legislation; but in no circumstances will the members of my Party prostitute themselves or the people they represent by accepting out of hand a suggestion or a directive by the Premier in this way. By all means let the Government bring a matter before this House and let its pros and cons be debated, but the Government must not go on to the public platform and try to claim that it has a divine right that cannot be challenged or refuted, in the belief that the rest of the members of Parliament will follow quietly.

Mr. McAnaney: They do.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes; on the other side of the House they do. I appreciate that: they cannot do otherwise. The point is that any decision of that nature must clearly be taken after sufficient debate in this House and in another place. Again, I stress the responsibility that will be shown by members of my Party in transacting the business in this House. We do not accept a script being prepared for us to follow. The action that members on this side will take will be what is required of them under the Standing Orders of this House, with a sense of responsibility to those whom they represent. Every member looks forward to taking an active part in debating the legislation outlined in the Governor's Speech a week ago. We will do this in a responsible way, we will not be gerrymandered, organized, or painted into a corner by anyone, no matter where that member sits. We will be, as we have been in the past, a responsible Opposition. I support the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I, too, support the motion. I endorse the remarks of the Leader and other members in relation to the untimely deaths of the former Speaker (Hon. R. E. Hurst) and the former member for Southern in another place (Hon. H. K. Kemp). Mr. Kemp served the people of South Australia not only as a loyal member of Parliament but also as a capable and hard-working officer of the Agriculture Department. I also congratulate the Speaker on his election as Speaker of this Chamber.

Representing the intelligent citizens of Davenport, I wish to refer to two matters of prime importance to my constituents: Commonwealth-State relations, and State aid to independent schools. The most important policy issue facing the people of South Australia and Australia was not mentioned by the Governor in his Speech: the issue of Commonwealth-State relations. Australians are witnessing the most radical change in their federal system of government since Federation. This change is being brought about not through a change in the Commonwealth Constitution as one would expect, but by the Commonwealth Government pulling so tightly on the purse strings that the States are currently being strangled.

The ugly head of Whitlam-style centralism is becoming a reality. The 1973 Premiers' Conference and the recent federal conference of the Australian Labor Party have shown the Australian people that Mr. Whitlam means business. The latter conference is particularly significant for South Australians. At Surfers Paradise, the A.L.P. conference resolved that all legislative powers must be conferred on the Commonwealth Government. This means that it is impossible for the South Australian Labor Party Government to adopt any policy in relation to legislative powers in South Australia that runs counter to such powers in the Commonwealth sphere, even though State Labor Party members may disagree with the handing over to the

Commonwealth of such legislative powers. South Australians have been sold out without our own Premier raising an objection.

The Australian Senate, which was established to safeguard the interests of the smaller States, is under threat. The A.L.P. openly attacks its future. Its federal platform states "amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution to abolish the Senate". Again, our State A.L.P. raises no objection whatever. The extent of the centralist policy can be seen from the A.L.P. federal platform. Before 1971, this platform stated "amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers . . .". That is an all-sweeping statement, to say the least. At the federal conference in 1971, the platform was amended to try to disguise this policy, although the policy remained basically the same. The new amendment stated "amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution to clothe the Parliament of Australia with such plenary powers as are necessary and desirable to achieve international co-operation, national planning, and the Party's economic and social objectives". It simply means that the Commonwealth Labor Government would like to take over Australia.

Mr. Whitlam justified his centralism in the *Australian Quarterly* in 1971 by saying, "It is not so important however to determine which Government carries out some particular function as to ensure that the function should be properly carried out." Surely Mr. Whitlam, despite his egotistical opinions of his own Government, appreciates fully that Governments are basically decision-makers and that a Government in Canberra will differ in its decisions from a Government in Adelaide, Perth, or Brisbane. For a number of years it has been apparent that Commonwealth-State relations needed revision. As a Federation, Australia is in a unique position whereby the Commonwealth Government raises 77.1 per cent of all public revenue, the State Governments raise 12.9 per cent, and local government raises only 9 per cent.

The public revenue raised by the Australian Commonwealth Government is significantly higher than that raised by any comparable federal Government. In Germany, the federal Government raises only 49 per cent of the total revenue; in Canada, 51.5 per cent; and in the United States 62.9 per cent, which is the highest raised by any other federal Government. The Australian Commonwealth Government therefore has greater power than have any other federal Governments to raise revenue. For a workable Federation, it is imperative that governmental responsibility be matched with the power to raise revenue. State Governments have the responsibility for education, health, hospitals, and urban development, spheres in which expenditure increases at a far greater rate than the population increases. Although the States have these important responsibilities, the majority of the power to raise revenue lies with the Commonwealth Government.

The Commonwealth Government is reluctant to hand over the necessary finance to the States to match these responsibilities. This is seen by the fact that during the last nine years the Commonwealth's increase in revenue from income tax has been over 100 per cent, while the increase in the State's share of these revenues has been only about 70 per cent. Therefore, expenditure by the States in the basic areas of education, health services, hospitals, and urban development has not kept pace with expenditure in other areas of the economy. The States have fallen further and further into debt, relying more and more on Loan grants from the Commonwealth Government. The absurd

situation has now been reached where almost three-quarters of the revenue independently raised by the individual States is allocated to the payment of interest on the Commonwealth Loan grants.

Obviously, this critical situation has to be resolved. There are two courses of action. First, the Commonwealth Government can be given greater responsibility to match its revenue-raising power. The other alternative is to ensure that the States receive adequate financial return to carry out the responsibilities allocated to them under the present Commonwealth Constitution. Mr. Whitlam has chosen the former of these alternatives, which is a policy of centralism. Under Mr. Whitlam's proposal it is intended that the States be invited to submit to the Commonwealth proposals for the spending of finance, and it will then be left to the Commonwealth Government to determine how and where the expenditure should take place. This expenditure will initially be administered back through the States to regional authorities composed of public servants and Government appointees.

In South Australia four regional zones will probably be established, one encompassing the entire metropolitan area and three to cover the remainder of the State. One can envisage, without using unreasonable imagination, that very quickly the State Governments will become nothing but Commonwealth public servants, and the ultimate result will be a Commonwealth Government served by commissions and regional authorities. The obvious implication is that members opposite will become nothing more than puppets of the Commonwealth, if they are not puppets already. It is proposed that the regional authorities will administer education, the use and generation of power and fuel, hospitals and medical services, urban development, transport, and the enforcement of law and order. These regional authorities will be answerable to commissions in Canberra, commissions composed of public servants and Government appointees. These commissions will ultimately be responsible to the Commonwealth Government through the appropriate Minister.

The Labor Government in Canberra has already announced its intention to establish a Pre-school Commission, a Schools Commission, a Commonwealth Department of Urban Affairs and Regional Development, a Fuel and Power Commission, an Australian Hospitals Commission, a Conservation and Construction Commission, and an Industries Assistance Commission. Local government bodies have been informed that they may apply for direct financial aid from the Commonwealth Government on a regional basis. The real threat of such a centralist policy is that the rights and independence of the States will be completely ignored. The minor States (South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania, and possibly even Queensland) will be ignored, because of the demands and political pressures of Victoria and New South Wales. The people of South Australia will not be able to determine for themselves such issues as whether Monarto should proceed, but rather the authorities in Canberra will dictate whether the people in Adelaide will decentralize.

The power of South Australians to object through the ballot box will be destroyed, as their votes will be swamped beneath the votes of the people of the other five States who have no interest in regional development within South Australia. For the voter to object through his local member of Parliament, he will have to go to Canberra. It is apparent that the more centralized the Administration and Government the less concerned it becomes with isolated or regional problems, and the less influence the voter has on regional issues. The final result is a massive and

cumbersome bureaucracy supporting a remote but all-powerful dictatorship in Canberra.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crimes): Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The other alternative is for the Commonwealth Government to give to the States adequate finance and revenue to carry out the responsibilities already allocated to them through the Commonwealth Constitution. The allocation of such finances cannot be on the restricted and inhibitory basis of the past. Such revenue needs to be allocated as a proportion of the total income tax collected by the Commonwealth Government with additional provisions to encompass the growth of the individual States and the liabilities suffered by the smaller States. The broad outlines of such a proposal were unanimously agreed to at a Premiers' Conference in 1970. However, the relationship needs to develop well beyond the superficial allocation of finance.

A new co-operative federalism needs to exist in all areas of finance, administration and legislation. The State Governments must be willing to release certain of their powers to the Commonwealth Government, particularly in the areas of resource development, commercial practice, censorship, consumer protection, marketing and industrial law. In the past the States have not willingly co-operated even between each other in such matters, and so the current crisis has emerged. Equally, the Commonwealth Government must be willing to hand full responsibility to the State Governments in such areas as education, medical and health services, community welfare, urban development and transport.

In granting such responsibilities the Commonwealth Government must ensure adequate finance for the States to administer these responsibilities. This does not mean that the grants from the Commonwealth Government to the States in these specific areas cannot be conditional, but in being conditional they must still allow the States freedom to determine their own balanced development. Through such a Commonwealth-State relationship it is possible to ensure that those matters concerning the individual are administered and governed at a level as close as possible to the individual without a bureaucracy destroying the voting power of the individual. On matters of national importance the Commonwealth Government is able to develop national objectives and national plans without being unduly restricted by the lack of co-operation between the States. The future of Australian federalism is at stake. The choice is either the rape of the States and the loss of their voting rights or a new style of co-operative federalism. I turn now to my second subject—State aid for independent schools.

Mr. Becker: That's a good subject to raise.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is the very matter that members opposite backed out of last week. We gave them the opportunity to discuss it in the House, but they turned down that offer. On that occasion the Government refused to debate the following motion:

That in the opinion of this House the recent decision of the Commonwealth Government to withdraw aid from some independent schools should be revoked.

The Premier issued a challenge to discuss the matter in the Address in Reply debate, and I will do that. One can only speculate about why the Government has tried to bury the issue. Perhaps it was because it will soon be forced to adopt a similar policy regarding non-systemic independent schools, and two pieces of evidence support this opinion.

First, the States must refer to the Commonwealth Government such of their present legislative powers as will assist the Commonwealth Government to carry out its Party objectives. Obviously, State aid for independent schools is one such objective of the Australian Labor Party in the Commonwealth Government. Secondly, Mr. Whitlam is hell-bent on ensuring that the States spend their revenue as he sees fit. Mr. Whitlam, in his address at the June Premiers' Conference, said:

We believe that the Government responsible for gathering and dispersing huge amounts of public money is obliged to see that the money is properly spent. We believe that most of the problems with which allocations from the national Budget are meant to deal cannot be confined to or defined by individual States.

I am certain that Mr. Whitlam regards education as one such problem. For these reasons it is quite apparent that members opposite may soon have to adopt a policy similar to that adopted by the Commonwealth Government on aid to independent schools. The Commonwealth Government announced recently that it would stop making per capita grants to many non-systemic independent schools.

This announcement has left, in the nostrils of the Australian public, a stench of deceit, mistrust and discrimination against the parents and children in the independent-school sector. Before the 1972 Commonwealth election both Mr. Whitlam and the then shadow Minister for Education (Mr. Beazley) promised that all schools would receive per capita grants under a Labor Administration. I emphasize that they referred to all schools.

Dr. Tonkin: They've changed their tune now, haven't they?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Too right they have. On October 28, 1972, Mr. Beazley stated:

No private school will get less under an A.L.P. Government than the per capita grant that it now receives.

After the Commonwealth election Mr. Beazley, as Minister for Education, reaffirmed this policy in the House of Representatives when, on Wednesday, May 30 last, he said:

My view is that every school in the country, including Geelong Grammar, should receive a basic grant from the Commonwealth and that the Commonwealth should have an identity with the education of every child.

These promises have now been broken. Doubtless Mr. Beazley made them in good faith but obviously he has been overruled by a Cabinet determined to dictate the type of education that every child in Australia shall receive. It is apparent that the opinions of the Commonwealth Minister for Education on independent schools now take second place to the opinions of the Minister for the Environment and Conservation (Dr. Cass). On February 19, 1973, Dr. Cass stated, as reported in the *Australian*, that Catholic schools should be removed from the control of the church bureaucracy and developed more as community schools. He claimed that:

In essence, they (the Catholic schools) should become part of the Government, but not State, education system.

That statement shows clearly that the Australian Government intends to abolish independent schools completely. Furthermore, in abolishing them, it intends not to hand those schools to the State education authorities but to take them over under the Commonwealth system. So much for the opinions of Mr. Beazley and for the Report of the Interim Committee (known as the Karmel report) for the Australian Schools Commission. That report, made in May, 1973, stated:

It values the right of parents to educate their children outside Government schools.

The Commonwealth Government apparently has no regard for election promises and little regard for the recommendations of a Government-appointed committee and the democratic rights of Australians. I draw attention specifically to Article 26(3) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the United Nations Charter. It provides that—

Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

The right to choose in education, as in any other fundamental action in life, is of vital importance, but the Commonwealth Government is now placing unfair restrictions on that right. That Government has used the Interim Committee to enunciate the sordid and unpleasant details of an education policy laid down in the terms of reference. We all know that Professor Karmel has an extremely good reputation in South Australia. The Government has then used this expert technical committee to shield it from the expected public antagonism to the details of the policy, and, unfortunately, the Australian public is now putting the blame for those details on the expert committee, rather than on the persons who drew up the terms of reference, namely, the Commonwealth A.L.P. Government.

Most Australians, including myself, agree that every child should have equal opportunity of education. Education is too fundamental for our society not to allow this equal opportunity. Therefore, expenditure on education must be allocated on a scale according to need. However, such an allocation must recognize that every child has a need. We do not stop feeding obese children for an indefinite period because the food requirements of those children are less than the requirements of children suffering from malnutrition. Why then apply this policy to education? Obviously, every child has a need in education.

Parents who send their children to independent schools contribute revenue towards education through their taxes. Therefore, it would appear reasonable that these children should receive some benefit from this revenue, while accepting some penalty for their independence of education. Under the administration of the previous Commonwealth Government such a penalty was imposed. The Report of the Interim Committee makes it possible to calculate that in the year ended June 30, 1973, public expenditure (State and Commonwealth) was budgeted to average \$559 a student at Government schools and \$151 a student at independent schools. The students at the Government school were receiving almost four times what the students at the independent schools were receiving.

Further, I support that aid to the independent schools should be scaled according to the long-term needs of the school and possibly even the financial resources of the parents, although this latter criterion would be difficult to administer.

I applaud the Commonwealth Government on its generous allocation of revenue to some of the independent schools. But there the applause must end. The remainder of the Government policy is a series of political manoeuvres and unfair school discrimination. The July polls on voting support have already shown the fruits of A.L.P. policy. The generous gift to Catholic schools has halved the potential vote of the D.L.P., the A.L.P. being the beneficiary of this change in voting patterns. One speculates with interest at the possible attitude of the A.L.P. to Catholic schools when the D.L.P. has become a spent political force, especially in the Senate. The report of the interim committee contains 200 pages, 10 of which are devoted to a general description of computer-programming techniques used to locate the "disadvantaged" schools, but no details are given of the criteria to which these techniques

were applied. The report refers to the "Index of resource use" but gives no details of relative weights applied to the components of the index. Obviously, the writers were told to hide the facts.

The gradual removal of State aid to independent schools will encourage the establishment of elitist schools, available only to the wealthy. If we are to have a freedom of choice in education, that freedom must be real and not restricted to a minority of the affluent. Freedom of choice must be freedom for all. All parents, rich or poor, must have the opportunity to decide whether they send their children to a Government or an independent school.

Mr. Keneally: Which school did you attend—State or independent?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I did not go to an independent school: I went to a Government school.

Mr. Keneally: Where will you send your children?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: By the time I have any children to send, if the A.L.P. is still in power I shall probably have no choice.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are strictly out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: When the economics of the Government's policy are examined I become even more sceptical of the real motives behind its current thinking. It has been estimated by some of the disfranchised independent schools that at least 20 per cent of their pupils will be forced to attend Government schools. The cost of educating these children at Government schools will be four times the cost of present Government assistance to the same pupils at an independent school. I have already quoted the exact figures. The real economics therefore are only 20 per cent of the current expenditure on these pupils. I understand that there will be a real saving of \$1,000,000, a rather trivial sum compared to Commonwealth Government expenditure of \$660,000,000 on education.

The educational welfare of the "displaced" pupils has been ignored by the Commonwealth Government. A gradual phasing out of per capita grants would have enabled the pupils to finish their education without having to change schools. Even the Interim Committee recommended that the grants should be phased out over two years. The Government, in its wisdom, in determining to destroy the non-systemic independent schools, has decided to terminate these grants at the end of the current academic year. As a result of this decision, the "displaced" pupils will be forced into Government schools that are already filled to capacity. The attitude of the staff and students at Government schools will further destroy the confidence of the "displaced" pupils. I point out to the Minister of Education, who is unfortunately not here, that the headmaster of a large high school that can expect a large number of such pupils has already described them as "refugees of private schools". What a despicable, inhumane attitude to take. Is this the attitude of the whole department?

The Commonwealth Government is to be condemned for its policy on per capita grants to independent schools, because it abuses the rights of the citizens in a democratic country. It is a policy that smells of educational dictatorship and discrimination. It is a policy that attempts to destroy the independent school system. It is a policy that our own State Government will probably be forced to adopt. I call on all parents, particularly the parents of the discriminated students, to rise up and voice their objections to other members of the public, and especially to the Commonwealth and State Governments.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion and join with other speakers in conveying condolences to the families of deceased former members, namely, the former Speaker (Mr. Reg Hurst) and the late member for Southern District in the Legislative Council (Hon. Harry Kemp). The Governor's Speech covers a wide range of legislation that will be introduced this session. Before enlarging on the Governor's Speech, I would be remiss if I did not pay a tribute to the electors in the Gilles District for the confidence they placed in me in again electing me as the member for the district. I would especially thank members of the Gilles branch of the Australian Labor Party and their supporters for their help in making this result possible. The State-wide result of the election was the return of a Labor Government for the first time in the State's history. The campaign in Gilles was intense and rather confusing at times because we had difficulty in determining whether my opponent was a Liberal and Country League member or a member of the Liberal Movement. However, we finally determined that he was a Liberal Movement candidate because of the multitudinous pieces of purple paper floating around the district. I think that the Minister of Environment and Conservation became interested because of the pollution problem the pieces of paper were causing. There were all kinds of gimmick such as shopping lists, etc., which appeared with almost monotonous regularity.

Mr. Keneally: Where did they get the money?

Mr. SLATER: It intrigues me where the money came from, but I am sure that some Opposition members know and can give us the answer. During the campaign much attention was paid to the Gilles District by the Leader of the Liberal Movement, and I should be grateful for his help because it meant that I was able to increase the majority for the Australian Labor Party. I am sure that it was unintentional help, but I am pleased to say that this assistance is still continuing, because last week another purple bit of paper was distributed, and this is an interesting document. Addressed to the electors of Gilles, it states:

An active and enthusiastic Liberal Movement group has been formed in the Gilles electorate, and we are seeking your support. As a small, but already highly efficient and effective political Party, the Liberal Movement is destined to become a major force in State politics in the near future. Our Parliamentary leaders, Steele Hall, Robin Millhouse, and Martin Cameron, are all men of the highest integrity, with considerable political ability—

that would be open to doubt, particularly by some members on the other side—

and they are backed by a growing organization of active and dedicated members.

I shall not read the document in full, but the purpose of the brochure was to inform people that, on the night of July 26, Mr. Robin Millhouse and Mr. Cameron would speak and answer questions at the Highlander Hotel. I am sure that there was no traffic jam at the meeting. The brochure was signed by the President of the Gilles branch of the Liberal Movement and has an indecipherable signature, although I believe it to be genuine.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They are active in Southern, too.

Mr. SLATER: Yes, so I understand. At least people in the Liberal Movement have the courage of their convictions, misguided though they may be, unlike some members who, at the first opportunity, jumped off the band wagon or jumped off the purple jeep when the pressure was applied. I give those members of the Liberal Movement some credit in that regard. The Governor's Speech referred to builders licensing. Some difficulties have been experienced by applicants for a general builders licence. This matter has been referred to me by people in my

district and generally concerns applicants holding a tradesman's restricted licence who apply for a general builders licence. As many of the applicants are migrants, they cannot convey to the board (because of language or some other reason) their qualifications to organize or supervise building construction to the requirements necessary to obtain a general builders licence.

Several applicants have sufficient trade experience and expertise, but are unable to cope with the technical details required for applicants to obtain a general builders licence. I believe that the legislation should be amended to give these tradesmen the chance to progress to general construction work by permitting the issue of a provisional licence. This licence would allow a builder to proceed with construction work on his own behalf in a limited way whilst under the inspection and supervision of the licensing board. I trust that this amendment will be accepted by all concerned.

I now refer to the present scurrilous campaign being conducted by the Australian Medical Association against the proposed Commonwealth health scheme. The first consideration should be the health of the nation. However, despite the protestations of those who claim to speak on behalf of the medical profession and state that the patient is their first concern, I am sure that they are interested very much in the money that the patient provides. The report of the Prices Commissioner about doctors' fees, laid on the table last week, proves fairly conclusively that there has been a rapid increase of 54 per cent in doctors' incomes during the past three years, and apparently they are still looking for more.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the increase in the average wage?

Mr. SLATER: The average wage increased by only 34 per cent, but doctors' incomes have increased by as much as 54 per cent.

Mr. Gunn: That's incorrect and you know it is.

Mr. SLATER: The attacks on the health scheme are intended to confuse the Australian public. The principle elements of the Commonwealth Government's proposals are based on the following:

(1) The establishment of a single Health Insurance Fund to finance hospital and medical benefits to which the whole population is entitled.

(2) Medical coverage based on benefits in a schedule negotiated with representatives of the medical profession.

(3) Hospital coverage, based on free standard-ward treatment, out-patients treatment to be available without charge or means test.

(4) Provision for community health centres, ancillary services and domiciliary services.

(5) Funding of the health scheme by a 1.35 per cent levy on taxable incomes and a matching Commonwealth subsidy. The levy would provide for exemption for low-income families and contribution ceilings for high-income taxpayers.

(6) The continuation of existing tax concessions on contributions to private funds and net medical and hospital expenses.

It should be remembered that the controversy is about a proposed health scheme. In a letter sent to doctors the Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) stated:

The Government has published the report prior to making decisions about the final form of the new health scheme for the express purpose of obtaining objective criticisms and suggestions. I must frankly say the Government does not regard as representative of the views of the medical profession, the over-simplified and, in some cases, untrue statements that have so far been publicly put forward.

One such over-simplified statement is this: "Patients will be forced to go to Government clinics and patients will not be able to visit their usual doctor." That is false,

because the scheme will have no effect on established doctor-patient relationships. Government clinics will be established only in areas where overbilling is general. These clinics will not be compulsory. Patients may continue to go to doctors who overcharge, but they will have to pay the difference between the doctor's bill and the actual benefit schedule.

Mr. Mathwin: If you get a sore throat in the United Kingdom, you could finish up with a gynaecologist.

Mr. SLATER: We are not talking about the United Kingdom. Another argument advanced is that doctors will be paid by, and hence controlled by, the Government. Three methods of billing and payment are proposed: first, direct billing of the plan by the doctor who accepts the benefits paid by the plan in full settlement; secondly, billing the patient, who forwards the account to the plan for payment of the benefit to the doctor; thirdly, billing the patient, who pays the doctor and claims the benefit from the plan. The last-mentioned is the method now used by health benefit funds. Doctors will not be controlled by the Government any more than they are now controlled by these funds.

Another suggestion is that Government bureaucrats will be checking up on people's private medical problems. The proposed plan does not require any information about treatment other than that included on the doctor's account, and this again is similar to the system now applying with health benefit funds. Another suggestion put forward by persons claiming to represent the medical profession is that the scheme will cost more. However, the scheme will be funded from a 1.35 per cent levy on taxable incomes. Some people will pay more, some will pay less. Generally, people on lower incomes will pay less. A further suggestion bandied around is that patients will be forced to go to public wards in hospitals. Here again, the scheme proposes that preferred accommodation will be available, but that the patient will be charged for it. Thus, while a patient in a standard ward will not pay anything, a patient in a single room will pay approximately \$15 a day.

Mr. Wells: Can the patient select his own doctor?

Mr. SLATER: Yes. I consider that the Australian people will benefit by the introduction of a national health scheme. It is long overdue and at present many of the people who most need attention do not receive it because of the cost involved. They cannot afford the doctor's fees and the hospital charges, and at times they cannot even afford to pay contributions to hospital benefit funds. The Australian people generally will benefit from the proposed national health scheme.

Mr. Gunn: You hope!

Mr. SLATER: I am sure this will be the case; members opposite eventually will find that it is so. In the Address in Reply debate last year, and subsequently by way of a question in this House, I referred to the construction of a new bridge to replace the Darley Road ford. Although I did not see it, I understand a public affairs programme on television last week conveyed the impression that the construction of the bridge was to be postponed indefinitely, and a spokesman from the Highways Department was quoted. I have information from the Minister of Transport that this is not so.

Mr. Gunn: You're lucky.

Mr. SLATER: Perhaps I am fortunate in having closer contact with the Minister than has the member for Eyre: we get the attention our questions deserve. People in the Campbelltown area and on the other side of the river in Windsor Gardens are concerned about the delay in the

commencement of the construction of the bridge. One of the problems has been that the Campbelltown and Enfield councils had difficulty in the location of the approaches to the bridge, and also acquisition problems. It would have been necessary to demolish a public hall constructed by the Enfield council if the original plan for the bridge had been followed. However, after some delay both councils have agreed on the approaches and the location of the bridge and the Minister has told me that construction is expected to commence in 1974. Before this can be done, the Torrens River will have to be regraded and realigned both upstream and downstream from the bridge. The earthworks involved will be extensive because of the approaches to the bridge, and this will provide an elevated alignment. This part of Campbelltown covers a very pleasant area and the Highways Department has paid special attention to ensuring that the gum trees in the area are preserved. No doubt this will please the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Although I have referred to this structure as a bridge, it will be a twin curved bridge carrying three lift. (3.35 m) traffic lanes, with a median strip. The overall width will be 96ft. (29.28 m). The project is in the forward planning stage and construction will commence soon, no doubt pleasing the motorists who use the road fairly consistently.

Finally, I pay a tribute to my opponent in the recent State election campaign, Don Glazbrook. I understand that he is no longer living in my area, and although I do not agree with his political views I respect him as a man.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Is he still in the L.M.?

Mr. SLATER: I do not know whether he is still in the Liberal Movement, but I pay a tribute to him as a person. He has been my opponent on two occasions, first as a Liberal and Country League candidate and, I take it, as the L.M. candidate in the recent election. I understand he will not stand again because he has taken up business at Victor Harbor. I support the motion.

[Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.30 p.m.]

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): As part of its overall plan to change Australia into a Socialist republic, the Commonwealth Labor Government intends to destroy the present national health scheme and replace it with a totally different nationalized health scheme—

Mr. Crimes: You wouldn't exaggerate, would you?

Dr. TONKIN: If I thought it was a matter of exaggeration and not a matter of extreme importance to the people of Australia and South Australia I would not be talking on this subject. It is because of my deep concern, which obviously the member for Spence does not share, that I am going to say what I intend to say about the scheme. The Labor health scheme, which has been designed by doctors of philosophy and economics and not by doctors of medicine (not even one medical practitioner was a member of the Deeble committee), takes little or no account of the true welfare of the community or of individuals in it, and the scheme is being introduced purely as a matter of ideological change—for no other reason than because it is Labor Party policy. The Labor Party is unable to determine whether or not the present health scheme is working properly, because it will not consider the present health scheme.

Mr. Crimes: We have experienced it.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased for the honourable member, because he is obviously in excellent health and it is a credit to the present scheme that he is so well.

Mr. Langley: He can afford to pay, too.

Dr. TONKIN: I am not willing to enter into the financial affairs of the honourable member even if the member for Unley is. It is obvious that the member for Unley is indulging in the same procedure as every Labor politician has engaged in ever since the proposed Labor nationalized health scheme was first suggested. This is setting up a smoke screen confusing the issue and making it impossible for the average man in the street to understand exactly what is going on. It was most interesting to hear the member for Gilles speaking and parroting the Party line on the health scheme suggested by the Labor Government. He did it well, but only because he was reading from some publication. Obviously he did not hold any firm convictions about the matter, but he parroted the same old myths, the same old misleading statements, and I think that he almost believed them, or else he thought he did. Once again the major myth he propagated and tried to perpetuate was the old myth that we currently did not have a health scheme. This is so much poppycock and balderdash. It is not true, yet it is a myth that is being continuously sold by the Commonwealth Labor Government and by its cohorts in this House.

In the interests of drawing a cloud and smoke screen over the true issue of nationalized medicine, the Commonwealth Government has welcomed and has actively encouraged the present emphasis and controversy over doctors' fees. Led by the Prime Minister, whose efforts have been untiring in this matter during the last three or four years, and the Minister for Social Security, the pattern now becoming familiar of deliberate denigration and attack against any target set for destruction has been faithfully carried out against the medical profession. This emphasis on the fee issue and the denigration has been used to cloud the public mind of the real issues involved. The whole matter of health care has been made to sound so complicated that the average member of the general public is totally confused and is in no position to make any decisions, one way or the other, and this has been deliberately done.

Mr. Hopgood: By the A.M.A.

Dr. TONKIN: It has been done deliberately in a short time, and we can see from this evening's press that the Commonwealth Government is to spend large amounts of the taxpayers' money in further propaganda aimed at selling its own brand of socialized medicine. As the Government intends to send out all this propaganda on the nationalized health scheme, I now make the distinction between the national health scheme we currently have, and the proposed nationalized health scheme. The public will be tempted, because of the confusion that has been deliberately engendered by the Labor Party, to accept the Government's propaganda as being representative of the only solution to what is an artificially created problem. It is obvious that this Commonwealth Government will stop at nothing to institute nationalized medicine in Australia as one of the first parts of its overall programme of nationalization.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: I now intend to refer to some of the issues that have been raised, to explode some of the myths that have been deliberately allowed to develop regarding the present form of national health care.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: By interjecting, members opposite are contravening Standing Orders, and I will not contravene Standing Orders by replying to their interjections.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot reflect on the Chair in that way.

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, I do not in any way try to reflect on the Chair: I just make the observation that members opposite are obviously doing so. Regarding doctors' fees, I believe the profession has unwittingly fallen into the trap set for it by the Labor Government. Even at this stage some doctors are continuing to play into the Government's hands by failing to recognize the use the Government is making of their present fee claims. I cannot see why this should be considered to be a fair reason for them to stop their negotiation for a fair fee increase. The Australian Medical Association in its submission has made recommendations arrived at only after intensive study by financial experts.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Prejudiced experts employed by the A.M.A. for its own purposes.

Dr. TONKIN: I will have a few words to say about economists. I would expect the Minister to support the work of his colleagues, the doctors of philosophy and economics, who presume to dictate to this nation as to the standards of health care it should enjoy. The fee claimed by the members of the A.M.A. to be a fair one is based on a formula which takes into account practice expenses, cost of living and, in the case of South Australia, uniformity of fees with those in the Eastern States. This study has been made deliberately and most thoroughly, because A.M.A. members realize that they must document their claims for fee increases as the public has every right to know why fees are to rise. Mr. Hayden, the Commonwealth Minister, rejected these recommendations outright and then set up a tribunal to examine and report on medical fees. Today, we hear that the A.M.A. is to appear before the tribunal and will co-operate with it willingly and provide all the information it can give to that tribunal.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you support the Commissioner in South Australia?

Dr. TONKIN: If the Minister is content to listen quietly to me, he will hear what I have to say about the recommendations of Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs in South Australia. I will not be trapped by the members of this Labor Government into the same mistake of placing all the emphasis on doctors' fees, because that is how they are obscuring the true issue of the nationalization of health care in every sphere.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You do go on with the most incredible things.

Dr. TONKIN: The London School of Economics has produced many famous men, but the Minister of Education is not one of them. It is a very shrewd political move to refer the fees to a tribunal, because it means that the Commonwealth Government can drag up the fee issue at any time it wishes to. It will be a particularly appropriate time, from its point of view, and I suspect that the fee issue will deliberately be brought up again when the nationalization proposals come before the Commonwealth Government and nothing the Minister of Education can say will deflect me from my course on this. The Premier is aiding and abetting his Commonwealth colleagues by doing exactly the same thing: by referring the fee issue to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs in this State. This report, which was released last week, is a remarkable document.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You do not even sound sincere.

Dr. TONKIN: I am not concerned about whether or not I appear to be sincere to the Minister, as I do not depend on his good opinion, but there are several issues that I challenge in the report of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. I am looking at para-

graph 3. Although this is not set out as a term of reference, it is an important point that the Commissioner makes, and I think we can take it as a term of reference. In paragraph 3 he says:

The following information on the growth rate in net incomes of all classes of medical practitioners during the last few years, as given by the Minister for Social Security in the Federal Parliament on May 2, 1973, in reply to a question asked by Dr. R. E. Klugman, M.P., negates the A.M.A.'s assertion that substantial increases in medical fees are warranted.

That is a fairly good basis—a political answer to a political question! That is important, is it not? The Commissioner refers to the growth rate of the doctors' net incomes and finishes with this statement:

The average net incomes would now be: general practitioners—somewhat above \$19,000 a year; specialists—approaching \$30,000 a year; the most highly paid specialist (pathologists)—in excess of \$66,000 a year.

I cannot find any of these medical practitioners in South Australia. The Minister has got his figures all wrong, the reason being so that they can be used in a propaganda exercise; and that is exactly how they are being used. I cannot see how they can be based. The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs is acting in good faith, but I think he is being fed some terrible information.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The doctors have been telling lies, apparently.

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot see how any recommendation or report such as this can possibly retain its validity when it depends on a political reply given by the chief proponent of Labor's nationalized health scheme in answer to a political question. Indeed, the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs in his report quotes the Commonwealth Minister again when he justifies the recommendation for an increase in general practitioners' fees only. This appears in paragraph 8, on page 5. He quotes the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security, who "estimates", and so on. In the same paragraph he admits that due regard must be paid to the fact that they work many more hours a week than most people and that their services are required at any time of day or night. I go further and say that that applies also to most doctors, whether they be general practitioners or specialists.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What about someone I know who was milking cows one night by the light of a hurricane lamp?

Dr. TONKIN: But a hurricane lamp will not produce a smoke screen thick enough to obscure the issue, which is nationalized medicine. The Commissioner in his report also rejects moves for uniformity in South Australia. I do not hear any objection from members opposite. The Deeble report supported uniformity, and the builders workers unions are currently submitting a log of claims and taking industrial action in claiming uniformity, because they say that a bricklayer performs the same job in Sydney as a bricklayer does in Adelaide, and should be paid at the same rate.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you support that?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, I do. The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs gives figures for living costs and average weekly earnings, which are already out of date. In this regard I refer to the recently announced cost of living increases. Where were they the highest?—in South Australia. We are getting used to it. The cost differential, which the Labor Party said should not exist, is now being slowly but surely destroyed. It is fascinating to find that this Labor Government is supporting a cost differential which it says should not exist because it is not fair to the worker. It would be laughable, if it were not so serious,

to find this Government supporting the report's rejection of uniformity, when through the trade union movement it is supporting moves for uniformity in other wage claims.

There was no mention of cost of living and cost differentials in that case when the A.M.A. submitted its recommended fees, which were based on a formula which took into account the cost of living and the cost of practice and which was said to be, in this report, regarded by both the Commonwealth authorities and the Prices Branch itself as a reasonable formula. So the recommended fee increase arrived at by the A.M.A.'s financial adviser using this formula may be too high.

Mr. Langley: Do you question this?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not question this in the slightest degree, because I do not know: it may be too high. The proposed interim increase of 12½ per cent for general practitioners' fees recommended by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs may equally well be too low, particularly considering the political basis of some of his information and the overall rate of inflation since December, 1972, which is running at present at some 13 per cent.

Mr. Langley: Who laid the foundations for it?

Dr. TONKIN: The blame lies fairly and squarely at the door of the Commonwealth Labor Government. All the present fuss about doctors' fees could be avoided if—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: "If you just gave in to the doctors."

Dr. TONKIN: I thought the Minister was going to say, "If you just nationalized them", because that is what he had in mind.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true.

Dr. TONKIN: The present fuss about fees could be avoided if some mechanism were set up to allow for the constant review of medical fees, based on a formula geared to the cost of living and not dependent on the availability of Government revenue. As I believe that a Commonwealth Liberal Government would institute such an arrangement, I hope that such a Government has an opportunity to do so at the first possible moment. Doctors are now in a dilemma. They want and deserve just and fair fee increases; they do not want and they strongly resent political capital being made of their claims, and they do not like—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Indulging in politics?

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Glenelg has said many things about the Minister of Education, and I am starting to believe they are all true.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're putting such a bad case that I feel sorry for the doctors.

Dr. TONKIN: It seems to be worrying the Minister. Nevertheless, a deliberate attempt is being made by the Commonwealth Government to generate antipathy towards the medical profession. The Premier states that he has written a letter to both the Australian Medical Association and the General Practitioners Society asking for a guarantee that their members will conform to a fee increase of no more than 12½ per cent. He knows as well as I do that neither organization can give any guarantee or assurance for its members, as each organization has the power only to recommend fees. Certainly there is general conformity with the recommendations that come from these bodies, but a guarantee cannot be given. This immediately makes me ask why the letter was couched in these terms. Could it be that the Premier would like to impose price control on doctors' fees?

When one looks back to the overall aim of the Commonwealth Labor Government of nationalization at any cost, the answer immediately becomes clear, even to the member for Unley, who is trying to interject. Of course the Premier wants to impose price control. He will appear on television, or on the front steps of Parliament House if necessary, waving pieces of paper in his hand, dancing up and down and using the occasion to denigrate further the medical profession. I predict that he will use any excuse to impose price control in order to aid and abet his Commonwealth colleagues in nationalizing the medical profession. I repeat my warning to members of the medical profession. In spite of all the efforts being made by the Commonwealth and State Governments to keep the medical fees controversy alive, it must be settled as soon as possible so that the public arena may be cleared for the consideration of the true issues involved in the Commonwealth Government's proposals to change our national health scheme for a nationalized health scheme, with all the serious effects this would have on the standard of health care in our community.

Having dealt with the diversionary tactics, which represent the main line of attack the Commonwealth Government is adopting, I shall now look at the myths that are being propagated. Mr. Hayden is guilty of subtle, yet blatant, misrepresentation when he allows the first of these myths to be perpetuated. He has even gone on record as saying that Australia is one of the few advanced countries in the world without a universal health scheme.

Mr. Mathwin: Balderdash!

Dr. TONKIN: That is absolute balderdash. I suppose Mr. Hayden relies on the word "universal" to qualify his remark and get him off the hook. Of course we have a national health scheme in this country. It is astounding and a measure of the Commonwealth Government's activities in this field that an impression has been gained by many people over the last few months that we do not have a health scheme. It is argued that, because of the lack of a scheme, the Labor Party's nationalized health scheme should be introduced. It is appalling that this should happen, but the very success of the present health scheme has possibly proved its undoing in this regard. We take the present health scheme so much for granted because it works so well, is efficient, and promotes and preserves the highest possible standards of health care in Australia, standards which are famous and which are envied in every country throughout the world—

Mr. Crimes: It's 50 years behind the times.

Dr. TONKIN: —in spite of the expert opinion of the member for Spence. Why does the Commonwealth Government, by implication, deny that we have a national health scheme now? Obviously, once again, because it will stop at nothing; it will bend the truth to have its own ideologically-based scheme introduced. The myth of "no health scheme at present" has been perpetuated by such programmes as *Chequerboard*, which was shown some weeks ago on ABS2. I must make some allowance for the interviewer in Britain, as he was such a long way away, but I suspect that he was given the wrong terms of reference. This sort of thing has happened often. In the first part of the film we were shown a series of interviews with patients who all said how wonderful life was in Britain now that the national health scheme had been introduced, as opposed to the situation that existed before there was any such scheme. I agree that the introduction of the national health scheme in Britain represented an advance on the sort of health care that country had before. Unfortunately, it was the wrong sort of health care, and with the scheme

introduced the standard remains at a low level; to call it mediocre would be to praise it too highly. As I have worked under that scheme, I know exactly what I am talking about. Nevertheless, this television programme was slanted towards suggesting that Australia did not have a national health scheme. In the context that we do have a national health scheme, that whole segment of this programme was completely irrelevant.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Have you any constructive suggestions?

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased the Minister has asked me that, because I must tell him that a little later I will give a summary of them, and I will do so as simply as I can. In fact, the Australian form of health scheme is so superior to the British scheme that it is hard to believe. To see this, one has only to look at how many doctors have come to Australia from Britain to enjoy the high standards of health care here and to enjoy working here under our scheme.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: The point these doctors make beyond all others (and I hope the *Hansard* reporters can hear what I am saying above the noise) is that the doctor-patient relationship is so much better in Australia. These points were brought out later in the same programme. Perhaps they did not get their instructions right. These points were made by Australian doctors working in Britain. The first is that people cannot change their general practitioners easily: they may sign a form and apply. Here I should like members to be serious, because I can see that the member for Florey is really interested. A person may sign a form and apply for a transfer from one general practitioner's list to another, but the point is that his transfer depends on there being a vacancy on the list of the doctor to whom he wishes to transfer. That is the crux of the matter. The whole ability to transfer is governed by the number of doctors available to provide the services, and Britain has a shortage of doctors that is nearly as bad as our shortage of doctors here.

Mr. Slater: They come here to get on the band waggon.

Dr. TONKIN: We still have a shortage, and it is about time the honourable member realized that. The point was made that in Australia the general practitioner of one's choice chose a specialist carefully and that, in fact, one had a choice of specialist. In Britain, one takes whoever is available. One is very rarely able to choose.

Mr. Duncan: And people must do the same at Elizabeth. That's how crook the system is.

Dr. TONKIN: The remedy is in the hands of the people of Elizabeth at present, if any fault exists. If a nationalized health scheme were introduced, the people of Elizabeth would have no say whatever.

Mr. Duncan: We would still have a doctor.

Dr. TONKIN: Hospital scenes in Britain approximated those in public hospitals in Australia, including in South Australia, and patients were admitted from the patients' and outpatients' departments just as they would be here, but an Australian surgeon made the point that the national health scheme in Britain could not function (it could not have been started) without a large intake of foreign practitioners each year. He said that not enough local people were training in medicine nowadays, because not enough of those people were attracted by the long course involved (it is about seven or eight years), by the ultimate high responsibility, and by the low recompense for the measure of responsibility they took.

Mr. Duncan: You don't hear of many doctors starving to death.

Mr. Langley: What do they get—\$19,000.

Dr. TONKIN: I think the member for Unley would do well to listen. If a medical practitioner in Britain earned the equivalent of \$19,000 net, he would think he was on velvet.

Mr. Langley: What do they want here? Put that on the record.

Dr. TONKIN: I think the member for Unley may put himself on the record, but I am not sure for what. Another Australian doctor said that he missed the doctor-patient relationship in Britain. He was asked, "Would you like to see a national health service introduced in Australia?" This was a slanted question once again, as once again it implied, just according to the Labor Party's line, that we did not have a national health scheme in Australia at present. It was a slanted question but, even as such, the reply was that he would be unhappy, because patients would lose their right to choose their medical practitioner and their form of health care.

Mr. Crimes: They do now.

Dr. TONKIN: I am afraid that the member for Spence is going to do himself damage soon if he is not careful. The doctor made the point that Australian patients were very spoilt and that they expected personal care. This is right. Why should a person not expect personal care from his doctor? Why should not any member of this House or other person in the community expect personal care from his doctor?

Mr. Nankivell: I'll bet the member for Spence demands it.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sure the member for Spence would demand it. I have come across patients like him previously.

Mr. Crimes: I assure you I am not going to call on a specialist at your say so.

Dr. TONKIN: I am very relieved. Our present national health scheme has made it possible for us to expect and receive personal medical and health service. Why should this be changed, especially when the proposed change, as has been shown quite clearly in Britain, will destroy these important features of our medical service? It was because of the undesirable features of the British system that our former national health scheme was devised, and it has proved to be an outstanding success.

Mr. Duncan: For the doctors.

Dr. TONKIN: A scheme that proves to be a success for the doctors must also be a success for the patients.

Mr. Duncan: Not if they cannot afford to pay the doctors.

Dr. TONKIN: I made the point before the dinner adjournment, but unfortunately the member for Elizabeth was out of the Chamber, that anyone may at any time walk into the casualty department of any public hospital in this State or anywhere else in Australia and receive perhaps not instant service but the service they need and require, and that is my reply to the honourable member. If any patient walks into any public hospital in Britain, he will receive a lower standard of care. He will pay exactly the same amount or nothing, but the standard of care that he receives will be lower. I suggest that the member for Elizabeth do a little homework and start getting down to what people want, and I suggest that he start getting away from ideology and theory. It will do him good if he does those things. The present scheme has been reviewed constantly and was last upgraded in 1970. It needs little more to provide for everyone in the community to enjoy health care at its present high standard.

Mr. Langley: What about the people—

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the member for Unley interjected then, right on cue: he never misses. Pensioners and other low-income earners should be subsidized into the voluntary health insurance system on a graduated needs basis and, again, I believe that a Commonwealth Liberal Government would introduce such a scheme.

Mr. Langley: Why didn't that Government do it while it was in office for 23 years?

Dr. TONKIN: It has been estimated that all but 3.6 per cent of the population already has some form of cover for hospital treatment.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What about the others?

Dr. TONKIN: One can understand, and must make allowances for, the Minister, who has swallowed the Labor Party's national health scheme hook, line and sinker. He will not listen to any other point of view.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Thousands of people walking the streets today cannot afford to see a doctor.

Dr. TONKIN: I could reply to that, but you would find it offensive and out of order, Mr. Speaker. All but 3.6 per cent of the population have cover for medical treatment, when the various pensioner schemes are taken into account. The present scheme preserves the freedom of the patient to choose his general practitioner or specialist and his form of hospital care, and it preserves the doctor-patient relationship, which is so important in the management of illness.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're putting up about the weakest case I've heard for the doctors. They couldn't possibly have chosen you to put their case here this evening.

Dr. TONKIN: I speak for the community.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I wonder whether the Minister will move that I have an extension of time if I require it: he has taken up about 10 minutes of my speaking time. The present scheme is administered efficiently, as the Nimmo report found. I suggest that members opposite read that report: perhaps they have forgotten it. It is administered efficiently by a series of non government health fund organizations and these organizations are co-operative or mutually organized, and the assets that accumulate belong to the members.

Mr. Crimes: They handle the funds and invest where they want to.

Dr. TONKIN: What is wrong with that? Someone ought to give the member for Spence a few lessons in economics. I am sorry that the Minister of Education is not in the Chamber. The voluntary insurance scheme continues to attract support from the community, and this is what really hurts the Labor Party. As there is a continuing demand for membership within these funds, enrolments are increasing. Not only that, but there is a continuing demand for increased levels of insurance. In other words, more and more people are demanding and accepting private medical care because they want higher and higher standards of medical care. What on earth is wrong with wanting higher standards of medical care? I cannot understand the Government; it wants the lowest standards spread over the whole population, whereas we want to pull everyone up to the highest possible standards. Members opposite will not agree, and I do not understand them.

Mr. Crimes: You want us to be satisfied with what we have, but we are not satisfied.

Dr. TONKIN: If the Labor Party is dissatisfied with features of the present system, it should introduce improvements such as those I have outlined. But why change a

system, which has proved over the years that it can work well, simply to satisfy an ideological obsession to destroy everything that involves freedom of choice in the interests of nationalization? That is what it amounts to, and that is the whole aim of the exercise, no matter how the Government rationalizes it. The proposed Government nationalized health scheme will not only involve loss of freedom of choice but will be administered by a monolithic Government department. There will not be anything like it. It will be so big. We are told that it will use an enormous computer, and everyone in Australia will be allotted a seven or eight-figure number: that is all the patient will be under this system, a number!

The hospital care that will be provided will be at public hospital level, and anyone wishing to take advantage of private hospital treatment will have to insure in just the same way as is done now, but it will be in addition to the proposed 1.35 per cent levy on taxable income. That figure is the biggest laugh of all time. Even now we are told that out of Consolidated Revenue an additional \$1.50 will have to come for every \$1 raised by that levy. Labor members are born optimists. This is the present figure quoted, but it seems certain that additional funds will have to be made available, and they will have to come from the taxpayer's pocket again. If our costs follow the pattern of health care costs in the United Kingdom, where the cost has now risen to \$100 a head of population, a health levy to approximate that expenditure here would need to be about 10 per cent, not a 1.35 per cent levy on taxable income.

Mr. Keneally: Who will pay the increased doctor's fees—the taxpayer?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think that the member for Stuart has been following my argument. In its first year of operation the United Kingdom scheme cost three times as much as it was estimated it would cost, and this experience was repeated also in Canada. No doubt our health services would cost us much more, and it does not matter what the Commonwealth Minister says about the average man in Australia having to pay less for health care. This is rubbish, because he will find himself paying more. Why cannot he continue to pay into the present scheme and enjoy the highest possible standards of health care? Because of the demand for public beds, and because this would be the only form of accommodation allowable under the Government's levy scheme, private hospitals will also be forced to provide public beds. This is significant in South Australia, where we are fortunate that we have a high standard of private hospital care available to the community, in both church and community hospitals. Private hospital accommodation will become more difficult to obtain and, with increasing costs and the additional private insurance that will become necessary, patients will be precluded from seeking private hospital care because of the expense. This is an odd situation for a Socialist Government that says it wants to improve conditions for everyone. If there are to be enough public beds, our private hospitals will have to be taken over. Let me deny the second major myth in the Government's propaganda campaign that the proposed nationalized health scheme would be free. Nothing in this world is free, and we, as taxpayers, will, as I have already said, pay through the nose for health care of a lower standard. Any system that takes as its basis the lowest common denominator in health care must be of a lower quality than that which aims to provide the highest possible health care, which is provided by our present system. The thing that concerns me most of all is the loss of the doctor-patient relationship. That relationship is something that

the Government obviously does not understand. Government members will demand it from their doctor when they are ill or insecure or when in need of help. Although I am not happy to say it, I feel confident in saying that all members will at some stage be ill, even with a terminal illness, and at that stage every Government member, even the Attorney-General will welcome a high standard of doctor-patient relationship.

The Hon. L. J. King: It can't happen to me!

Dr. TONKIN: Everyone says, "It can't happen to me," but it can happen to everyone, and it will happen, because death is a sad feature of life. The doctor-patient relationship is well recognized as a bond of trust that grows between the doctor and his patient. The patient will recover without it, but it is a comforting thing in times of sickness and stress to be able to fall back on that bond of trust, which doctors recognize as a vital part in the recovery process. I realize that the economic theorists do not take any notice of what doctors think about health care. I am wondering when we will see our local economists setting up a private practice in which to treat people's illnesses. Some doctors are better able to establish this understanding with their patients than are others, but in a full-time salaried medical service the effort may not be made.

Mr. Duncan: It depends on where you live; doesn't it?

Dr. TONKIN: Anywhere in Britain you will find that you get somewhat miserable service. As I have worked under the scheme in Britain, I suggest that the member for Elizabeth go there and obtain his medical care and let the people of Elizabeth and Australia enjoy our present high standards. Recently, I took a new partner into my practice. He told me that the position in Britain had not changed in any way from what it was when I was there 15 years ago.

Mr. Coumbe: Did you work under that scheme?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and I was not proud to work under it. It is a soul-destroying scheme for patients and doctors alike, and that will happen here if we let it. The first to squeal will be those who have been so vocal on the other side. Australian patients are spoilt and fussy, and demand personal attention. I believe it is their right to do so, just as I believe it is the doctors' responsibility to give this attention. The Commonwealth Government's proposed health scheme was designed by economists, and I am sure they see nothing out of the ordinary in allotting all patients a computer number and treating them as elements in a computer programme. I think perhaps all economists should read a compulsory subject during their course in psychology and human relations. This may enable them to understand personal reactions more clearly and more sympathetically.

Mr. Keneally: What about showing a bit more humility.

Dr. TONKIN: If the member for Stuart does not believe that a doctor, faced with a patient with an incurable disease for which he can do nothing and about which he has to break the news to the patient, does not know what humility is, then I suggest that the honourable member is totally devoid of feeling and decency. Doctors get many of the dirty jobs. A recent letter in the *Advertiser* on July 28, 1973, from Mr. J. Davies, Tutor in Economics, University of Adelaide, demonstrated clearly the workings of the economist's mind when he said that he believed that there must be a deficiency in the present service if doctors considered that there would be an over-utilisation of their services under the new scheme if it appeared to be free. Mr. Davies may be an expert with figures, but it is obvious that he knows very little about human nature.

Over-utilization of health services is a well-known and documented phenomenon that has been experienced in Britain, New Zealand, and Canada, and there is no reason to suppose that it would not follow the introduction of the Government's nationalized health proposals here. This, and the standards set for average health care, are the major factors in lowering the standards of health service delivery under such schemes. Patients who urgently need reassurance deserve to receive it, and the present system in no way inhibits patients from seeking help. It has, quite obviously, however, been most successful in preventing over-utilization of health services, making sure that those who have a real need for medical care receive it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who said that?

Dr. TONKIN: We have another person coming in on cue in the place of the Minister of Labour and Industry, and I am grateful to the Minister. The Bright report, recently released, lays down four criteria of a good health service. They are humanity, imagination, universality, and economy, and they are placed deliberately in that order. In every way, our present health scheme is suitable, when considered under these headings. Improvements may certainly be made, but they can be made with a minimum of fuss and without the massive disruption that would result if the Labor Party's proposals were accepted.

I urge everyone in this State who values our present high standards of health care, who values the personal relationship that he has with his doctor, particularly when he is ill and in need, to reject this proposed change from an efficient system, which yet allows a satisfactory doctor-patient relationship, to an impersonal, ideologically designed form of computer health care.

Mr. Speaker, it is your health and the health of every member of the community that is at stake, and it is your life and the life of every member of the community that is at stake. We must not let Labor politicians ruin either. I support the remarks made by other members concerning the late Hon. R. E. Hurst and the late Hon. H. K. Kemp. I add my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your office, and I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Life is full of surprises: for example, half an hour ago I would never have guessed that I would—

Mr. Nankivell: You were hanging people half an hour ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am flattered that the member for Mallee has been watching television. I said that life was full of surprises, and the first surprise of many is that half an hour ago I did not think I would be congratulating the member for Bragg. That is something I do not often do now, but I must congratulate him for his sentiments, because he is the first Liberal and Country League member to follow the lead of the member for Goyder in this matter. It is the first occasion for some time that he has followed him. On July 11, an article by the member for Goyder appeared in the *News* headed "Health, the big issue of nationalization".

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who wrote it for him?

Mr. Becker: Ernie Crimes!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The article began as follows:

The plan by the Labor Government to alter Australia's medical and health scheme is fundamentally designed to begin the nationalization of our health services.

As I understand the member for Bragg, that was the lead he was following this evening, and I congratulate him on it. I am now confident that the honourable member will

support the motion to be moved by the member for Goyder on this topic, and I am glad that we will at least have his support from amongst L.C.L. members. Secondly, I am mildly surprised to be speaking in this debate as early as this. Sitting in this position on the nearest we have in this House to cross-benches, one never quite knows what is going to happen.

Mr. Venning: You are given the chance pretty often.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly must pay you, Mr. Speaker, the respectful compliment of saying that you have given us a very fair go, but that is not one of the matters that surprises me. In the 18 years that I have been a member of this House, I have progressed (if that be the word) from the position now occupied by the member for Salisbury, which was graced by me for one session, down that side of the House, and around to here.

The Hon. L. J. King: And out through the door!

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Listen to L.C.L. members now: no doubt they wish it were true. I am mildly surprised because I am speaking as early as this, but when I come to think of it I should not be surprised, because, notoriously, members of the L.C.L. are never ready to debate the Address in Reply motion, so that it was not too hard for me to get in as the fourth member on this side on the first day of the debate.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It may be because its hard to criticize the Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nothing in the L.C.L. has changed, because most of its members were not ready to speak this evening.

Mr. Gunn: That is untrue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My third reason for being surprised is that the Leader of the L.C.L. (or the Leader of the Opposition, as his title is in this place) so far ignored political reality in his speech this afternoon as not to refer to the changes that had taken place in politics from the centre to the right in this State. One cannot help feeling that was a rather inadequate response to the challenge of the present situation. I do not propose to ignore what has happened, for the benefit of the member for Alexandra, and I hope he will listen to what I have to say about the situation.

I propose to speak about it for three reasons. First of all, I hope that, whatever else I am, I am a realist, and I believe that reality on our side of politics should be faced. I believe that the present situation should be explained and that there is no reason to duck it or to try to avoid it in any way. I remember only too well the sensation I had when, for the first time, I saw myself described as a Liberal Movement member in one of the documents of the House—the green sheet on which our names, addresses, and Parties are set out. It was a strange sensation after having been in the L.C.L. for so long. But there it was, and the situation must be faced by us all. Secondly, I am glad that we have in the gallery tonight a good sprinkling of L.M. supporters from a group which used to have an L.M. member, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Keneally: Are you referring to Davenport?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the member for Stuart can guess, and he could have five guesses and be pretty close to the mark. Thirdly, I propose to deal with the present situation because there really is so little new in His Excellency's Speech as to make it hardly worth a comment. However, in case Government members should be disappointed I promise them that, if time lasts, I shall have something to say about them in a moment. The origins of the present situation on this side of politics go back to

the early 1930's and to the amalgamation of the old Liberal Federation, as I believe it was called, and the then Country Party of South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The L.C.L. always has been a strange mixture, right back to the early days.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister will contain himself he will see whether or not I agree with that interjection. The price of that amalgamation was a very strong (indeed a preponderant) influence of the country members of the new League.

Mr. Nankivell: How could it be otherwise? There were 26 country seats and 13 city seats.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps this is the fourth surprise I am going to get tonight—some support from the member for Mallee. It had been confidently expected before the amalgamation took place that the country element would not dominate the new Party. However, and unfortunately, for a generation it did dominate and it continues to do so. That in itself is not necessarily a bad thing, but the unfortunate result is that, because most country people are conservatively inclined (and I do make that as a generalization without reflecting on any individual), the Party which they dominate came to be conservatively inclined and to be seen by the electorate to be so inclined, and it has steadily lost ground in the electorate ever since. That is the fundamental cause of the problem.

For many years a number of us within the Party tried to do something to correct this situation. For 10 or 15 years we tried. We failed, and all this came out into the open, as my honourable friends in the L.C.L. will acknowledge, with the resignation from the Leadership of the member for Goyder. There was such a reaction amongst Liberals and others in his favour that it led to the formation of the Liberal Movement which was to be, as many of us hoped, an organized group working largely within the L.C.L. to reform it and to gain control of it, and in that we almost succeeded at the annual meeting of delegates, as it was called, last September, We failed by about 64 votes in about 1,100 to get the Presidency.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: And you are sad and disillusioned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will see about that. The next step I will mention—and there are plenty of others I will not mention—was the passing by the State council, in the teeth of my opposition and the opposition of many others, of two resolutions which meant that those of us who were members of the L.M. either had to stand up for what we believed and what we had said we believed, or knuckle under. Some of us chose to stand up for what we believed. I may say that I have never regretted, from the moment I made it, the decision I took. I believe it was the right one and the honourable one; whether it will be the successful one is quite another matter, and only time will tell. That, briefly, is what has brought us to our present situation in this State. What, then, is our aim now? When I say "our aim" I mean the aim of the Liberal Movement. It is that the Liberal and Country League should break up into its original parts, into Liberals and Country Party; that is the aim we have set before us and the aim we can see being achieved at the present time, whatever denials may be made by members of the L.C.L.

We are often asked how we compare ourselves with the L.C.L. It is difficult to make a comparison between the two. We have adopted a declaration of aims which marks us, I believe, as a true Liberal Party. That, certainly, is our intention for it. Unfortunately, it is not possible to go to any writing in the L.C.L. and see what

sort of a Party it is. One of the problems about the L.C.L. always has been that it cannot be pinned down; one cannot find anywhere its policies, its outlook, its philosophy, anything. That makes it extraordinarily difficult to draw a comparison between the L.M. and the L.C.L., and that is why I have gone over the fundamentals of the matter tonight.

We see in the future in South Australia two Parties to the right of centre of politics. We aim to co-operate with the Country Party, which was formed again as a separate Party in South Australia about 10 years ago. That aim, too, is being fulfilled. I know, as does every honourable member in this House, of the exchange of preferences that will take place and certainly is requested by both of those Parties at the Southern by-election in 10 days from now. That is the first example, the first concrete result of the co-operation between the two Parties, and I know very well how ill certain members in the L.C.L. have taken it. But that is a pattern for the future. It is no longer possible in this State for one Party to succeed and at the same time to contain both elements, Liberals and Country Party, without one dominating the other to the defeat of both. That situation must be accepted, acknowledged and acted upon. That is what we have done.

Mr. Hall: I think Sir Robert Menzies has a view on that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am prompted by the member for Goyder to mention the remark of Sir Robert Menzies, because what we want to see, as has been said several times in the past few months, is co-operation and partnership with the Country Party while we are in Opposition and when, combined, we have a majority, as we shall in due course in this House and elsewhere, a coalition in Government. The only way that will be achieved is by our having separate organizations acknowledging that we disagree on many things, but agreeing to disagree and respecting each other for our disagreements about the views we express. That is what has worked at the Commonwealth level and also in a number of other States.

Mr. McAnaney: It has not worked too well over the last 20 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Heysen says that it did not work too well over the last 20 years—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It was a marriage of convenience.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Politics make strange bed-fellows.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remind the Minister and other members opposite that they can start crowing when the Labor Party has been in office in Canberra for over 20 years, and I bet it will never happen. Sir Robert Menzies was absolutely right last week when he told the Victorian Liberal Party to come to its senses and work in co-operation with the Country Party. As in any partnership, whether it be a partnership of marriage, business or politics, there will always be the rough times as well as the smooth times, because that is human nature. I am convinced that this is the only workable solution to the political situation in this State and throughout Australia. In the light of what I have said, what should be our attitude towards the Liberal and Country League in this House? It is not easy to avoid the temptation to recriminate. We must not do that, nor must we show ill-will toward any individual, whatever privately we may think, whatever that individual's attitude may be to us. Indeed, I could say a bit about that if I wanted to. Squabbling and disunity, whatever the rights and wrongs of the squabble may be, are always a

disaster, and I said as much at the declaration of the poll at Mitcham after the last election. The sooner our present situation is resolved and we get to a workable arrangement, which I believe to be the sensible solution of two separate Parties working together, the better I will be pleased.

Mr. Payne: It's too late: Hickinbotham got the pre-selection.

Mr. Langley: You will get the preferences, and that's the main thing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I may say a word or two about that in due course. I have given my view of the situation and have set it out as plainly as I can. I have done so, because I believe it is necessary that we should face reality, and I hope, indeed, that some of my friends, if so they be in the Liberal and Country League, will follow my lead and make some contribution and not ignore what is the paramount issue on this side of politics at the present time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They just hope you will go away.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that is probably right, but they are wrong—we will not go away. We have no intention of doing that. Having said that, I want to make it clear that I bear no individual any ill-will. Indeed, if I have shown any irritation towards any individual in this place—

Mr. Langley: That is understandable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be, but I am sorry and I shall try to avoid doing so in the future. I try to regard every member in this place, whatever his Party, as a friend, and I to my friends in the Liberal and Country League that I will talk to anyone at any time in an effort to improve the present situation, because none of us must ever forget that the real enemy, our real political enemy, is the Australian Labor Party: all we should do is aim to get the Labor Party out of office at both State and Commonwealth level.

Mr. Max Brown: You have a fair job on your hands.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: And we will succeed in that job. Whether the member for Whyalla will be here to see it I do not know.

Mr. Langley: I don't think I'll be here.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Unley will be gone by then and his seat will be taken by a Liberal Movement member. That is our aim, because we believe that a Government based on the principles of Liberalism, supported by our Country Party friends, is the best sort of Government for this State and for the Commonwealth, and is a far better Government than a Government based on Socialism which is simply State control. I believe that in a perverse sort of way we are now in a delightful situation, because people in the community make no distinction between State and Commonwealth levels of politics. If Governments are of the same political complexion the good and much more of the bad rubs off on each of them, and that is the situation applying now. We now have a Labor Party Government at both State and Commonwealth levels. The present State Labor Government and State Labor Party can no longer indulge in that glorious pastime of blaming the Commonwealth Government for every mistake it makes and for everything that goes wrong in South Australia. It has now to stand up to the fact that its own Party colleagues comprise the Government in Canberra, and what those colleagues do wrong will rub off on them.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: They are going very well.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Labour and Industry says that they are going very well, but I should like to refer to four examples and see how well the Commonwealth Government is doing in each of those fields. I refer first to the economic situation in Australia. It has been often

said that political history in Australia shows that Labor Governments almost always go into office inheriting a Treasury in a sound and satisfactory condition. They spend the money and leave the Treasury in an appalling condition for their opponents to work like mad and get it back into good condition when they are booted out so that the cycle can be repeated. That is exactly what is happening today. There is in Australia at the moment galloping inflation, and let no member opposite deny that, and let no member opposite delude himself into thinking that this is not the cardinal political issue in people's minds at the moment, because it is, and members opposite know that it is.

The Commonwealth Government has the responsibility for the economy of Australia and has done not one thing effectively about it. Indeed, the reverse is true: it has fed inflation. The only action the Commonwealth Government has taken has been to cut tariffs by 25 per cent. It is obvious from the reaction of the State Government here that there was absolutely no consultation between them, despite what we were told about consultation between friends and members of the same political Party. There was no consultation whatever before that step was taken and no thought was given to the effect it would have on a State like South Australia. Even the Premier, despite his loyalty to his Commonwealth colleagues, had to say that he was "worried" by the situation. One remembers the sort of thing the Premier used to say when there was a Liberal and Country Party coalition Government in Canberra and something went wrong. What did we have in 1970? We had the Labor Party advertising a map of Australia with South Australia cut out. It said, "Put South Australia back on the map." What is it going to say now? We all know that the cut in tariffs will greatly damage South Australia's economy. Let no-one deny it—and I notice that no-one does deny it. It has been done by a Labor Government in Canberra, three Ministers of which are South Australians.

When I was moving my office, as I have done several times in the last few months, I came across a little pamphlet (it is not the Labor Party's Rules, either) which states:

On cost of living, for South Australia's sake vote Labor. Several prices are crossed out and higher prices put alongside them. This is what was said inside the pamphlet, which was used at the 1970 election:

Prices skyrocket, taxes increase under L.C.L. Government. How can the average family pay its way?

It went on to state—and let any honourable member tell me whether this is honest or dishonest:

The L.C.L. Government has drastically reduced the number of goods under price control. Control was lifted on some 32 items including many building materials, clothing, soft drinks and cooking utensils. As a result, prices have risen alarmingly on a wide range of items and services. Building materials have increased by 8.3 per cent.

What has the increase been since Labor has been in power—15 per cent or more? The pamphlet continues:

Clothing by 7½ per cent and soft drinks by 1c a bottle. Price increases have cut into every area of family budgeting; train and bus fares have increased, bread is up, water rates and sewerage rates have been increased.

Well, they have been increased even more under Labor. The pamphlet continues:

In addition to all this, seven entirely new State taxes were imposed on the South Australian public. This L.C.L. "Free-for-all" must be curbed and only a Labor Government can do it. A Labor Government will administer the Prices Act to protect the purchasing power of money in this State.

Well, what did the Government do; what has it done? That is rank dishonest advertising, and members opposite know it. Only the Minister of Labour and Industry is silly enough to try to interject. If we go to the back of the pamphlet we see it set out in a little more detail:

Price increases and taxes under L.C.L. Government. New taxes.

Then the taxes are set out that the L.C.L. Government was obliged to impose. Then:

Price increases.

Let me run through the items, and I challenge members opposite to deny that there have not been further increases since they came into office:

Bread, milk, butter, meat, building materials, joinery, trains, buses, university, doctors, clothing, petrol, hair-dressers, water—

and let the Minister say a few words on water when he gets up to speak—

sewerage, liquor prices, fishing licences, icecream, soft drinks, boat licences, abalone licences, and newspapers.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: And wages.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There are all those things, and members opposite are trying to chime in. They knew when they wrote that pamphlet what the situation was and what it would be. It is as bad as the Dartmouth controversy; they were dishonest enough on that, too. It was not very long after they came into office that things changed. I have here a photostat copy of a letter from the Premier, written to a trade union judging by the way it ends up, "Yours fraternally, Don Dunstan, Premier." This is what the Premier said:

Dear friend, I'm writing at private expense to explain why the Government has been forced into imposing new revenue measures—

and this within a few months, if my memory serves me correctly, of the Labor Government coming into office. He goes on to canvass the situation, and ends in this way. Having said that the "tall poppies" (to use his phrase) had been taxed to the limit in South Australia—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: He was not referring to you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No; I do not presume to be one of the "tall poppies". I seem to have got under the Minister's skin. Let me go on. This is how the Premier completed his letter:

We've had to turn to the only areas of additional taxation now left after having taxed the tall poppies this year. This means increased taxes and charges, which affect the family man.

Bear in mind what he had said in his pamphlet a few months previously. The letter continues:

We see no way out. The Labor Government will not cut essential services its people demand and which John Gorton couldn't care less about.

At that time he could still blame the Commonwealth Government, but he cannot now. Yet the same thing is going on all the time, with increasing rapidity. My guess is that the Commonwealth Government, unable to control the rise in wages which goes on continually, will be able to do nothing effective about the inflation we are experiencing in Australia. The political result to the Labor Party will be disastrous. The tragedy of it is that it will be a disaster for Australia as well. That is the first matter I mention. Let the Minister of Labour and Industry, if he likes, reply to what I have said. After all, it is within his department; he is the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Let me now deal with another matter, which my friend from Davenport this afternoon dealt with—centralism. The federal platform of the A.L.P. being what it is, it is impossible for a Labor man at one and the same time to

be loyal to his Party and be a good South Australian. That is exactly the situation.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Payne: You are a defector.

Mr. Wright: You are a renegade from your own Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is interesting that the only rejoinder I get from members of the Labor Party is abuse from the members for Adelaide and Mitchell. I get no argument, no refutation of what I have said—simply abuse, in the hope that it will put me off.

Mr. Payne: Don't leave the House tomorrow night because I will be speaking and will tell you about it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the member for Mitchell will allow me to give him the material and ammunition he needs in order to speak. Let me refer him to the platform of his Party under "Constitutional matters", and particularly paragraph 2, which states:

To clothe the Commonwealth of Australia with such plenary powers as are necessary and desirable to achieve international co-operation, national planning and the Party's economic and social objectives.

That could mean the world or nothing. The next paragraph states—

Mr. Langley: At least we have a rule book. What about you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think it is necessary for me to go on with these quotations: honourable members opposite are fully aware of their centralist philosophy. At least the Prime Minister is honest enough to make no bones about his centralist philosophy. Certainly there should be a revision of the Commonwealth Constitution, which is out of balance, but I do not believe we are yet ready to abandon federalism. What it would mean (and I challenge members opposite to deny this) if State Parliaments and Governments were abolished, as the Labor Party would like them to be, is that people in States such as South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania would be completely without an effective voice at the centre. Members opposite know that we would be dominated by the Sydney-Melbourne axis; it would be curtains for people living in the areas to which I have referred.

Mr. Wright: That's a stupid argument, and you know it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will see what the people of South Australia think about it in due course. It is rather interesting to see what the people of Western Australia are thinking now about the matter and what poor old Mr. John Tonkin is saying about it at present. Let the member for Adelaide answer that, if he can. The Labor Premier of Western Australia has admitted that the centralism of the Commonwealth Government is one of the causes (and there are plenty of others) of the decline of Labor fortunes in his State. There is no doubt whatever about that. Labor members must sooner or later declare whether they adhere to the policy and platform of their Party (and I have reminded them of this this evening) or whether they intend to be true South Australians and champion the interests of this State, as they are elected to do.

Mr. Wright: This is one country, not six States.

Mr. Crimes: Don't you believe in Australia? You want to cut us up into fragments.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What about the Citizen Military Forces?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister has brought me to the third point I wish to canvass: the question of defence. I do not intend to say much about this, for it is a matter predominantly within the Commonwealth sphere.

Mr. Wright: Tell us about Bjelke-Petersen.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Understandably, the member for Adelaide is living in the past.

Mr. Wright: Tell us about Bjelke-Petersen's saying that Queensland would secede from the Commonwealth.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He said that it might secede from the Commonwealth. I will try again to get on to my third point.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: How extraordinary is the abuse I am getting from the Labor Party members. At the last election, that Party promised to improve conditions for the C.M.F. After it came into office, no doubt wondering how to do that, the Commonwealth Government set up a committee under Dr. Tom Miller (I believe it is a good committee) to inquire and advise on what should be done with regard to the C.M.F. and the Australian Cadet Corps. Nevertheless, at the federal executive meeting of the Party a resolution was passed to abolish all military training in educational institutions. This was a most extraordinary thing to do. The Commonwealth Government set up a committee to inquire into these matters, yet the result of the inquiry is to be presumed and action, according to the federal executive, is to be taken immediately, without waiting for the committee to meet.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Are you a Major now or a Lance Corporal?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently the Minister does not want to hear what I am saying, which must hurt a bit if it makes him carry on in this childish manner. Although he is supposed to be in charge of the House, he continues to make these inane interjections. The fact is that this decision was taken in the teeth of the opposition of the Prime Minister. It shows the strength of the left wing of the Labor Party on the federal executive. I know that the resolution was swept under the carpet at the conference; it was not brought forward, on the pretext that there was no time to deal with it. It will be interesting to see how long this situation lasts. I now wish to deal with my fourth point.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Are you a Colonel or a Lance Corporal?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the childishness of the Minister's interjections—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad of your protection.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell us your salary.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will tell the Minister a few other things if he is not careful.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Does the member for Mitcham get extra time for his speech to make up for the time he has lost while members opposite have interjected?

The SPEAKER: The answer is "No". The honourable member for Mitcham,

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My fourth point, which we will have an opportunity to debate later at greater length, relates to the question of education, especially the question of Government aid to independent schools. I have read assiduously many times the policy speech given by Mr. Whitlam before the last election. There was not one hint in that speech that any aid given to an independent school would be reduced or cut out. Indeed, I believe (I cannot give the quotation for this) that Mr. Whitlam said straight-out before the election that there would not be any reduction in any aid then being given.

We know that he and the Commonwealth Minister for Education (Mr. Beazley) were out-voted in Cabinet, the

decision taken being to cut down, or cut out altogether in the case of some schools, that aid. I have no doubt whatever that the aim of the Labor Party is to destroy the independent school system in Australia. We get back to the Premier's phrase: the tall poppies. The Labor Party would like to cut down all the tall poppies, as it sees them, in Australia; one way in which it believes it can do this is by destroying independent schools. I have no doubt that that is their objective. I use this as an example of outright dishonesty on the part of the Government in making a definite promise before the election and then callously and deliberately breaking it within a few months.

Mr. Duncan: That's a dishonest statement.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Elizabeth has already spoken in this debate, but he will have other opportunities to speak. I remind him that I have a motion on the Notice Paper to which he will be able to speak in due course. I hope he does that. I shall end my speech by giving one example of something that is a little closer to home. I am a little puzzled by it and do not know quite what to make of it. I refer to the matter of dial-a-bus. As a result of the questions on notice that I asked of the Minister of Transport, which were replied to today, I now know that at least \$30,000 has been spent by the Government on dial-a-bus.

Mr. Venning: Shocking!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Rocky River says that it is shocking, and I think that he is right. The Government has pinned its hopes to dial-a-bus since it has come to office. That was to be the answer to the transport problem of metropolitan Adelaide. The Government even acknowledges now that it has gone, that the money has apparently been wasted and we have nothing in its place.

Mr. Venning: They couldn't care less.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not quite agree with that. I consider that Government members are worried about this matter, and well they may be, because there is much more that has not yet come out on dial-a-bus.

Mr. Wright: You're not accusing the Minister of being dishonest, are you? He replied to your questions today, so don't accuse him of being dishonest, when he is not in the House to defend himself.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not my fault that the Minister is not in the House. He could easily have been here if he had wanted to be.

Mr. Wright: If you accuse the Minister of being dishonest, I say you are dishonest.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For the benefit of the member for Adelaide, I say that I do not accept that, if the Minister is not in the House when I am making a speech, I cannot discuss his actions and activities. If Ministers choose to be out of the Chamber (and all but one of them are out of the Chamber at the moment) that is their bad luck and I will not be inhibited by it. If the advice that the Government had was against dial-a-bus, as I believe it to have been, it was very wrong of the Government to allow (indeed, to encourage) a private operator to go ahead with a dial-a-bus system, and it was far more seriously wrong for the Government to put money into it, yet that is precisely what has happened.

The member for Adelaide has said that my questions on notice were replied to. I put a few more questions about this matter on the Notice Paper today and I will be waiting with interest to see what replies I get to them, because I consider that this Government's transport policy, so far as there has been one, is a complete and utter failure: it is a shambles. Nothing is left of it, because the only thing that

this Government added to what we were doing was this matter of dial-a-bus and now even that has been shown to be absolutely nonsensical and impracticable. Those are the five matters to which I wish to refer about the Government and the colleagues in Canberra of Government members, because they are all banded up together, as we will see as time goes on—

Mr. Wright: At least we are one Party, not four.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will see about that. We have some knowledge of what went on at the Labor Party conference.

Mr. Payne: Don't forget that the doors are open at the A.L.P. meetings and conferences.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think I have ever said otherwise. If I have, I have forgotten the occasion. I have never criticized the Labor Party for Jetting the press in. I have mentioned the sorts of thing that will bring down the Labor Governments in South Australia and in the Commonwealth Parliaments. I acknowledge that at present both Governments are riding on the crest of the wave.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Without a gerrymander, remember.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A short time after last year's Commonwealth election I met Mr. Bill Hayden (Minister for Social Security in the Commonwealth Parliament).

Mr. Wright: I'm surprised he spoke to you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He was very pleasant to me and I congratulated him on his appointment and said I knew exactly how he felt. It is a most exhilarating feeling to be in office, at the beginning anyway; but the problems catch up and they will catch up with him as well as with this Government in South Australia. I wish to say one other thing before concluding. We shall not rely on the mistakes and dishonesty of the Government opposite us.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I must take a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member accuses this Government of being dishonest. He said he hoped to gain office because of the dishonesty of the present Government.

The SPEAKER: I cannot sustain the point of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not say for one moment that we will triumph because of the mistakes of our opponents. We will succeed in the long run because of the intrinsic value and worth of our political philosophy and I believe that, when we do succeed, we shall be able to form a Government that will be far better than either the present State Government or the present Commonwealth Government. Our success will be in the best interests of the people of this State and of Australia.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): First, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker. With you, I regret the circumstances that made such an appointment necessary and I join with all other members in mourning the passing of our friend Reg Hurst, but I do congratulate you on having been accorded this honour. We have already seen examples of your fairness and strength in controlling the House.

I also congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion on their promising beginnings to their Parliamentary careers here. In a very real sense, of course, those beginnings had already been made in what is probably the more important aspect of their political activity, which occurs outside this place. However, it is good to see also the way they quickly settled into their roles in this Chamber.

The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon paid my colleague the member for Elizabeth, the mover of the motion, a considerable compliment by singling him out for some treatment. It was treatment which that honourable member was well able to absorb and which doubtless he will return in kind in due course. I thought it was a considerable compliment to pay to a new member to single him out in this way.

We have had, and we are still moving through, stirring times in South Australian politics. It would be true to say that some men sat in this place for 25 years without seeing anything like the upheavals that have taken place in South Australian politics over the past four or five years. Everyone is asking whether we are returning to a period of stability under Labor, rather than having a period of stability under Liberal dominance. They ask whether a Dunstan decade seems assured, to quote the last line from a very widely read publication on South Australian politics. When we consider the history of electoral politics in this State over a long period, we find variations in the degree of stability that there has been. For example, we know that from 1910 until 1933 there were nine elections and eight changes of Government. Between 1938 and 1962 there were nine elections without any change of Government, and between 1965 and 1970 there were three elections that saw three changes of Government. The 1973 election, which was the first occasion on which a majority Labor Government in this State was returned to office, also showed an increase in the overall public support for the Government. It is probably true to say that between 1962 and 1970 there was some slight erosion of public support for the Labor Party at the State elections; this was not accurately reflected in the number of seats won by either Party, but we are all well aware that that factor depends not entirely on the number of votes cast but on the efficiency with which the electoral machine converts these votes into members of either political colour, and I will say more about that later.

Perhaps the last State election was not a fair test of the way political events are trending in this State, because it is certainly true that the honourable gentlemen opposite, and indeed their supporters outside this place, entered the contest in very sad disarray. I have only to recall some of the events that occurred in my own district in that contest to recall the sad disarray in which the Liberal Party found itself. For example, there was the attempt to remove the Party endorsement from my opponent only a few weeks before the election; there was a great battle over the Liberal and Country League and Liberal Movement how-to-vote cards; and there was incredible bitterness at the polling booths between supporters of both factions. I have proof that one L.C.L. canvasser tried to con an intending L.C.L. voter into voting the L.C.L. card for the Upper House and supporting me for the Lower House.

Mr. Venning: What happened on the peninsula?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I do not know, but I am aware that many people were confused by the proliferation of cards in the Mawson District, which is where this attempt took place. We also saw interesting innovations in electoral techniques at the last State election, some of them relatively trivial and some of considerable moment. At the trivial level, my opponent handed out pieces of sandpaper on which was stamped "Make life smoother with Scott". Various members of my sub-branch told me they queued up 14 times for these pieces of sandpaper, which are still being used in their workshops. However trivial this might be, it raises an important problem. Suppose that it had not been sandpaper but apples, or suppose that it had been,

as I heard alleged of one Opposition member in another district, posies for age pensioners. How far do we go before we run up against section 146 of the Electoral Act? No doubt most members would be sufficiently familiar with that section for me not to have to quote it to them. However, if they are not sufficiently familiar with it, I suggest that they read what it says about attempts to influence electors. In the Watergate kind of atmosphere in which we are living these days, it raises the whole problem of the kind of influence that should properly be exerted on the elector. I took this as being a bit of a joke; it is quite trivial, but it raises a serious problem.

At the other end of the scale was the extremely intense television campaign waged by the L.C.L. largely to highlight the L.M. section of its candidates. Various things have been said about this campaign, the most important being that it must have been extremely expensive, and it highlights the extent to which political Parties these days have to dig into their coffers to finance their campaigns. This is a problem which we as a society must examine carefully because, if political campaigns are to become increasingly expensive, it is also true that certain aspects of their financing must become increasingly undesirable.

As a result, there have been suggestions from people on my side of politics that there should be some way in which subventions of Government money be made available to political Parties to get them off the hook, without having to rely on money from other sources and having to knuckle under to the certain demands that may be made by these sources as a result of the cash coming across. The most I wish to say about this now is that it is important that there be legislation which would enable political Parties to be given free advertising time on television, because the vast bulk of campaign expenditure nowadays is on television. My own expenditure was modest in the campaign. In my district the Party probably spent in total as much as my opponent did on one pamphlet, judging by the number of pamphlets that were circulated and the quality of their printing.

The bulk of the money is spent not on pieces of paper but on time on television. I believe that the only way we have to get out of this whole business is by there being means whereby the television stations provide free time for the political Parties. I would agree with the member for Hanson, when he said soon after the election that the L.M. campaign was too soft in terms of the soft sell. In fact, there was no content in it at all. The electors were given no idea of the real policies that this group was pushing. Showing delightful television films of L.M. candidates romping on the back lawn with the kids and the dog or running up and down sandhills is not the way a person wins votes, unless the concept of human nature is simply that of the dog salivating every time the gong is rung.

Mr. Slater: People would be more inclined to vote for the dog.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Yes. The ball handling exhibited by one L.M. candidate playing cricket on the back lawn was about the sloppiest I have ever seen. The medium took over from the message. My own Party made clear what its policy was and what people would expect from it when it got back into office. It is our job to see that, during the next year, we bring those things about. Regarding the results of the campaign, there appears to have been an overall swing to the A.L.P. The swing was not large, but it was significant. In the metropolitan districts there was a considerable and obvious swing to the A.L.P. The

largest swing appears to have been in Salisbury, where my colleague increased his vote with a swing of 14.4 per cent.

Mr. Coumbe: Who was his opponent?

Mr. HOPGOOD: His opponent was not a member of the L.C.L. or the L.M. As a result of a scrutiny of the swings, it would appear that the largest swing to the Labor Party in any district containing a *bona fide* L.C.L. candidate was in Mawson. I had not intended to mention that fact, but the member for Torrens goaded me into referring to it; therefore, I think it important that I set the record straight. In the extra-metropolitan seats there appears to have been a swing away from the Labor Party, but the principal beneficiary of the swing was the Country Party, rather than the L.C.L. We cannot deny that the members for Gouger, Eyre, Light, and Frome increased their majority, and it would seem that the Labor vote in those districts that in previous years was high because of the assiduous cultivation of those districts by Labor members such as Mr. Hughes and Mr. Bywaters and the Hon. Mr. Casey, now in another place, has largely reverted to the Commonwealth Labor vote, which could be regarded as the normal Labor vote in those areas. Finally, there was generally a swing to the sitting member of whatever Party and in whatever district. Those swings that occurred to Labor in the country tended to occur in those seats where there was a sitting Labor member. Similarly, one sitting Liberal member in the city obtained a swing towards himself (I refer to the member for Hanson), and some of the other sitting Liberal members were able to contain the general city movement towards my Party. Looking at the broader scene now, there has been a general Labor resurgence throughout Australia. In the late 1960's there was not even one A.L.P. Government in Australia, but now we are in office in Canberra and in three States.

Mr. Coumbe: Only just though.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Only just is sufficient, and it illustrates the transience of political power. I now refer in some detail to what has been said today about the Whitlam Government, and start by saying that I believe the record of achievements that this Government has set up already will create a record difficult even for it to maintain in the coming years, and certainly for any Government of any other political stripe to maintain. Its achievements in social welfare have drawn praise from Mr. McMahon, the ex-Prime Minister, who said that he wished he had done the same sort of thing when in office. The big real battle ahead will be the battle to provide a decent, egalitarian, and humane health scheme for the people of Australia. Already reference to this matter has been made in the debate, and the member for Bragg spent most of his time talking about it. My contribution, however, will be limited to bringing forward certain quotations that I believe are there to be answered by those from the other side who would wish to answer what has been said.

First, I believe that this debate has shown that health is far too serious a problem to be left to the doctors, just as war is too serious a problem to be left to the generals. Let us consider what has been said by one doctor, Professor R. R. Andrew (Dean of the Faculty of Medicine at Monash University). People on my side have been at pains to explain that our health scheme is radically different from the scheme that has obtained in the United Kingdom for a long time. That has not prevented gentlemen on the other side, the Australian Medical Association, the General Practitioners Society, and the various under-strappers from raising a howl about the standard of medical care in the United Kingdom. Professor Andrew, writing to the *Australian* some time ago, stated:

The harsh criticism directed at the National Health Service in the United Kingdom by the President of the Australian Medical Association calls for an answer which attempts to bring up to date officially held medical views that apply to a past era.

Earlier this year, while in the United Kingdom, I spent two months investigating the health services of that country, concentrating on general practice, both private practice (about 5 per cent of all general practitioners), and the National Health Service, and especially the G.P. in health centres. My overwhelming impression was of high morale in the profession, both general practitioners and consultants; high professional job satisfaction; bureaucratic devices directed toward co-operation and assistance; and above all acceptance by patients in the health centres I visited (London and rural) to the point where I found it difficult to provoke any adverse criticism.

The "refugees from Britain's National Health Service" must have pretty well all left by now. A new generation accepts the concept of a health system which covers the whole population, and not the 80 per cent who are insured, as happens here.

The professor continued:

Doctors and most politicians are beginning to realize that health is a larger area than can be covered by doctors; that health and welfare are inextricable; that health has bodily, mental, and social aspects, and for comprehensive prevention and care there is a need for trained people—doctors, nurses, counsellors, sociologists and a whole host of others of great importance in total care—dentists, pharmacists, chiropodists, physiotherapists, speech therapists, audiologists, a not-exhaustive list.

He said more about the system and finished by stating:

It is indeed time for the A.M.A. to review its total opposition to any health system even remotely resembling that of the United Kingdom, particularly when there is so much misrepresentation and even unprofessional abuse.

Perhaps we could say something more about bureaucracy, because an editorial in the *Nation Review* on May 11 this year entitled "Health Muscle" states:

With the co-operation of half the doctors in private medical practice, the health scheme published last week would be a great improvement on anything we get now. If you aren't a member of a fund, the improvement is self evident: you will be insured. If you are now insured, the improvement will come if a reasonable number of doctors accept the "bulk billing" scheme. Its effect will be that you can step into a general practitioner's surgery, produce your card, pay nothing and never hear about the matter again. As a present member of a health fund, you are uncomfortably aware of the paper work thrust upon you by your own illness or that of a member of your family—

this is bureaucracy—

writing cheques, waiting for receipts, filling out forms, standing in a queue at the fund office, for a reimbursement of a few dollars a time. But you can do a lot worse, if you have had the misfortune to get caught in the compo machine. You are forced to go through this wringer even if you are separately covered by a health fund, for you must make your first claim on the compo crowd.

After some comments the editorial continues:

When you start hearing from doctors about bureaucracy and paper work in the coming months, it's your turn to remind them just how much paper work and indignity is being heaped on patients under the present set-up. In your own interests, you should tell your doctor that you want him to take up bulk billing.

What about Canada? It has been said accurately that, if the Commonwealth Labor Government's scheme resembles any other scheme, it most closely resembles the medical scheme in Canada. For this reason those who have a vested interest in opposing the national health scheme have turned their firepower on the system of medical care operating in Canada. Mr. Barrett D. Halderman, in a letter to the *Australian* some time ago stated:

As a Canadian who has spent the past three months holidaying in Australia, I have become increasingly disturbed and angered by the campaign being conducted by Australian doctors against the proposed Commonwealth medical care scheme. It seems that the profession has closely reviewed the programme of falsehood, unethical activity and emotionalism which the Canadian medical profession engaged in prior to implementation of Canada's first medicare scheme in the province of Saskatchewan in July, 1962.

As in Australia, Saskatchewan doctors called for a financial contribution from all practitioners—a fighting fund to “defend freedom, to oppose nationalization, to fight the lowering of health standards.” They filled the media (and their patients' ears) with continuing stories of how the sacred doctor-patient relationship would deteriorate, and would be pried into by faceless Government bureaucrats. They alleged the scheme would make them civil servants, that their medical judgment would be compromised, and that patients would be unable to see the doctor of their choice. They threatened to leave the province. Finally, they threatened to go on strike—which they did, disregarding their much-vaunted Hippocratic oath and leaving the province with emergency medical service for 23 days. The duly elected Government held firm, however, and the medicare plan went into effect with only minor changes relating to billing practices. The medicare scheme now operates throughout Canada, and is so popular that no Canadian politician would care to do away with it.

It is therefore disgusting to see the A.M.A. taking a one-sentence statement by a Canadian official, completely out of context, in an attempt to convince Australians that the Canadian plan, on which Australia's is to be largely based, is not working and is “the wrong system.”

It is heartening to know that Mr. Hayden has contacted the Canadian official and has exposed the A.M.A.'s seeming attempt at deliberate misrepresentation. It is to be hoped that Australians will not be taken in by the sickening campaign which, if Australian doctors continue to copy their Canadian colleagues' actions of 11 years ago, the hierarchy of the medical profession will undoubtedly carry on.

The member for Bragg has asked whether or not we have a scheme of national health in Australia. He says we do indeed have a national health scheme and that it does work. I agree with the first statement. We have a national health scheme of sorts in this country. However, I certainly disagree with the following statement. Such a national health scheme as we have in Australia at present is fine unless one gets sick. Tables have been published in our daily newspapers showing contributions, and they look fine. They make it appear that we are living in a paradise in respect of health care, but they ignore one thing: sooner or later one is going to get sick. These are the people who are discriminated against under the medical scheme existing in Australia.

There are also area discriminations, discriminations in relation to areas on the fringes of our cities where medical care is at a low level indeed and where only salaried medical services can really improve the situation, because there is no way a doctor can be forced to go into private practice in a certain area. If he does not want to live in that area and does not want to practise in it, he does not have to do so. The result is that the areas represented by the member for Salisbury, the member for Elizabeth, the member for Tea Tree Gully, and my own area are very much under-manned by general practitioners.

My colleague the member for Elizabeth has given me an example where, less than 18 months ago, a woman in his district rang a doctor asking for medical care for her husband. The doctor said he believed it was not necessary for him to come out at that time, and the man died later in the night. I do not know personally of similar examples in my own district, and this may be indeed a matter of luck. Medical services are strained to such an extent that home

visits can rarely be made by doctors; certainly they generally refuse to make them. Perhaps it is simply a matter of luck that a similar sort of tragedy has not occurred in my district.

What can we do in the long run? I leave that to those whose minds have operated far more on this situation than mine has, but I shall contribute to this debate words written in the *Advertiser* some time ago by Mr. Douglas Wilkie, speaking on general statements on medical care. This is what he had to say:

Maybe Russia has something to teach the West in education and health services, where priorities are more rationally adjusted to economic capacity. Russia provides its quota of medical research at the higher scientific levels. Its provision for sufferers from rare chronic or incurable ailments is humane if rugged by Western standards. But at other levels the Russians break away from the Western approach to health services.

All emphasis is on prevention of illness by hygiene and prophylaxis. Doctors' services are free but not medicines. Payment discourages the pill-taking syndrome. There are more than 400,000 doctors in the Soviet Union, in the ratio of one to every 600 people (nearly double the Australian ratio).

Three out of four Russian doctors are women, most of them paid by the State at the rate of 100 roubles a month—one-fifth the pay of a factory manager, and one-eighth that of a senior Party official. Not much of a reward for a six-year medical course. Equality of the sexes in Russia is a myth. Women are assigned the task of doctoring that vast majority of patients whose ailments are amenable to simple diagnosis and treatment, while referring the minority to specialists.

It is a glorified skilled nursing service, universally available. Enough to outrage our A.M.A. But the average life-span in Russia is now 67 years. The crude death rate is only 7.7 a 1,000, less than in the United States, Britain or Australia (8.65).

The member for Bragg had something to say about over-utilization of medical services. If the A.M.A. really has this fear it must be willing to drop its “keep off the grass” attitude and to experiment with new structures in the provision of medical care. What is the situation if a patient wants to see a specialist? Is it not true that the present health scheme, so praised by the member for Bragg, provides a financial incentive for the patient to go first to a general practitioner for referral? If he does not do that, he must meet the total bill.

Mr. Jennings: He has to go to the G.P. first, anyway.

Mr. HOPGOOD: He can go directly to the specialist, but he must then meet the total bill, so there is a financial incentive for the patient to over-utilize the general practitioner.

Mr. Mathwin: If the patient wants a specialist in the U.K. he goes independently and he pays for it at £15 a time.

Mr. HOPGOOD: That may well be. I am not here to defend the British system in all its aspects, but I ask this question of the member for Glenelg: if he is worried about over-utilization of health services, what is his attitude on this aspect? Why should it be necessary for the patient to get referral by a general practitioner? Surely this takes up more of the general practitioner's time? What is the attitude of the A.M.A. to this aspect of utilization? I believe that the association would fight to retain the right of referral to a specialist.

Broadening the field from medical care to the general matter of costs and availability of professional services, Governments must look very closely at this. Professional services generally, not only medical services, are becoming far too expensive for the average citizen. For this reason I applaud the recently announced move by the Law Society in South Australia to open an office to which

people may go off the street to consult a solicitor. Eventually it will be necessary, I think, to put salaried solicitors in our community welfare offices, but the Law Society is showing an excellent spirit in the gesture it is making and I sincerely hope the experiment will be successful.

Before moving from this topic, I should like to draw some sort of parallel with education in Australia. Just suppose we were in the situation right now where teachers were saying, "We are opposed to salaried teachers. We believe people should have to pay a direct fee to the teacher for his services, and if they cannot afford it let us set up funds whereby they can make contributions to those funds and from those funds the education of the children can be provided. If that is not enough the Government can shovel in some more." What sort of attitude would, the people of Australia take to those who advocated such a system for education? Yet, that is the sort of system the member for Bragg wants us to live with forever and a day in the provision of health care. I was proud to be associated as a supporter of the Dunstan Labor Government in the past three years. I believe this Government has achieved a tremendous amount. We have looked forward to the day when we would be joined by a Commonwealth Labor Government in the great work that we have to do in dragging Australia into the 20th century regarding the quality of life of its citizens. We have now been joined by a Commonwealth Labor Government, and our attitude all along towards the coming of a Commonwealth Labor Government is probably summed up in the second verse of the first chapter of the Gospel according to St. Mark. We have been John the Baptist pointing the way to something greater that will come. Now it has come and we want to co-operate in what has come. I refer to that chapter, as follows:

As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

In what way have we in this State tried to prepare the way? We have attempted to provide educational standards that will be second to none in the Commonwealth. We have begun the decentralization and humanizing of community welfare in this State. We have attempted to bring about self-respect for Aborigines, and we have introduced legislation against racial discrimination. We have set up sophisticated and effective structures involving Government control of and assistance to trade, industrial development, the arts, consumer protection, urban and regional development, and the environment.

The Speech of the Governor to this Parliament a week ago included the announcement of various means by which this work would be carried forward in the coming Parliamentary session. In this regard I wish to refer only to pyramid selling, which will be a further extension of the consumer protection that has already been well advanced under this Government, through the leadership of the Attorney-General. It is interesting to notice the attitude of American people, in the home of free enterprise, so called, towards consumer protection and pyramid selling. I refer to the July 16 publication of *Time* magazine and to the business section under the headline "Swindles: Battling the Biggest Fraud". Here pyramid selling is called "a billion dollar industry—and the nation's No. 1 consumer fraud".

In referring to Holiday Magic it is stated that it has been calculated that, if each Holiday Magic distributor signed up as many distributors as the company claimed he was

expected to, at the end of the year 305,175,780 people would be selling those products. All members are aware of the population in the United States at this time. The article refers to an injunction that has been brought against one of these pyramiders, and what is being asked for is not just an injunction but also forfeiture of all the pyramider's profits. The suit contends that pyramiding is tantamount to selling unregistered securities, and it is on that basis that the suit is being brought forward. I now refer to a report in that article of an interview of an 84-year-old Californian lady left with unsaleable soap powder stacked to her ceiling. She said:

I began to see that Bestline—

the firm under discussion—

weren't selling soap. They were selling memberships. They were out to catch all the suckers they could, and I admit that I was one of them.

I trust that it will be possible for this Parliament to turn its attention to legislation that will stop these practices as early as possible. In the last brief and almost unique session of this Parliament, which lasted two weeks, we saw an extraordinary turnabout by the L.C.L. in this State. The L.C.L. decided at last to accept the adult franchise which it had denied the people, and in particular the women of this State, for so very long. Wonder of wonders, it also announced that it was in favour of one vote one value. Indeed, this was the most extraordinary turnabout that we had seen in the history of politics for a long time. No other principle would be accepted but the principle of one vote one value, yet, when we look at every redistribution of electoral boundaries that has occurred since 1913, which is as far back as I am prepared to go, it has always been carried out by a Liberal Government in such a way as to weight the country vote as opposed to the metropolitan vote. I refer to the redistributions in 1913 by the Hon. A. H. Peake, in 1936 by Hon. R. L. Butler, in 1955 or 1956 by Sir Thomas Playford, and his again abortive attempt in 1962. All of these redistributions were blatant rural gerrymanders. Even the redistribution in 1969 under the Hall-DeGaris Government was so worked out as to add an arbitrary 15 per cent to the enrolment of the city electoral districts. It also provided greater elbow room in the apportioning of the enrolments of country districts than it did for city districts. We are still under that same distribution, and what is the result? The result is that at present the enrolment in the seat of Mawson, which I represent, is in excess of 26,000 people. This is the largest and the fastest growing district in South Australia. I imagine that the lowest enrolment would be in the District of Frome and, although I do not know the exact figures, there would be about 9,000 electors. Mawson has at least two and a half times the enrolment of Frome. This occurred under the redistribution carried out by the Hall Liberal Government.

I ask members opposite what is their present attitude towards a one vote one value system for this House, based as no doubt it will be on a system that will provide for individual members for individual districts. There is no possibility that what might come out of some future redistribution is proportional representation for the Lower House. It is important that the link between the member and his constituents be retained in this place. Any one vote one value system will have to be on the basis of individual districts, and it will have to provide for a situation as close as possible to equal enrolment in each district. What do honourable members opposite think about that in view of the statements made only a fortnight ago by their Leader in another place?

The other matter provided for in our amendment to the Constitution Act and the Electoral Act regarding another place was optional preferential voting. I support that system.

Mr. Gunn: It is similar to a voluntary vote, isn't it?

Mr. HOPGOOD: It is similar only in that it is not mandatory to have to mark all the preferences.

Mr. Gunn: Therefore it is voluntary.

Mr. HOPGOOD: It is voluntary, as is the present system. What is compulsory is turning out to vote, not the voting. I have spoken on three or four occasions in this House about the desirability of providing a compulsory turnout. What a person does with the ballot-paper after that is his own business. Ever since I have been a voter it has been necessary for me, to avoid invalidating my paper, to mark all preferences, despite the fact that I knew in advance that only my first vote would ever be counted, because there was not much chance, first in the District of Prospect, later in Torrens, as it was subsequently called, later in Glenelg, and now in Mawson, that the Labor Party candidate would be number three after the counting of first preferences. The Labor Party would be one or two.

Mr. McAnaney: Mawson next time.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I again draw the honourable member's attention to the figures I earlier quoted. So I was undergoing an empty ritual by filling in all the squares on the ballot-paper, simply so that my vote would be valid. I have supported this system for some time; I advocated it in the House some 12 months ago. I am glad it has been introduced for the Upper House and hope it will be possible to introduce it for the Lower House.

It has been interesting to note the attitude revealed in this debate by various members of the Opposition. I do not want to spend too much time on this now, but I think we can probably sum up the attitudes of the Leader of the Opposition and the new member for Davenport in this way: that their Party favours better housing, cheaper land prices, a more flexible sort of Constitution, and better medical care provided we do not adopt the only realistic means of bringing in these various things. The Leader of the Opposition is prepared to criticize what this State Government is trying to do about housing. Anything that this State Government can do to increase the stock of housing we have available to us in this State will get applause from me, because I know darned well the present waiting time for people to get houses under the Housing Trust. The issue of rental or home ownership is totally irrelevant to this situation: what is more important is the vast number of low-income people who want a roof over their heads, and they cannot get it.

The Opposition is not helping by trying to torpedo the only realistic suggestions that have come from any Party, including his own Party, for a considerable time. I support the Australian Council of Trade Unions venture; indeed, I am pleased to support any means of building up the stock of houses and also any means that will hold the drift in land prices, because it is largely the drift in land prices that is forcing more and more people on to the Housing Trust lists because they cannot afford to build with the private sector.

I have appealed to members opposite to co-operate with us in what we are trying to do if they want to see any future for private ownership, because, without the sort of controls we are going to bring in on land speculation, all persons will be affected, except for the upper fraction of the middle class, which always has the financial means to insulate itself against these price movements.

The member for Davenport mentioned a series of commissions which were being set up by the Whitlam Labor Government, and he gave us the attitude that he did not like them being created—the schools commission, the pre-schools commission, and so on. What is his alternative to getting Commonwealth money in these fields? Perhaps he does not want Commonwealth money in these fields. If he does not like the structure, what is so very wrong with the Australian Universities Commission, which is the model on which most of these other commissions were based and which was introduced by a Liberal and Country Party Government under Sir Robert Menzies? What is so very wrong with that model that we should not copy it as a prototype for getting Commonwealth funds into the area we have to look at?

Mr. Gunn: What about centralization?

Mr. HOPGOOD: If by "centralization" the member for Eyre means no movement from the *status quo*, no fiddling at all with the present role and powers of the States, then every person in this Chamber, with the possible exception of the honourable member, is a centralist, and every person outside this Chamber who is realistic is a centralist. We are saddled with a nineteenth century Constitution drawn up by our great-great-grandfathers; we have to sweep it away and bring in something more flexible which will enable Australians, irrespective of their State, to get the Commonwealth assistance they need.

[I was appalled to hear the member for Mitcham go on in the way he did this evening about States' rights, because I recall his Leader in this House, when he was the Leader of the Opposition, following an attack which our Premier had made on his Commonwealth Liberal Government and the paltry attitude it had taken towards this State, say, "I am an Australian." I cannot remember the exact words except those words. "Let us not get bogged down in these pettifogging disputes about how much money should go to each State. Let us take a wider attitude." I assumed that, when the Liberal Movement was able to remove itself eventually from the Liberal and Country League incubus, this attitude, which the member for Eyre would regard as centralist, would come to the forefront, and yet we hear the member for Mitcham being more conservative and more reactionary on this matter than anyone I have ever heard so far from the Liberal and Country League. This is simply another expression of the Opposition's attitude—"Sure, we are in favour of these things provided you do not take any realistic steps to bring them about".

I was interested to hear the little bit of history that the honourable member gave us. I contest with him the fact that the country domination of the Liberal and Country League dates from 1932: I believe it dates from 1910, and I refer him to Mr. J. B. Hirst's very much praised book *Adelaide and the Country*, published recently, which shows how the country was able to break free from the clutches of the city because of the way in which the Liberal and Democratic Union and the Farmers' and Producers' Political Union were able to dominate the Australian National League at the time when the Liberal Union was formed. It dates from then, but that is only a quibble. The more important things he had to say concerned the extra-parliamentary structure of the Liberal and Country League and all that has happened in it.

That is interesting because the conventional wisdom that keeps coming across to us from members opposite is that, except for getting votes, their extra-Parliamentary structure is largely irrelevant; they are largely free agents in this place and make up their own minds, and it does not matter what is happening in the general Party outside. If that is

the case, if they are almost *de facto* Independents, why did this upheaval take place? Why was it necessary for the Liberal Movement to be formed? Why is it that the members for Goyder and Mitcham find themselves separated from their former colleagues on the Opposition benches? One begins to wonder whether all this talk about members opposite not being under Parliamentary domination is all cant and humbug, for that is just what it has been.

The member for Mitcham revealed to us in this House in the last session how he was hauled over the coals for the attitude he took to adult franchise for another place. Surely, it is obvious that each political Party has its own means of control and sanction. What is important is that these means of control and sanction be open, that they should be recognized for what they are so that they can be judged for what they are. They are open in the Australian Labor Party. The Opposition attempts to conceal them, and they are the more reprehensible because of that.

Mr. Gunn: That is totally wrong.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I can only refer my friend to his ex-colleague and what he had to say in this House. I want also to refer to one or two of the things that the member for Mitcham had to say about the record of the Australian Labor Party in Government. He had the gall to talk about price movements under our Government. What did he (and he was old enough to do something) and his Party do when in 1948 Mr. Chifley tried to bring in Commonwealth price control? We could have had a structure which, over these years, would have been sophisticated and refined in such a way that we could now have, as perhaps no other Government in the western world has, a means of controlling price movements. But no, the Liberal Party would have none of it, saying that free enterprise was what it wanted. I am not sure what I make of Mr. Snedden's latest pronouncements; I wonder what members opposite make of them. I am sure that there is no chance that Liberal Governments in other States (especially in view of the attitude of their Upper Houses) will be willing to refer to the Commonwealth Parliament the powers needed to maintain effective control in this sphere.

The member for Mitcham also spoke about additional Government expenditure since the Whitlam Government had been in office. I have already quoted Mr. McMahon as applauding the social welfare scheme introduced. The honourable member did not refer to wage increases. It is part of the conventional wisdom that these increases contribute towards inflation, yet the Opposition Party in Canberra supported the national wage decision brought down some time ago. That Party had an opportunity to air its opposition to the increase; as it did not do this, I assume that it supported it. If we look at this the other way around, it could be said that an increase in doctors' fees must have some inflationary effect, if we accept the conventional L.C.L. wisdom about inflation. What is being said in the L.C.L. about doctors' fees and the movement of costs in all these sorts of things? The honourable member spoke about disaster for the Commonwealth Government; I need only refer him to the latest Gallup poll.

With regard to independent schools being destroyed, the honourable member did not say that it was projected that the total grants to independent schools were to be increased, not reduced. I fail to see how that can involve destroying the independent school system. Finally, he spoke about transport and dial-a-bus. Dial-a-bus was

only ever thought of as having a most limited application within a general transport system.

Mr. Gunn: That's what you say now.

Mr. HOPGOOD: The Minister of Transport, in making many pronouncements about this, has always made clear that he believed dial-a-bus would have only a limited application in certain areas. If members opposite want to see the out-workings of transport with regard to this Government, I invite them to come to my district. The extension of the Christie Downs spur line will benefit not only my district but also the districts of the Minister of Education and the member for Glenelg. This work is well advanced; the line, which is to be electrified when it is opened, will open to traffic in 1975. This is one of the main thrusts of the Government's public transport system. I look forward to the extension of a similar type of service to the north-eastern suburbs so that the people of the Tea Tree Gully area can also be assisted by this means.

I recall the Minister of Transport talking about bus lanes on highways and what could be done if private traffic could be kept away from those lanes. Various other methods were also brought forward. I regret that the dial-a-bus experiment (which had to be carried out to see whether it would operate properly) has not operated properly. However this involves only a minor dent in the plan unfolding for the upgrading of public transport facilities. Again I invite members opposite to join with the Government in the work it is doing in this sphere. I support the motion.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I, too, support the motion, which was moved by the member for Elizabeth and seconded by the member for Semaphore. It is the usual custom in this House for new members to move and second this motion, this occasion being no exception. I congratulate the two members concerned on their election to represent their respective districts in this place and sincerely hope that they will carry on the good work done by their predecessors. Since the House adjourned last December, we have lost several members and ex-members of this Parliament. Early this year we lost an ex-member, the late Mr. Roy McLachlan. Although I never had the privilege of meeting this gentleman, I understand he gave sterling service to this State. Then we lost the services of the former Speaker (the late Mr. Reg Hurst), whose passing was a shock to everyone; it illustrated to all of us that the duties of a member of Parliament involve a definite strain on his health. In addition, recently we lost the services of the late Mr. Harry Kemp, who was a dedicated member of another place. We extend to the relatives of these gentlemen our sincere sympathies.

In opening the present session, His Excellency referred to several matters with which I wish to deal. One matter that has been troubling me for some time is the lack of liaison by representatives of Government departments with local people in various districts. I shall give three instances in my district over the past few years that illustrate this situation. No doubt the officers of these departments are experts in their own field, but I believe they should communicate more than they do with the local people in order to ascertain the general conditions in a community. The first instance to which I wish to refer concerns the recent completion of a new Samcon school in the Oodnadatta township. The school building, which was completed last January, was to be occupied at the commencement of the school year early in February. However, following the rains in the Far North last January the school was flooded to such an extent that water was lapping at the doorstep; had the level of the water risen any higher, carpets throughout the school would have been destroyed. Most members

know that Samcon buildings have air-conditioning situated under the floor. The usual procedure is that the earth is excavated to a depth of about 2ft. (60 cm), the air-conditioning being placed under the floor. In this case, the air-conditioning was flooded with water.

When I visited the school in May this year, it was still unoccupied. I asked a question about when the school would be occupied, but this information was not available. I can understand why the Government was keen to have the school erected on its present site, since the Aboriginal hostel, the present school (and a pre-school kindergarten is to be erected on this site, so I sincerely hope the area is thoroughly examined before work commences), the single teachers' quarters, the head teacher's residence, the district health officer's residence, the Community Welfare Department office, and the police station are all situated in this street. The local people told me that they had warned the Public Buildings Department before the department started to erect the building that it would be in a water-course, but this advice was to no avail: the school was erected and was flooded. I was also told that the maps showed that where the school was erected was a water-course.

I asked what the department intended to do about the present position and the reply was that the school would be occupied, because this position might never arise again. I assure the House that it will happen again. It has happened over the years in the North and I am sure that, unless precautions are taken, it will happen again. The position can be overcome by putting an earth bank through the schoolyard.

Doubtless, this would reduce the playing area for the school, but anyone who has been to this town knows that thousands of acres (hectares) are available around the town and it is only a matter of extending the schoolyard in a different direction to provide ample playing space. Apparently, Oodnadatta is not the only town that has experienced this problem, because a report in the *Advertiser* of June 16 this year, headed "Whyalla school on a flood creek", states:

Whyalla's most recent and biggest high school, Stuart, is built on a flood creek. Councillor M. R. Knuckey this week showed councillors an aerial photograph of the creek taken about eight months after floodwaters had engulfed the school in February. Most of the new school was under more than a foot of water on the official opening day.

I gather from the report that the water surrounded the school but did not flood it. I should have thought that the school at Oodnadatta could be erected on the same site as that on which it has been erected, provided the air-conditioning unit was placed at ground level, the school built above the air-conditioning, and the surrounds raised with soil. This could have overcome the problem, but now that could not be done. The only precautions that can be taken are the provision of an earth bank to divert the water.

Another case that arose in the North about a year or two ago is in relation to work being carried out on the Birdsville track. In June, 1971, I visited this area with the Commonwealth member for the district (Mr. C. R. Kelly). We attended a race meeting at Marree and were inundated with requests from people who lived on this road to approach the Highways Department to try to persuade the department not to raise the road level in the watercourses on it. They told us that the work being carried out would almost certainly be washed away in time of flood.

When we took up the matter we were told that the engineers had the matter under control. Work was then being done on raising the level under the floodways and putting in concrete pipes. However, in January, 1972, the roads were washed away. The concrete pipes were washed out and the road became completely impassable for 15 days. One stockowner told me that he had cattle in yards in Marree and was feeding these cattle on hay at a cost of \$1 a bale. He could not take the cattle out of the town.

He also told me that he had crossed the Frome River, which runs into Lake Eyre South, in a sedan motor car when the river was in full flood. The river spreads out to a width of about half a mile, and when it floods the water washes the road out, no-one being able to proceed on it for a few days. He pointed out that in this area one should study the vegetation, because where one saw coolibah trees one could reckon that over the years floodwaters had reached the line of the trees. I feel sure that, if the department's officers approached the local residents in these areas, seeking information from them, that would save the Government departments much money, particularly in repair costs.

The third instance I want to refer to is the standard gauge line that has been put down in recent years from Port Ririe to Broken Hill. A few miles east of Peterborough is a lagoon known as Howards Lagoon. In the early days this lagoon was filled with water fairly regularly but, over the last 20 years, the lagoon has been dry. When the surveyors surveyed for the new standard gauge line they put the line right over Howards Lagoon.

The local people pointed out that this lagoon was subject to flooding but apparently their advice was not heeded, so much so that last January, only two years after the line was completed, this area received about 8in. (20.3 cm) or 9in. (22.8 cm) of rain and the lagoon filled to the extent that water was lapping the ballasting on each side of the railway line. The railway authorities had to build a line around the lagoon, costing many thousands of dollars.

The question to be asked is: what is the future of this line? Is it intended to build a causeway across the lagoon or erect a diversion around the lagoon? This is another instance in which, if the department had listened to local people, many thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money could have been saved. I want to refer to a matter dealing with the recent State election, held on March 10. Honourable members will realize that nominations closed for that election on February 27 and the election was held 11 days after the close of nominations.

I consider that the short time allowed between the closing date of nominations and election day was an affront to people living in the remote areas in South Australia. Many people in the remote areas that the member for Eyre and I represent receive only one mail service a week. These people were allowed only 11 days in which to apply for a postal vote application form, have the form sent back, fill it in to apply for the postal vote, have the postal vote sent back, and record and post back the vote.

I cannot see that the Government gained anything by delaying the announcement of the election date, because it was common knowledge around this House long before February 27 that the election would be held on March 10. I think all that the Government achieved was an embarrassed Electoral Department and a depriving of people in the outside areas of a postal vote. The Government has been stating consistently that it wants one vote one value. In fact, the member for Mawson dealt with

this matter a short time ago. However, I am sure that the Government's actions in the recent State election gave the people in the outback areas one vote no value, and I hope that at future elections the Government will give people more time to have the vote that the Government claims it is so interested in.

His Excellency in his Speech mentioned tourism in South Australia. The member for Eyre and I have problems in our districts, in that much of these districts is outside the council areas of this State and tourism is becoming so popular in these areas that the communities are finding it extremely difficult to cater for tourists. The areas in the Flinders Range and up towards Lake Eyre are receiving an influx of tourists in the spring and the local people cannot provide facilities such as toilets, etc., to cater for so many people. Progress associations have been formed in these districts, but the communities are so small that they cannot raise the necessary funds to provide these facilities. I have been negotiating with the Premier and with the Director of the Tourist Bureau on this matter and I have emphasized that the Government will have to come to the rescue of these areas and provide grants so that they can provide the necessary facilities. The local people are willing to maintain the facilities, once erected, but they cannot see their way clear to provide any money towards the cost of building them. If the Government is to encourage tourists to come to these areas it will have to provide grants to establish the facilities in the areas.

This year, it is expected that the wildflowers in the Flinders Range will be the best for many years. Even last year there were about 8,000 tourists during the spring holiday weekend, and this year the number may increase to 10,000. So I hope that the Government will seriously consider this matter. If the Government is to encourage tourists to this area it will have to provide these facilities. Four months ago I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Cameron) who is responsible for unemployment relief grants and, although I have received an acknowledgment, I have not received an actual reply. I pointed out to the Minister the difficulties associated with these areas and that some unemployed Aborigines were looking for work. If the Commonwealth Government could see its way clear to increase unemployment rural relief in these areas it would be of benefit to the local community. I hope that the Government, in administering the funds, will consider this matter.

In 1972, I drove to Oodnadatta and, on the way back from Oodnadatta to Marree, during the school holidays, I passed nine coaches of schoolchildren. The coaches had just left Marree and the passengers approached the hotel-keeper there for the use of his toilet facilities. Eventually, the hotelkeeper had to lock the toilets, because the strain on them was too great. As a result, the children had to roam around the town and ask the townspeople whether they could use their private toilets. That is not good enough. If the Government wants to encourage people into these areas it must provide the necessary facilities. One of my biggest problems in representing a district the size of mine is the condition of the roads in the Far North. I agree that the distances are great (people up there speak in hundreds of kilometres) and I realize that it is a strain on the Highways Department to maintain these roads. However, it is up to the Government to see that sufficient funds are made available to be able to provide the necessary services.

It is embarrassing to me when I go North and see the condition of the roads up there. On my last two visits to the North I was bogged in the main street of Marree on

both occasions, and this no doubt delighted the local people. It delighted me, too, because it gave me an insight into the conditions these people have to face in wet weather. Oodnadatta and Marree have a type of grey clay in their streets. No work has been done on the streets there ever since the towns were settled about 80 years ago. No such things as kerbing and footpaths have been built and, after a rain, the streets are under water. Recently, I was shown a photograph taken in 1926 after a downpour. On the Tuesday of the week before last when I was there, exactly the same conditions prevailed as those shown in the photograph. The streets are one mass of bog or churned-up clay and, whenever it rains, the hotelkeeper immediately rolls out strips of rubber to place over the hotel carpets to try to protect them from people treading mud all over the floor. This is not good enough.

These are the only two towns in the whole of my district that do not have sealed streets. Farther south is Cradock, where four people live, but it has a sealed street running through it. Places such as Andrews and Hillo-down, where four people live, have a siding and sealed streets. Yet in Marree, where there is a break of gauge in the Commonwealth railways and which has a population of about 300, and in Oodnadatta, which has a population of about 200, the streets are in the same condition today as they were 80 years ago.

Work is being done on the Birdsville track and the road from Hawker to Wilpena Pound is being sealed. Even if we went to the extent of slowing down the work on these roads in order to make money available to carry out at least some maintenance on certain other roads in the North would meet the wishes of people engaged in raising cattle and sheep and coalmining at Leigh Creek, all of whom have to suffer the bad roads. If only some maintenance could be carried out on these roads it would suffice until the roads were sealed. The road from Hawker to Leigh Creek is about 100 miles (about 161 km) long. This road would have the highest vehicle rating of any road in the North. This unsealed road runs parallel to the Flinders Range on the western side and has many creek crossings, because the floodwaters from the range run west into Lake Torrens. The road has many strips of red clay, which after a rain is practically impassable. The creeks to which I have referred have much good grey gravel, and it would not be too expensive to put the gravel on to the road and to upgrade it to make it an all-weather road. The roads need to be all-weather because of the flash flooding in the ranges. If money were spent for maintenance on the road it would make conditions better for the people of Leigh Creek.

The road from Leigh Creek to Lyndhurst is excellent and was put down with metal only a few years ago. If every road in the North was in such good condition no-one would have any room for complaint. The road from Marree to Lake Eyre is mainly a tourist road. At present, many tourists use it to get to Lake Eyre, particularly since the late Donald Campbell made his attempt on the world's speed record. Unfortunately, this road has been graded for many years, with the result that it is low and, after a rain, all the water runs to the lowest point in the road, with the result that anything up to 200 yards, (182.8 m) of road may be inundated with water and become a lagoon. The people have to stay at home and wait for the road to dry out, whereas if a concrete pipe with a few loads of rubble were put in these low places, the road would almost become an all-weather one.

The thousands of people who will visit the Flinders Range will most certainly go on to see Lake Eyre north,

which is at present full, and Lake Eyre south, which is fast filling (more rain has fallen in the last few days); so, many thousands of tourists will be in this area next spring. The department will have to pay some attention to this road. The Lyndhurst to Marree road of about 50 miles (80 km) is quite good, but in several places water lodges after rain, causing delays to heavy transport for two or three days. If metal was spread in the worst places, this could become an all-weather road. The road from Marree to Oodnadatta is about 260 miles (416 km), and I understand that it has been closed for more than half the time since last January. Only small patches of a distance of about half a mile (.8 km) need attention on this road.

The bad condition of the road benefits the Commonwealth Railways, because when travellers on this road become stranded they put their cars or trucks on the train, resulting in increased revenue to the Commonwealth Railways. After a heavy rain, all traffic north of Anna Creek diverts to the Stuart Highway, which is almost an all-weather road, but the distance is a few hundred miles further for the trip than it is on the direct road through Marree. Carriers complain when they have to divert to the Stuart Highway, because they have to pay a road toll, which considerably increases the cost of transport in this area. Although I have referred previously to the condition of streets in Oodnadatta and Marree, I should like to refer again to the condition of streets in Marree, because I have seen these streets twice recently.

I wrote to the Minister about this matter, sent him photographs of cars bogged in the main street, and pointed out the many difficulties that were being experienced. In his reply the Minister stated the road would be sealed in 1975-76. This information amazed me, because the schedule of proposed work for the financial year ended June 30, 1973, debit order 4588.2, indicated that a distance of one mile (1.6 km) to 2 miles (3.2 km) would be sealed, but out of a total estimated expenditure of \$52,000, up to June 30, 1972, \$4,000 had been spent. It was expected to spend another \$32,000 up to June 30, 1973, and one would have thought that the remaining \$16,000 would have been spent this financial year. In this year's schedule of proposed work for the financial year ending June 30, 1974, no reference is made to the Marree street. Furthermore, little has been done to this street except that a metal road has been constructed around the new school. Local residents are disappointed, because this project has been delayed for a year or two, and I am sure that they will make more representations to the Minister about it.

His Excellency in his Speech referred to the South Australian Railways. Most members are aware that Cabinet appointed a committee in April, 1971, comprising Mr. I. J. Lees of the Highways Department, Mr. H. C. Evans of the Auditor-General's Department, and Mr. D. C. Rodway of the Premier's Department to examine the operations, services, and administration of the Railways Department. I think that most members would have read this report by now: it is a comprehensive one and very revealing, and I wish that all members of the community would read this report, because they would then realize the difficulties that are being experienced at present by the department. I shall not refer to the report at length, but will leave that to the member for Heysen, but at page 166 the committee recommends the zoning of wheat deliveries. I was disappointed because the committee did not deal at length with this subject: it dealt with freights, but its only reference to wheat was the zoning of wheat deliveries.

I will strenuously oppose this recommendation until all other methods have been considered. I believe that the Minister has not made any effort to overcome the problem we have in this State whereby wheat is being delivered to terminals by road in preference to carriage by rail. Not sufficient effort has been made to persuade growers to deliver their wheat to the local silos. The committee recommends that the closing of several railway lines be considered, but I refer to a particular line because I am most conversant with it. I ask the member for Rocky River to excuse my referring to this matter, because the line is situated in his district. I refer to the Clare-Spalding line: I saw it laid when I was a schoolboy, and saw it reach its peak in the late 1920's when at one time there were three trains in the railway yard.

Today's patronage has fallen to such an extent that one goods train a week operates, passenger traffic was closed 16 years ago in preference to the use of a road bus, and now we have one goods train a week. In the past few years the total revenue from the Clare-Spalding line (not including wheat cartage) amounted to only \$3,000 a year for all general merchandise, livestock, and everything else except wheat. This amount would not be sufficient to pay the wages of the stationmaster. At the last harvest only 26,100bush. (946.4 m³) of wheat was delivered to the silo at 13.3c a bushel (0.0364m³), and the total revenue at the last harvest from wheat cartage was \$3,480, enough to pay the wages of one permanent way man.

In these circumstances I cannot understand how the public can expect this line to remain open. Few business people in Spalding (and I am sorry to say this because I live in the town) patronize the railways, and most goods are carried by road. I am sure that if this section of the line were closed they could not complain. Rather than close the whole line, I suggest that the permanent way gang be stationed at Clare and be provided with road transport, a suggestion of the committee. With road transport the gang would be more flexible and be able to move more quickly, thus maintaining greater distances of the track. The gang could maintain the line from Clare to Andrews and keep that section of the line open for wheat traffic.

Mr. Venning: What about reducing rail freights?

Mr. ALLEN: I will refer to that matter. I have carried out a survey of many farmers, asking them whether they would be willing to carry wheat to the local silo and at what price. I have been told that they would be willing to carry wheat to Andrews for 8c a bushel. At present the rail freight is 13.3c to Port Adelaide. The growers are offering wheat taken from the paddock to the terminal for 10c a bushel: they reap the wheat, leave it in the paddock, and it is removed for 10c a bushel. One cannot blame them for not carting the wheat to the local silo, because it costs 3c a bushel to the local silo, and then the rail freight is added. These growers have said they would be willing to accept zoning if the freight were reduced to 8c. If zoning were implemented one could expect 300,000bush. (10 920 m³) of wheat to come into the Andrews silo this year, as compared with 26,000bush. (946.4m³) last year. The larger quantity at 8c would bring in revenue of \$24,000 as compared with \$3,480 last year. This is the only silo on the Riverton to Spalding line.

If a special train could be provided, with two engines and 16 type "O" trucks each taking more than 40 tons (40.64 tonnes), the train could move 24,000bush. (873.6m³) of wheat. That would bring in \$1,920 a trip,

or between \$9.50 and \$10 a mile (1.61 km). I am not conversant with railway costing, nor do I know what return would be necessary to make such a train a paying proposition, but I imagine \$10 a mile would be ample. If a goods train were to be cancelled and special trains run, filled to capacity, the wheat could be carted at 8c a bushel and the farmers would be willing to accept zoning. I hope the Minister will heed what I say and that he will do some costing. Perhaps he can prove to me that this is not an economic proposition. If so, I am willing to accept his decision, but some attempt must be made to rectify the situation. It is useless to sit back and let things happen, throwing our hands in the air and losing \$26,000,000 a year on the operation of the railways. We should make some effort to overcome the deficit. The South Australian Railways hauls the grain; it does not load or unload. All it is being asked to do is to haul the grain at \$1,920 for a 200-mile (321.8 km) trip.

Other centres are in the same position as Andrews—for instance, Hallett, Burra, Farrell Flat, and Quorn. All these centres could be the basis for experiments under similar conditions. Perhaps the Minister will say this is creating a precedent, but I say we should try anything rather than have a deficit of \$26,000,000 a year. If the experiment is not successful, that is too bad, and we can try something else. On June 18, 1970, just after the present Labor Government took office, the Minister of Transport and Local Government, as he was then, was reported in the *Advertiser* under the heading "Warns on rail service" in the following terms:

The Minister of Transport and Local Government (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday that the co-operation of people in country towns was essential if some rail services were to be retained. At a meeting of the federal executive of the Australasian Transport Officers' Association, Mr. Virgo said he had earlier referred to a major South Australian line which was in jeopardy because of a threatened loss of the main source of freight revenue. Without naming the line, Mr. Virgo said: "I think it is going to require far more than a Ministerial or Government attitude to retain some of these services."

The Minister finished by saying, "It will require the co-operation of all concerned." Let us also have the co-operation of the Minister. Let us see whether he can put into operation the suggestions I have made. If they are not practicable I would be willing to withdraw them. For goodness sake, let us try something and not just continue to incur this huge deficit. support the motion.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the motion, and in doing so I extend sympathy to the relatives of those members who have passed on recently. I make special reference to the Hon. Reg. Hurst. I did not have the opportunity of serving in this Chamber with him, but I knew him personally and had great respect for the gentleman. I refer, too, to the Hon. Henry Kenneth Kemp, who was a member in another place. I had the honour to serve with him for a short time and I pay a tribute to him for the loyalty he displayed to the principles in which he believed. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment and wish you well in the high office of Speaker in this House.

I am honoured to represent the electorate of Gouger. The name has been derived from the first Colonial Secretary of South Australia. Robert Gouger was born in 1802 and died in 1846, at the comparatively early age of 44 years. According to the records, it was in the vicinity of his tent that the proclamation of South Australia was read. A note has been made concerning Robert Gouger recording that he played a great part in the work leading to the foundation of South Australia and became the first Colonial Secretary.

As a believer in the bi-cameral system of Parliament, I appreciate the honour of having served in another place. To me, that was an interesting experience of great value; I shall always value my experience in that Chamber. Being interested in the history of those who may have been foolish, shall I say, in seeking a position in the Assembly, I find that it was in 1915 that the last member came from another place to take a seat in this House. His name was Kirkpatrick and he had been in England, acting as Agent-General. He returned in 1914 and took a place in this House from 1915 to 1918. After having served previously for many years in the other Chamber, he returned to it in 1918 and served there until 1928.

I express my appreciation of the attitude of the other candidates in the election in Gouger on March 10. I am certain the greatest respect existed between the four candidates, and I very much appreciate the attitude adopted. In referring to elections generally, I also express my support for voluntary voting. Only today the Premier indicated in a most definite way in this Chamber that voluntary voting would not be accepted by his Government. Despite this, however, we must accept certain facts that have been established and published recently. Gallup polls show that 67 per cent of the people in Australia prefer voluntary voting systems. In South Australia 75 per cent of the younger people want voluntary voting. I challenge the Government to hold a referendum on voluntary voting, as I am sure that the result would be strongly in favour of adopting it. Having been elected as an L.C.L. member, I am most happy to be a member of this Party. More and more it is evident that the philosophy of political Parties comes down to a purely black and white division, one the philosophy of Socialism and the other of *laissez faire*, or free enterprise.

I understand Socialism to be a collective system of ownership and operation of the means of production, usually by the Government. By the means of production, I refer to capital goods, whereas free enterprise stands for the right of individuals to express themselves in the way in which they are most capable. On the other hand, Socialism introduces more and more control. Freedom is experienced by a method of free enterprise and the right of the individual to carry out his or her responsibilities as they see necessary. Field-Marshal Slim said:

There can be discipline without freedom, but there cannot be freedom without discipline.

I have referred to that statement to show that freedom does not mean the non-acceptance of responsibility but, rather, the personal right to discharge such responsibilities in a disciplined manner. I believe that economic justice can best be achieved by free men through free enterprise.

Inflation has been referred to in this House today and the member for Unley suggested that no blame could be placed on the present Commonwealth Government regarding the soaring rate of inflation. I remind the honourable member that the latest cost of living index figures indicate that the highest increases in the cost of living were in South Australia. Further, there has now been a Labor Party Government in South Australia for several years, and I say that the responsibility of the soaring inflation in this State can be placed at the door of the present State Government.

Many statements are made and much is said by this Government in defending the fact that it is the system of free enterprise that causes inflation and, in this regard, I refer to the words of Emerson, who said:

What you are speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say.

I should now like to comment on the remarks made by the member for Elizabeth in this debate regarding the co-operative established at Whyalla, as follows:

It is now history that the employees arranged to lease machinery and portion of the factory from James North to set up a workers' co-operative, ... I recently had the opportunity to revisit the co-operative and the enthusiasm of the members is magnificent. Productivity has risen greatly, absenteeism and lost time are almost non-existent, and the members are in high spirits and appear to be enjoying their work. The basis of the co-operative is that all members are equal partners in the venture. They have elected a manager to run the business from day to day and they direct him according to general policy guidelines that they lay down at weekly meetings. The members draw award wages, and the working conditions are those set down in the award, or better. If any members of this House are in Whyalla and have the opportunity to visit the factory, I strongly urge them to do so.

I should like to accept that invitation and visit that co-operative. I should genuinely like to see it in operation and see how it is administered, because I believe that many questions regarding this matter have not been answered. Why has there been a change in attitude of these people who were formerly employees? Why is there now no absenteeism? All the workers are happy and, indeed, I suggest that here rings a note of freedom as far as these people are concerned. Who will receive the profits? If these people receive the profits they will be happy but, if they are denied the profits, they will not be so happy. Therefore, because they are in an undertaking where they can express their ability and their potential to improve, develop and expand, they are happy. This is the argument I put forward in regard to private enterprise. Where people have the opportunity to develop they are happy and will co-operate.

Mr. Hopgood: You would like to see more co-operatives?

Mr. RUSSACK: That is nothing new. There are many co-operatives throughout the country. Indeed, Southern Farmers started as a co-operative, and this same development will possibly apply to this enterprise at Whyalla. I suggest that, as it expands, those who are in the management of the co-operative will gradually move to absolute methods of business procedure as we know them in our private sector today.

I should now like to consider one of the major industries in my electorate, that is, primary industry. The District of Gouger extends from the areas of the old copper mining districts almost to Port Broughton through to Snowtown, taking in Blyth, Riverton, Hamley Bridge, Balaklava, Nantawarra and Lochiel, and is essentially a rural area. Cereal crops of wheat, barley and oats are grown throughout this district. Over the last two decades the yields in this production of grain have been improved markedly because of the scientific methods and assistance that have been given in this field. Other crops are grown, such as field peas and oilseed crops. As far as the pastoral interests are concerned, there is about a 50 per cent interest in the production of wool and fat lambs, and it is interesting to note that pigs have the greatest concentration in the State throughout that area, although there is a definite decline in the pig population at present because of deflated prices.

The cattle population in the last five years has more than doubled. Big concentrations of poultry exist around Riverton, Balaklava, Snowtown and Hamley Bridge. The poultry is, in the main, kept for the purpose of egg production, and many small holdings have found it necessary to enter into intensive farming because of the smaller size of the holdings. Over the past years the area has demanded diversification, and credit is due to many of the landholders for their performances during the cost-price squeeze of the

years immediately behind us. In the Watervale-Auburn area, grape production is increasing and a lucrative wine industry is being developed. Although there has been an escalation generally in the price of the commodities produced in the rural areas, this is being offset greatly by increases in costs.

This afternoon in this Chamber there was laid on the table by the Minister of Transport a report from a committee that has been investigating transportation. I uphold the investigation in the interests of safety. As far as roads and transportation are concerned, emphasis must be placed on safety, and in that respect, where there is a call for increased speeds in transport vehicles, it is necessary to consider safety. However, I feel there must be caution in some of the measures that could be introduced in association with Bills concerning transportation. I will give an example. The committee has intimated that there could be suggestions and this has been confirmed in the report tabled today which contains a formula for vehicle loadings. On that basis one producer has estimated that he will have to make three trips instead of the normal two he makes now, both to the fertilizer works for the purpose of procuring his artificial fertilizer and to the silos for delivery of grain.

Primary industry is important not only in the District of Gouger and in the State of South Australia but also throughout the country of Australia. I have checked on the production and the exports of primary industry. I have excluded classifications under primary industry such as forestry, mining and fisheries, and have included only exports directly from agricultural, pastoral and other rural interests. In 1968-69, these exports from Australia were 57.5 per cent of our total exports. In 1969-70, they were 53 per cent, and in 1970-71 they were only 49.7 per cent. Although there was a decline in the export percentage from 1968 to 1971, with the increase in prices of the commodities produced in the rural industry I venture to say there will be an increase in the percentage of exports from this field.

I turn now to local government, which in South Australia today is in a most confused situation. I pay a tribute to those people who give time in this community service. In South Australia we have the proud record that local government was first introduced in Australia in the City of Adelaide, and from that time many men have given many years of service to local government. It is an effective form of government and is the government closest to the people. There must be change because of changing situations but I hope we do not lose the basic principle of local government. Committees are often appointed to investigate some aspect of a district. These committees are costly and often their investigations prove successful, but may I suggest that once local government loses its identity as we know it today there will be a greater need for more committees, because local government in its normal function carries out many of the duties that would have to be assigned to costly special committees. Local government is a continuing instrumentality that administers local affairs most efficiently and, because it is passing through a most uncertain period, many people who have had great experience in local government are, to a degree, bewildered.

Over recent years grants and other moneys made available to local government have been reduced. This, associated with rising costs, is making it more difficult for these bodies to remain viable. Yet, many councils are still working efficiently, and I again commend those who are responsible for their administration. Throughout the

District of Gouger many councils have satisfactorily completed roadworks and maintained many kilometres of road. It would be of great assistance if the road leading from the township of Blyth through Lochiel to Green Plains was sealed, providing a sealed surface on which grain could be conveyed from areas in the Mid-North to the fine port of Wallaroo, where adequate installations exist for the effective shipment of grain to oversea markets.

Students in country areas should have the same opportunity to reach Matriculation standard as is provided to city students. Therefore, I ask that all high schools in the Gouger District be provided with matriculation classes as soon as practicable. I know that some schools, especially the Riverton High School, have requested such classes. I ask that this matter be considered and that, where possible, a wider curriculum be introduced into area and high schools in country districts. Where school buses operate, I ask that every consideration be given to parents. I know that the Education Department has a good record in this respect. I ask that, wherever possible, the department continue to investigate school bus routes with a view to providing the greatest assistance possible, so that the least inconvenience is suffered by students and parents.

I now refer to housing for pensioners. A few years ago, some brick houses were made available in Kadina for pensioners, who were charged a rental representing a percentage of their pension. I suggest that, if at all possible, the provision of more houses of this type in country areas should be considered. Many aged people have found it necessary to leave country areas, as they have been able to find a home only in the metropolitan area. I can say confidently that many of these people would accept accommodation if it were available in their own area. I commend people in country towns who are doing their best to provide domiciliary services to enable elderly people to remain in the environment to which they have grown accustomed in their lifetime. At present, the provision of homes for the aged is being considered at Balaklava, Riverton, Hamley Bridge, and Kadina. At Riverton and Kadina the provision of these homes has reached a certain stage. I ask the Government to continue to help in all ways possible so that elderly people may be housed satisfactorily in their local environment.

For many years movement from country areas has been a problem, and it has been aggravated by the advent of improved transportation. In 1964 the Industries Development Committee, sitting as a special committee to inquire into the decentralization of industry, laid on the table of this House a report in which it stated that over the past 20 years a great deal of thought had been given in several countries to the associated problems of alleviating the congestion and attendant waste that had occurred in highly concentrated industrial areas, and of arresting the drift of population from country to urban centres. Therefore, this is not a new problem: it has been with us for a considerable time. So far no solution has been found. However, I ask that every assistance be provided to struggling country towns in their fight for survival.

I know that tourism is of great assistance in this respect, having given a big fillip to many country towns. Tourism is an industry that can help, but there should be a balance, with tourism being complementary and not being preferred to other industries. Successful National Trust museums, which have been established in country areas, attract many people. They attract tourists, who use local accommodation, and they also attract people who may establish some other type of industry. Events such as Transpo at Riverton and the Cornish Festival in the

Cornish mining area of Moonta, Wallaroo and Kadina, have been successful. As I believe that credit should be given where it is due, I wish to thank the Government for the help it gave, both through the Tourist Bureau and the Department of the Premier and of Development and in providing finance, to the very successful Cornish Festival held recently. I suggest that every encouragement be given to tourism, but I repeat that there should be a balance. Tourism should not be promoted to the detriment of some other industry.

I understand that the standardization of the rail gauge from the east-west link-up to Adelaide is being considered. If my memory is correct, in recent years it has been indicated that when the standardization to Adelaide is complete there could be a standard gauge line to Wallaroo. I ask the Government to consider this proposal further. Work on upgrading this line should be expedited. The installations at the port of Wallaroo could be developed to such an extent that Wallaroo would become a major port for South Australia.

As I think Government members could have treated me more harshly than they have this evening I thank them for the courtesy they have shown me while I have made my first speech in this House. I repeat that I appreciate being elected to represent the District of Gouger. I accept the challenge: I will do my best to represent the district in the way the people of Gouger would have me represent it. I support the motion.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In supporting the motion, with regret I offer my sympathy to the families of the late Mr. Reg Hurst and the late Mr. Harry Kemp. I had the privilege of knowing both gentlemen, and we recognize the loss to this Parliament caused by their passing. I take this opportunity to wish you, Mr. Speaker, every success on your appointment to your new office.

I refer again to the all-important question of water in this State. A report in the *Advertiser* of May 17, 1973, headed "Headline-seeking in River Claim," states:

Mr. Giles, M.H.R., was "headline seeking" in saying that the future of Adelaide was in danger from regional growth along the River Murray, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Corcoran) said yesterday. South Australia's water supplies were ensured into the next century, Mr. Corcoran said.

I wonder what has changed the mind of the Minister of Works so much in the past three years. A little more than three years ago, when I was previously a member of this House, the Premier, the Minister of Works, and, especially, the Minister of Education said that South Australia's water supplies certainly were a long way from being safe, consequent on the proposal to build a storage at Dartmouth. Now the storage will be built at Dartmouth and the Minister of Works has said that South Australia's water supplies are ensured for a period extending into the next century. This is an amazing statement and I only wish that he was correct in what he said.

I have made representations seeking additional water for several growers in the Riverland but on every occasion I have been met with a blank refusal. If South Australia is already over-committed about 25 years or 26 years before the turn of the century, what progress can the people in that part of South Australia look forward to, in the absence of any expansion at this stage? I consider that the Government and especially the Minister of Works have a duty to be forging ahead with providing additional storage. Dartmouth is being built, and that is well and good. Let us look to the next most suitable storage. Let us see that South Australia gets an increase in its entitlement every

time an additional storage is built, because that is the only way in which we in this State can progress.

During the debates about water supply that took place in this House about three years ago, we faced a continual barrage from the members of the then Opposition and we were told that we could not rely on water from a proposed storage at Dartmouth, because it was about 600 river miles (about 965 km) from South Australia and the Eastern States would use all the water before it got to this State. It was also suggested that Sir Henry Bolte would bore a hole in the bottom of the dam and run the water to Melbourne. Obviously, these statements were ridiculous.

I put it to the Minister of Works that the sooner he and his department negotiate with Governments in the Eastern States and with the Commonwealth Government to ensure that additional storages, administered under the River Murray Commission, are proceeded with, the better the position will be for South Australia, because that is our only chance to progress. At the same time, I offer my appreciation to the Minister of Works for the measures that his department has taken in the past two or three months in flushing out the section of the river between lock 4 and lock 3 by dropping the river level for about 10 days or a fortnight so as to drain the backwaters of the river between those two locks and to remove as much water as possible from Lake Bonney.

I also appreciate the tolerance shown by the people in the Waikerie area and below Waikerie, knowing that all the water drained from the backwaters must go past their properties, but I also know that in the long term this action is the greatest safeguard that the growers in that region can have in the summer months. I say that because, if there was a drop during the summer months, which is the critical irrigation period, those people would be inundated by salt water from the backwaters and this could have a devastating effect. I consider that, if the Engineering and Water Supply Department carries out this work during the winter months every year, when the flow rate in the river is over 10,000 cusecs, all the people in South Australia will benefit and the people downstream from lock 3 will be safeguarded during the summer months.

The irrigation distribution systems are an important part of water supply in South Australia. The open distribution system in this State at present wastes much of our allocation of water and I urge that, once a project has been started in an area to convert to a closed system, the work be not left half through, because the effectiveness of any system cannot be felt fully until the work is completed. The *Murray Pioneer* of June 7 contains a report of what the Minister of Lands stated when he opened the State conference of the Australian Dried Fruits Association on Tuesday, May 29. That report states:

An irrigation rehabilitation programme for the Riverland areas was being undertaken by the Irrigation branch of the Lands Department, the Minister of Lands (Mr. Kneebone) said when opening the A.D.F.A. State conference last week. He said the programme now included most of the up-river areas and would eventually involve all of them and Myponga.

Mr. Kneebone said, "We have already replaced the open concrete-lined main channel at Cooltong with a closed pipe system and will soon institute pressurization at the main pumping station instead of by way of individual block pumping units for that area. The completion of a pipe main system for Ral Ral Division at Chaffey is also well under way . . .

That is the point, because the Secretary of Chaffey Settlers Association (Mr. Moss), in a letter to the Minister dated October 31, 1972, stated:

At a meeting held recently and presided over by the Berri District Officer, the Chaffey Settlers Association was

advised that concrete channels Nos. 10, 11 and 15 in this area are not to be piped this year as previously intended, and could actually be left in their present state for at least another 10 years.

What is important is that, until a system such as this is completed, there is no pressurization whatsoever. A fully-charged system tries to operate with a minimum of not less than, say, 5 pounds to the square inch (34.47 kPa), and this determines the size of the pipes the growers need to install in their properties. While open channels remain there is no pressurization of the system; consequently, the individual grower must install larger pipes in his property to achieve the same result. All members know the extent to which pipes increase in price as the size increases.

Drainage is an important part of irrigation distribution systems. On July 3, 1973, I introduced a deputation of growers in the Cadell irrigation area to the Minister of Lands which pointed out to the Minister that in that area the Government had recently completed a comprehensive drainage system and had installed a modern pumping unit. Unfortunately, this comprehensive drainage system is of little use to the area if the growers cannot afford to install internal drains in their properties to make use of the system. It is essential that the Government make finance available at a low rate of interest to enable the fruitgrowers to install the necessary drains in their properties to make use of the facility that the Government has provided at considerable cost. One thing is useless without the other. Under the war service land settlement scheme the Commonwealth Government recognized those problems and provided money so that the drainage of these properties could be carried out. I believe it is essential that something similar be carried out in the remainder of this State's irrigation areas. Once this water has been drained from these properties it must be disposed of. There are ways and means of making good use of this water which, at present, is all directed into evaporation basins along the banks of the Murray River, and this contributes greatly to the salinity problem in the part of the river that flows through South Australia.

Until these basins have been removed, we cannot ask Victoria and New South Wales, "What are you doing about the salinity problem?" We must get our own house in order first before asking those States to do the same. There are many uses to which this water can be put. As I have said on other occasions, once a property has been drained for a short time the average salinity of the water leaving the property is about 800 p.p.m. Pasture can be grown with this quality of water. I believe that the member for Murray would agree that many of the pasture areas around and just above Lake Alexandrina would often be irrigated with water of about 800 p.p.m. This water can be used, but it needs to be sent in a direction opposite to the river, because the farther the water is taken back from the river the less chance it has of getting back and polluting our important water resource.

I now turn to the problem we have faced in the Riverland in the last six or nine months in relation to harvest labour. All members know about the shortage of harvest labour this year and the problems it caused the industry. A report in the *News* of February 20, 1973, under the heading "Fruitgrowers barter for scant pool of pickers," states:

Fruitgrowers stand on country railway station platforms each day, trying to outbid each other for the thin dribble of fruit pickers as they step off trains from Melbourne. Growers wait in Commonwealth Employment Service offices for an allocation of pickers—then leave disappointed and "empty-handed". These are common sights at places such as Shepparton, Mildura, Cobram and Robinvale in northern Victoria, as fruitgrowers face a critical shortage of labour.

If the pickers cannot be found, there is a danger that this year's large crop of dried fruits and pears will rot before it can be harvested.

Although the article dealt with the Mildura area, it was typical of the problem that existed in the Riverland. The dried pack from the Sunraysia and Riverland district this year was down by 50 per cent, largely because the growers could not procure labour to harvest the fruit. An article in *The Murray Pioneer* of May 17, 1973, under the heading "Harvest labour prospects are bleak—M.H.R. claims" states:

A suggestion that natives from Papua/New Guinea could be given temporary work visas to come to Australia to relieve the expected labour shortage for the next fruit harvest has been rejected by the Minister for Immigration (Mr. Grassby).

Mr. Grassby went on to say that we should consider using mechanical harvesting. That is well and good, but mechanical harvesting is still in its infancy, and the cost of converting existing plantings to suit mechanical harvesting is considerable. The average grower is unable to do this and, what is more, it might take him anything between 10 and 20 years to achieve. In the meantime, we still have to work out what we will do to harvest the fruit crops on the river. Ironically, at that period the number of unemployed throughout the country stood at about 100,000, yet we could not obtain sufficient labour to harvest the crops. An article in the *Advertiser* of March 16, 1973, under the heading "Canada breaks dole racket," states:

Toronto, Thursday. A Government crackdown on abusers of Canada's unemployment benefits programme has disqualified 40,846 people—65 per cent of those investigated. The Manpower Ministry investigated 62,879 benefits claimants across the country in the first nine weeks of this year. This covers only about 10 per cent of the 620,000 Canadians drawing unemployment benefits, but it was enough to put the wind up illegal claimants. The maximum claim is \$100 a week. The investigators concentrated on communities where there were jobs available and no-one to fill them.

That was similar to the situation we have seen in this country in the last year. The article continues:

In Calgary and Edmonton, investigators, checking on 32 claimants using a box number where their cheques were sent, found the box was the address of the Banff Springs Hotel, a ski resort in the Rockies.

The Australian Government could take a lead from the Canadian Government and consider closely our unemployment figures in the light of what I have said. In turning now to transport, I refer to the Lees report and its

recommendations concerning the Riverland and Mallee districts. If the recommendations of this report are implemented, the Karoonda to Waikerie railway line and the Berri to Barmera line will be closed within five years, and the Tailem Bend to Berri line will be closed within 10 years. This will mean that all existing railway services within the Mallee and Riverland areas will be closed within 10 years.

If freight rates are to be kept in proportion, it is essential that the railways services remain as a stabilizing factor in order to keep transport costs at a competitive figure. The railways will do a great service to decentralized industries in this State if it can keep a check on transport costs affecting the all-important decentralized industries. For the canneries, wineries, and packing houses of the Riverland, a considerable quantity of freight comes and goes from that area.

I refer briefly to education matters in the Riverland, particularly to the existing high schools at Renmark, Glossop and Waikerie. I have visited the new school at Para Hills and inspected several primary schools south of Adelaide using the open-plan system. When one looks at these magnificent schools, one cannot help wondering whether people in country areas are a somewhat forgotten race, especially when we compare these schools to those in the Riverland.

In that area schools consist of two or three solid-construction buildings with the remainder of the school comprising 30 or 40 temporary wooden units that are complete fire hazards. The people of that area have accepted those facilities for years, but it is time that some facilities such as those now available in the metropolitan and near-metropolitan areas were constructed in country areas. I ask the Minister of Education to consider the standard of buildings now existing in high schools at Renmark, Glossop, and Waikerie, and we look forward to the planned commencement dates of new schools at Glossop and Renmark. The Council of the Corporation of Renmark has provided the Education Department with an ideal site close to the town, and the sooner the department begins this project the better it will be. I support the motion.

Mr. CRIMES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 1, at 2 p.m.