

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

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

QUESTIONS**SPORTING FUNDS**

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government intends to make available additional funds to amateur sporting organizations in this State? In several ways amateur sport now requires additional funds. Earlier this week the Deputy Premier presented awards to people selected as the sportsman (or sportswoman) of the month and, subsequently, presented the award to the person who was adjudged sportsman of the year. At that function it was made clear that several people were not present because they were training in other States because of the inadequacy of training facilities in this State. This situation applied particularly to swimmers. At present \$11,000 is required by amateur sportsmen in this State so that a contingent of sporting representatives can be sent to the Commonwealth Games. With these matters in mind, and because any improvement in facilities in this State would entice people from other States and overseas to come here and provide additional competition for local amateur sportsmen, I ask whether the Government intends to make these funds available.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the Leader has said, I was honoured to be present at the News-Caltex sports star of the year award last Monday evening, and I do not disagree with what he said. For many years amateur sport in this State has been neglected, but the Leader will be the first to admit that the Party of which he is a member has been guilty for many years of culpable neglect in this regard. We cannot make up for that neglect in a relatively short period, but I assure the Leader, as I assure all sportsmen in this State, that this Government is vitally interested in promoting sport. Although the member for Hanson has said that he wants a Ministry of Sport established in this State, I think there are many practical ways in which we can assist sport apart from establishing such a portfolio.

The Premier told me only the other day that he was currently involved in discussions and deliberations that could lead to some added assistance being given to amateur sport in this State. As I said the other evening, I believe that sport plays a vital part in the average Australian's life, and this involves millions of people. In various ways, we all look to our sportsmen and sportswomen in order to derive some pleasure, or indeed leisure, and I assure the Leader that, while I can give him no specific indications at this time, the Government is concerned about this matter and will do what it can to assist. I will refer the question to the Premier, who, as I have said, is currently engaged in discussions and deliberations on the matter. If the Premier sees fit to indicate to the Leader the direction that the Government intends to take in this regard, I am sure he will do so.

WALLABIES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation give the House any information in addition to that contained on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser* alleging that 30,000 wallabies have been slaughtered on Kangaroo Island in the last 12 months by the use of the poison 1080?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I read the report in this morning's *Advertiser* with some concern, being aware

that the National Parks and Wildlife Service had received reports on the use of 1080 for the destruction of wallabies on Kangaroo Island. In fact, the resident ranger there has had six cases reported to him which he is currently investigating. Although there is clear evidence that 1080 has been used by some residents of the island for the destruction of the Dama wallaby, the figure of 30,000 mentioned in the report would certainly not be correct. However, I am concerned that this poison has been used for such a purpose on Kangaroo Island. As all members may be aware, 1080 is a poison used under the Vermin Act for the destruction of vermin, including rabbits, foxes and wild dogs. However, as there is no vermin on Kangaroo Island there seems to be no reason why this poison should be used there.

The Minister of Lands has discussed this matter with me and expressed concern about it, and he has said that he has contacted the stock firms on the island and received an assurance from them that in future they will cease to supply 1080 to residents of the island. However, 1080 could be ordered from the mainland and transported to the island, and as I believe that it should not be used for the purpose for which it is apparently being used there, I intend later this year to seek to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act in order to prohibit the use of 1080 on Kangaroo Island.

I should point out, because of the public interest in this matter, that, until last year when the National Parks and Wildlife Act was amended to provide protection for the Dama wallaby, there had been open season on that species on Kangaroo Island. There are many wallabies on the island, because the conditions there lend themselves to their prolific breeding. About 30 per cent of the island's area comprises national park and much of the other area on the island is not suitable for farm production, thereby providing ideal conditions for the Dama wallaby. The current situation is that the wallaby can be destroyed only under a pest permit issued by the resident ranger on Kangaroo Island. He issues a permit only after examining the application and visiting the area concerned. When issuing the permit, the ranger certainly does not permit the wallaby to be destroyed by the use of 1080. The department is concerned about this matter and is taking steps to prevent any further occurrences of the problem.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works say whether there have been any changes in the River Murray Commission this year regarding the commission's powers, functions and administration, or whether changes are contemplated? What additional work, if any, is planned by the commission to control and improve the quality of water entering South Australia in the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Deputy Leader will be aware that earlier this year the Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, together with the Ministers responsible for water supply, met with the Prime Minister in Canberra to examine the possibility of altering the River Murray Waters Agreement Act. This was an historic occasion: it was the first meeting on this matter since, I believe, 1913. As a result of that meeting a steering committee was established to examine the necessary alterations to the Act to provide for the protection of the quality of water as well as the quantity of water in the river. Under the present Act we have certain powers to control the quantity of water, but no power in respect of the quality. That steering committee has subsequently met on several occasions and only on Friday last, at the Hobart

meeting of the Water Resources Council with other State Ministers and the Commonwealth Minister for Conservation (Dr. Moss Cass), the Ministers from Victoria and New South Wales and I discussed the possibility of our meeting to consider some of the submissions already made by the steering committee regarding the control of quality of water in the Murray River.

I had asked that the terms of reference given to the committee be slightly altered and extended but, as discussions were still proceeding as to whether such a course would alter the problems confronting the committee (it would broaden the problems confronting it), it was thought that this course should not now be taken but that we should get on with the problem as outlined in the initial terms of reference of the committee. It was left on the basis that the New South Wales Minister (Mr. Freudenstein) would take the initiative in this matter and call a meeting of Ministers to consider the progress made by the steering committee. We consider that it is absolutely essential and urgent that action be taken to protect especially South Australia's interest regarding the quality of the water. As a party to the agreement and from the financial point of view, the Commonwealth Government is naturally involved in the matter.

If I have failed to cover any point, I will obtain further information for the honourable member. At this stage all I can say is that negotiations are proceeding. Although the steering committee has been active, I cannot say now when we will be able to amend the Act. I sincerely hope that we can take that action this session, but we may not be able to do so until next session. The honourable member will appreciate that the Act must be amended if we are to be able effectively to control the quality of water in the Murray River, a matter that is so important to us.

PACKAGING

Mr. KENEALLY: Bearing in mind that legislation is to be introduced that is designed to have deposits placed on drink containers, I ask the Minister for Environment and Conservation whether he has any plans to control other aspects of the pollution problem connected with packaging, which is fast becoming the major polluter in this country. Each member knows of the increase in his garbage disposal. We all know of the incredible packaging associated with shirts. Other cases of over-packaging probably include egg cartons, cosmetics, and toiletries, and there is even a suggestion that some people refuse to buy safety razors because of the excess packaging associated with them.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am saddened by the fact that some people are discouraged from buying razor blades, because pollution comes in many forms. I assure the honourable member that, although we plan legislation specifically to deal with the problem of non-returnable drink containers, this is certainly only one aspect of the packaging problem that is concerning the Government. I point out that the Director of the Environment and Conservation Department is Chairman of the subcommittee of the Australian Environmental Council, on which are represented all State and Commonwealth Ministers concerned with this subject. That subcommittee is examining the matters raised by the honourable member as well as dealing with all other problems associated with packaging. I hope that, as a result of that examination, we will see not only in this State but in all States further legislation to deal with the packaging problems to which the honourable member has referred.

BALDNESS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask officers of his department to investigate the activities of an organization which advertises widely that it can restore hair growth on the heads of men who are bald? This matter obviously concerns a great proportion of the male population of this State. Although the organization involved spends much money on advertising, I do not believe that the implied claims that it makes can be substantiated. I point out that in Victoria it is an offence under the health regulations to represent in any way whatever that a person is able to prevent, cure, or alleviate baldness or loss of hair. Sums of \$500 or \$600 have been mentioned in the complaints I have received.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As this is a matter for the Minister of Health rather than for the Attorney-General, I shall ask my colleague to look into it.

DOCTORS' FEES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have previously informed the House of the action taken by the Government in relation to the report on doctors' fees of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs and I published a letter which I had written to the Australian Medical Association Incorporated and the General Practitioners Society of Australia. I received an immediate acknowledgment from the A.M.A. and a further letter which I shall read in a moment. From the General Secretary (Dr. Yuille) of the General Practitioners Society I received the following letter:

Dear Mr. Dunstan, Thank you for your letter of July 25, 1973. Please note, first, that the address of the General Practitioners Society in Australia is not and never has been that to which your letter was addressed and, secondly, that I am replying to your letter in spite of the fact that you have not extended a similar courtesy to me when I have addressed letters to you over the past three years.

I am not aware of receiving any. The letter continues:

The committee of the society does not meet again until late in August and I am therefore quite unable to comply with your request by the date you mention. I received from the A.M.A. yesterday the following letter:

Dear Mr. Dunstan, With reference to your letter of July 25, 1973, in relation to medical fees in South Australia, the South Australian Branch Council of the Australian Medical Association has met to discuss this matter, and in addition I have had the opportunity to have informal discussions with the Prices Commissioner's representatives and with the Director of your department. I believe we are all agreed that the Prices Commissioner had limited time to examine a complex area based on a moderate quantity of information only. There are some anomalies, consequently, in the Prices Commissioner's report which bear examination. For example, in section 3 (b) (iii) which is taken from a Federal Parliamentary statement, it is claimed that doctors' net incomes had risen by 54 per cent over the last three years. This statement cannot be applied necessarily to South Australia without considering State differences, improvement for previously inadequately remunerated groups such as physicians and anaesthetists, the recording as medical services of remuneration from pathology, etc., going to instrumentalities, and a movement of patients from the public to the private sector with an increased number of services (and hence increased hours of work) performed by individual private practitioners. In addition, the quoted percentage increase in fees, as stated in 3 (c), implies a comparable increase in income, whereas only a portion of the total work of a general practitioner attracts fees from the common fee schedule. See also section 10 (a) last two paragraphs. In 9 (a) it would seem that the report believes that the common fee for specialist consultations increased in 1971

and 1972, whereas these have been constant since at least July, 1970. We believe there are other areas which could be worthy of further study. I would like you to know that this branch of the Australian Medical Association has a membership of approximately 1,600 while that of the South Australian Branch of the General Practitioners Society is approximately 100. Of this 100, a number belong to the Australian Medical Association and would receive any recommendations we issue. May I point out that through a member of our branch council we have taken pains to make the General Practitioners Society aware of the import of this whole matter. You will be aware of the good record of observance of the common fee schedule by the medical practitioners of this State. You may not be aware that recorded non-observance includes not only higher fee charges but also fee charges lower than the common fee schedule. It is my earnest desire to avoid price control. For example, I do not believe it is professionally and socially desirable and, of course, such a mechanism would involve further Government expenditure. In regard to sections of Part 1 of the common fee schedule relating to specialist consultations, I am concerned for sections of the profession whose net incomes have been subject to small rises and even reductions over the past two years. For example, documentation could be produced relating to a successful neurologist (specialist physician) with a stable practice whose income has fallen by approximately 12 per cent over the last three years. For the above reasons I believe I could make recommendations to members along the following lines with an expectation of good co-operation:

1. Part 1 of the common fee schedule.
 - a. Relating to general practitioners. An increase of 18 per cent.
 - b. Relating to specialists. An increase of 14 per cent.
2. Parts 2-10 of the common fee schedule.

Adherence to present fee charging practices, except for a few items referring to general practitioners (including your stated confinement item) which I believe the Prices Commissioner will submit to you in the very near future.

I would be most grateful for your advice which would enable me to assure members that further negotiations with the Prices Commissioner could continue immediately any more detailed information comes to hand. Also that any controls introduced would have a specified short duration. You will appreciate that it is my desire to maintain good relations in our community by striving to reach a situation mutually agreeable to all concerned. In conclusion, I would be most grateful for the opportunity to discuss this whole matter with you should the above suggested recommendations not be agreeable to you and in order to avoid any potential misunderstanding.

I met Dr. Sando and Dr. Auricht this morning at 9 o'clock, an appointment that I had arranged following the receipt of that letter. I discussed the matter with them at that meeting and handed to them a letter from me in the following terms:

Dear Dr. Sando, I refer to prior correspondence on the subject of medical fees. In view of the fact that some doctors do not propose to comply with the request of the Government, it will be necessary to declare medical services as declared services under the Prices Act. However, I am prepared to agree that no general price order should issue specifying for all medical practitioners a maximum fee, provided that the members of the Australian Medical Association comply with the recommendations of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs at this stage. The matters put forward by your association do not appear to the Government to support a greater increase immediately, but if the Australian Medical Association agrees to the proposal I have outlined, the Government would be prepared to have the Commissioner undertake immediate discussions with the association to see whether his recommendations should be revised. In relation to those doctors who are not members of the Australian Medical Association and who do not comply with the recommendations, or where members of the association indicate they are not prepared to accept the recommendations of the Commissioner when the association has indicated its recommenda-

tion that they do comply, the decision would then rest with the Government as to whether individual doctors would have maximum fees specified in relation to them.

I had what I thought was a fruitful discussion with the two doctors this morning and I have arranged for the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs to confer immediately with the Australian Medical Association to find out whether there should be any revision of his recommendations to us. If there was a revision of his recommendations, the Government would accept that revision and notify the A.M.A. and the public accordingly. I consider that we are on the way to getting, with the overwhelming majority of medical practitioners in South Australia, a satisfactory arrangement on medical fees.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether the letter he quoted as being the one handed to the President of the A.M.A. this morning was prepared before or after his discussion with Dr. Sando and Dr. Auricht? During his statement the Premier read a letter from Dr. Sando, I think, asking for a chance to discuss the matter of fees with the Premier, and the Premier said (and this was his phrase) that he had had a fruitful discussion with the two gentlemen this morning. I have been told (I hasten to say by neither Dr. Sando nor Dr. Auricht) this morning that the discussion, which the Premier said in his statement took place at 9 o'clock, lasted for only a couple of minutes, which would have made it impossible to have any sort of discussion, much less a fruitful one, with those concerned. I stress that that information may be unreliable, but the Premier now has the chance to correct it and to say for how long the discussion lasted. I note that he handed the letter to the gentlemen this morning, and I wonder whether he made them wait while he prepared it as a result of the discussion, or whether it had been prepared beforehand, thus making the discussion in any case a farce.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The letter had already been prepared: I had dictated it last evening.

Mr. Millhouse: That's what I thought.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So what! Doctor Sando and Dr. Auricht had a lengthy discussion with the head of my department and the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs yesterday morning before they sent to me the letter that I have read to the House. I have had a full report of this discussion, and it was in the light of that discussion and the letter that, after consultation with my colleagues, a decision was made by Government. I wanted to communicate this decision to Dr. Sando and Dr. Auricht as soon as possible, and as soon as they saw me I outlined the Government's views.

Mr. Millhouse: A fruitful discussion!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I told them that I was waiting for the letter to be typed. I had prepared the draft last evening, but it would set out what I had just said to them. The letter having been brought in, I checked and signed it, and handed it to them. We went on to discuss several matters arising from it, and there was a fruitful discussion. They wanted clarification of some matters in the Commissioner's report and in my original letter to them, and they got it. Although the member for Mitcham apparently does not like this, Dr. Auricht specifically expressed his view that the A.M.A. was appreciative of the way the Government had dealt with it over the last few days since the Commissioner's report—

Mr. Millhouse: How long—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You're not going to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

TOILET FACILITIES

Mr. OLSON: As several buildings in Adelaide are used mainly by the medical profession (for example, Gawler Chambers, 188 North Terrace, where, according to the pink pages of the telephone directory, there are 15 doctors), will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health what procedure is adopted to provide toilet facilities for the public? On Monday, July 23, whilst waiting for a lift in the building I have mentioned, a woman hurried to a door marked "Ladies" but found that it was locked. She came back and complained to the lift attendant that she was feeling ill. The lift attendant walked this person to the upper floor to find out whether the ladies' room on the fourth floor was opened, but this room was also locked, whereupon the woman hurriedly left the building and was sick in the gutter outside. When inquiries were made of the Health Department at the Adelaide Town Hall about the position regarding this matter, it was explained that the Act was such that the occupants of these buildings were not responsible for providing such services. In view of the many people who are required to travel long distances to visit medical specialists, will the Attorney ask his colleague to investigate the possibility of ensuring that such facilities are provided in buildings in which medical attention is given to the public?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to the Minister of Health.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Transport say whether he considers that the South-Eastern Freeway is capable of serving the citizens of the southern part of the State as well as the projected population in the new city of Monarto? I understand that, when the South-Eastern Freeway was first planned, the idea of building the city of Monarto had not been conceived and therefore the population of Monarto was not a population load to be considered in constructing and siting the freeway. Since then, the city has been planned and people living in the southern part of the State have expressed concern as to whether they, as citizens living farther from Adelaide, will be inconvenienced seriously if the freeway is overloaded by the people of the new city.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I expect that in the next few years, once the potential of Monarto has been assessed properly, a complete review of the ability of the South-Eastern Freeway to carry traffic will be undertaken. It is clear (and it has been since the establishment of Monarto has been under consideration) that it will be necessary to provide a better type of public transport system between Adelaide and Monarto. Several studies are being undertaken about this matter at present and I think the outcome of those studies and the resultant action taken will have a direct bearing on the capabilities of the South-Eastern Freeway from the point of view of private and commercial motorists. At this stage it is not possible to be specific in reply to the question, other than to say that part and parcel of the planning of Monarto must be the planning of access routes to and from Adelaide, and that planning is now being undertaken.

TERINGIE HEIGHTS WATER SUPPLY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department will acquire the Foothills Water Company Proprietary Limited and therefore take over the responsibility of

ensuring a continuous supply of high-quality water to the residents of Teringie Heights? Foothills Water Company Proprietary Limited now supplies water to the residents of Teringie Heights. However, for five days during last summer the residents were without water of any kind. Apparently the reason for this is that the present pumping facilities that supply the water for this private company from a bore are quite inadequate. On other occasions also the residents of this area have been without water. As the population in this area is tending to increase rapidly, this problem is likely to continue to increase and, in fact, to worsen at an exponential rate. Therefore, can the Minister give an undertaking that his department will take over this water supply?

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: I have examined this matter recently. The honourable member has already referred to some of the difficulties associated with this scheme (a private scheme, I may add), which is not satisfactorily serving the people it was meant to serve. Those people seem a little reluctant to allow the Government to take over the scheme, because to do so may cost them more than the present cost, although I understand that the private operator (and this is one of the few schemes in South Australia operated in this way) has said that an increase in the price charged for water may be necessary. This may alter the views of some people and they may decide that it would be better for them to use the Government water supply. I believe that they would be well advised to do this, because not only would they be assured of a supply but also it would be safe from a health point of view, although it may cost them a little more. I intend to write to the honourable member seeking his assistance and to ask him to canvass these people. I will supply him with a list of consumers, and he can ascertain whether the past attitudes that have persisted have changed and whether people will now be willing for the Government to negotiate with the present supplier to take over the scheme. However, I point out that the cost of taking over the scheme, as I understand it, will not be low, and negotiations will have to proceed with the present supplier. There will be no guarantee (nor could I give one at this stage) that I will take over the supply. Certainly, it would be in the best interests of the people living in the area for the Government to do that and, if I can, I will do it, but I will not pay an exorbitant price for an inefficient scheme in order to satisfy the needs of most of the people, unless they are willing to say that they are ready for us to take over the scheme. I hope I will receive the honourable member's co-operation (and I am sure I will) in this matter, so that it can be resolved satisfactorily.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain details of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's plan, if any, for sewerage Wattle Street and neighbouring streets situated in a subdivision above Haines Road, Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I shall be pleased to do that, I may have signed a letter to the honourable member yesterday indicating what the department intends to do in this area. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

GLADSTONE PRISON

Mr. VENNING: Is the Attorney-General aware of the unsatisfactory reply he gave to me, prepared by the Chief Secretary last week, about the future of the Gladstone prison? It had been rumoured in the area for the past

six months that the Gladstone prison's future was in jeopardy. Consequently, I asked the Minister a question and he replied:

The Chief Secretary is not aware of the origin of any rumour regarding the Gladstone prison. Plans for extensions to shower and messing facilities are far advanced. No departmental recommendation for closure has been made. Any decision on the future of the prison will be considered in the light of the forthcoming report from the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee.

The report of this committee was received by members yesterday, and part of it reads as follows:

Gladstone prison should be phased out altogether, serving as a medium security local and overflow facility in the interim. It has three disadvantages: it is old, in a country area not close to any urban concentration, even a small one, and represents excess maximum security capacity. Apart from its correctional disadvantages it necessarily entails expenditure by way of maintenance, modernization, and travel accessibility which would be better devoted to other projects.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know what was unsatisfactory about the reply given by the Chief Secretary, as it seemed to be very adequate and sensible. As it indicated, the future of the Gladstone prison will be considered in the light of the report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee. That report has now been tabled, and I have no doubt that the Chief Secretary will do as he indicated he would do and reconsider the question of the Gladstone prison in the light of that report.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether, as a result of a question I asked last year drawing attention to the smoke and soot fall-out from the boilerhouse at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the situation has been remedied? In his reply the Minister indicated that action would be taken to change from coal burning to using oil.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I can recall the honourable member's question and the information I gave him. However, at this stage as I am not sure whether the suggested action has been taken I will inquire. If no action has been taken, I will ascertain details of the planned programme for the honourable member.

SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. WRIGHT: As I heard from a source in another State that negotiations are to be commenced in New South Wales in relation to reducing the number of service stations in that State, I ask the Premier how long it will be before the closure of surplus service stations will commence in South Australia and when will the relevant Bill be introduced.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As a result of a meeting held last week of representatives of all the oil companies and of the Automotive Chamber of Commerce, I have written to all the oil companies in the following terms:

The Government of South Australia is determined that the excessive number of service stations in this State will be curtailed in the interest of economic retailing of motor spirit. We aim to increase the average throughput at service stations to the extent that they become economically viable for dealers to operate and also to reduce costs of distribution and maintenance of premises so that the price of petrol can be kept as low as possible. For several years there has been a voluntary arrangement between the Government and the major oil companies to the effect that no additional service stations would be constructed in the metropolitan area of Adelaide unless a site elsewhere in the area was closed. Certain other undertakings were also given. In the main, that voluntary agreement has been observed by the parties concerned but the time has now come when all companies must be bound and the whole State included.

Several meetings have been held over the last year between representatives of the oil industry and the Government, but efforts to achieve a voluntary agreement with all oil companies which would meet the Government's requirements have proved fruitless. In consequence, I have caused draft legislation to be prepared in order to achieve our objective. The permanent head of my department has now advised that following examination of the draft legislation by oil industry representatives there is a possibility that a "voluntary" agreement can be arranged in the face of an otherwise inextricable situation. Accordingly I am writing to say that any proposal put forward by the oil industry must be subscribed by all companies selling motor spirit in South Australia. The criteria for an acceptable proposal are set out in the enclosed statement. I shall expect your written undertaking within a short time but nevertheless I shall proceed with the preparation of the Bill in the expectation that it may be needed in due course.

The enclosed statement referred to is as follows:

Criteria for Voluntary Retail Outlet Disinvestment Scheme to be submitted by the oil industry

To be acceptable to the South Australian Government such a scheme must:

- (1) reduce the number of retail outlets operating in South Australia on January 1, 1973, by approximately 10 per cent by June 30, 1974;
- (2) include a reduction by 10 per cent of the company-owned outlets operating in the metropolitan area as at January 1, 1973;
- (3) provide for each company not to do anything to the detriment of the scheme and to accept the judgment of the Government in this regard: in particular each company would undertake not to reopen an outlet closed under the operation of the scheme nor to take any action either as wholesaler, retailer, owner of a site or lessee of a site which would contribute to the reopening of such a site;
- (4) provide that additional industrial motor spirit pumps will not be installed unless the company can demonstrate that throughput will be not less than 6,800 / a month;
- (5) bind companies to abide by decisions of the Dealer Conciliation Committee in relation to disputes concerned with dealer agreements;
- (6) provide that sales and deliveries of motor spirit from oil company depots will be in quantities of not less than 200 l.

It is understood that the S.A. Automobile Chamber of Commerce concurs provided:

- (a) a subcommittee of representatives of the oil industry, reseller associations and Government reviews the draft licensing legislation before August 25, 1973;
- (b) there is significant progress within three months in regard to outlet closures;
- (c) individual companies provide to the Government by August 31, 1973, lists of branded and supplied outlets as at January 1, 1973;
- (d) individual companies provide, on October 1, 1973, and on a quarterly basis thereafter, the addresses of outlets which have been closed in the previous period.

STRATHALBYN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: In reply to a question I asked yesterday, the Minister of Works said that investigations had been made into a scheme for supplying water to the country lands between Callington and Strathalbyn, including the areas of Hartley and Woodchester. There will be considerable development in Strathalbyn in future, and the quality of the water in Lake Alexandria is becoming more polluted. As I understand that the present pumping system is most inefficient, I believe that it would be more economical to supply water to the existing Strathalbyn and country lands scheme through a pipeline connected to the new Murray Bridge to Hahndorf main. Will the Minister examine this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I must admit that I had some difficulty hearing the earlier part of the question but,

as it apparently relates to an extension of the scheme that I outlined to the honourable member yesterday in reply to a question, I will obtain a further report for him from the department.

MARKETING BOARDS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier say what is the Government's policy on the composition of statutory marketing boards and whether the Government has any plans to replace the present grower control of these boards? Further, is the Government aware that rural organizations, especially United Farmers and Graziers, are opposed to suggestions of the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Senator Wriedt) that people other than growers should be appointed to statutory marketing boards? Most members of the rural community believe that the goods they produce are their own and that they should have majority representation on the various statutory marketing boards. Indeed, they believe that outside interests controlling these boards might act in a way that is not in their best interests and that there should therefore be no change in the present situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has never been the policy of this Government that marketing boards should be composed solely of producer representatives. If the honourable member pays attention to an expression of philosophy in this House by another member of his Party as recently as last evening, he will know that a marketing proposal of that kind certainly does not tally with *laissez faire*. At this stage, I cannot say that we have any proposals to alter the constitution of marketing boards for which this Government is responsible.

FREIGHT AGENCY

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport give details of a statement reported in yesterday's *Advertiser* concerning the establishment of a State-owned freight-forwarding agency being considered for South Australia? Under the heading "Drive to Cut Freight Charges" the report states:

Establishment of a State-owned freight forwarding agency as part of a drive to cut freight costs is being considered for South Australia. The proposal is one of a number put forward as a result of a study of the interstate transport needs of South Australian manufacturers.

Other proposals include the possibility of allowing increased axle loads and gross vehicle weights for road transport operators and arrangements for the pooling and blending of loads which are either less than full loads or are an unusual mix of high and low density goods. The study was undertaken by the Minister of Transport's office for the Industrial Development Advisory Council and financed on a 50/50 basis by the South Australian Government and industry.

I have been contacted by two transport operators who suggest that some aspects of the report seem to cut across the Flint report which was tabled in the House yesterday. They referred especially to the proposal regarding the possibility of allowing increased axle loads and gross vehicle weights for road transport operators.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I point out, first, that both the press statement to which the honourable member refers and the Flint report are matters which, at this stage, are reports. True, the Flint report is a little more advanced than the goods transport study but, without traversing the ground that has already been covered by the honourable member, the situation is that that is a committee established to study goods transportation. That study is jointly sponsored by the department and by private enterprise and, when the report is concluded, the recommendations in it will be studied. The sole purpose of the report is

for the first time ever to make a proper study of the transport of goods, bearing in mind that the industrial situation in South Australia is such that most of our manufactured goods are subject to transport and therefore have a transport component built into their costs.

The conflict of matters being considered by the goods transport study and the Flint committee concerns axle loadings. Without being adamant to the extent that I cannot retrace my steps, suffice to say that there is no intention at all of altering the existing eight-ton (843 t) back-axle loading. If and when we ever reach the stage of reconsidering that, it would be changed only over a long period, because the roads constructed throughout the Commonwealth of Australia (where the eight-ton limit applies) have been built to withstand that load. If that load is altered the whole of our road structure throughout Australia (not just in South Australia) would have to be altered as would all our bridges, culverts, etc. This would be a most difficult job and, at this stage, I can say with certainty that there is no intention in the foreseeable future of altering the eight-ton axle-limit load.

TRADESMAN SHORTAGE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what further action, if any, he is taking to combat the extreme shortage of bricklayers and other building tradesmen that is facing the South Australian building industry? Will the Minister follow the lead of the progressive Liberal Government in Victoria in bringing tradesmen from oversea countries by air lift? This question is similar to a question asked on July 25 regarding the Government's trainee programme, and I refer to p. 32 of *Hansard*, where the Minister is reported as saying:

It has been 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.

This scheme involves a long waiting period and, as there is currently an extreme shortage of tradesmen in the South Australian building industry, what other action does the Minister intend to take?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: At this stage we are not contemplating flying in tradesmen. However, the Premier and I will meet with the Master Builders Association towards the end of this week, and no doubt this will probably be one of the questions raised by the association. I shall probably be able to tell the honourable member after that meeting of any decisions we make on the association's requests.

FRANCES RAIL GANG

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Transport say whether it is intended to transfer the railway construction gang from Frances to Naracoorte? Concern has been expressed by my constituents about the reported transfer of the railway gang located at Frances. Railway personnel give balance to the town, provide valuable numbers at the local school, assist local business in a general way and are very much an integral part of that thriving and expanding community. Frances, which is situated about half way between Bordertown and Naracoorte, is part of an area that has survived the rural crisis. Railway families have an important place in the community and it is the wish of the people of Frances that these families remain at this centre.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be delighted to investigate the matter raised by the honourable member and let him have a reply in due course.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Local Government indicate what his legislative programme will be for this session regarding changes to the Local Government Act following the submission of the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee in 1970?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, I cannot give the honourable member the specific information he seeks, because the action taken by the Government will depend entirely on when the report of the Royal Commission on Local Government Boundaries is handed down. I expect that, after the Commission's report is handed down, sufficient time will be given for the report to be studied and considered, and amending legislation will then be introduced. I should like to think it will be in the current session, but I think I am being rather optimistic in that regard. That is the situation regarding any alteration to the Local Government Act arising from the Royal Commission's inquiry.

WATER RATES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Works say whether, in view of the proposed increase in water rates, the Government will consider abolishing water rates charged to amateur sporting clubs? I understand that many amateur sporting clubs are experiencing financial hardship in paying water rates, particularly excess water rates, on grounds leased from the Adelaide City Council and other local councils.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My immediate reply is "No", but I will examine the matter to see whether or not this can be done. I have received representations on this matter from the women's playing fields organization. As yet, however, I have not received a report from the department. I think that the honourable member will realize that this is not the only way amateur sport can be helped. As I am not certain how far-reaching a decision on this matter may be, it is being examined at present. All I can say is that the matter is currently being investigated; I cannot say now whether or not I can do what the honourable member suggests.

X-RAY UNIT

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health what was the date of the last visit to Marree of the chest X-ray unit and the date on which the next visit will be made? When I visited this town recently my attention was drawn to the fact that it is some time since the X-ray unit visited the area; in fact, some people claim that they cannot recall the last visit.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

SEWERAGE SERVICES

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether the Commonwealth Government has given him any assurance that moneys will be made available to South Australia this fiscal year for the purpose of extending sewerage services? In my district (and I know this applies in other districts on the fringe of the metropolitan area) there is the problem of septic tank effluent flowing into the streets, creating a health hazard as well as affecting the amenity of the area. This is one of the few things that make parts of my district unpleasant to live in. Before the Commonwealth election, statements were made that the Commonwealth Government would take action in this connection. South Australia has been fortunate that previous Governments, of whatever political colour, have done more in this field than has been done by Governments in many

other States. However, there is a leeway that must still be made up.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Negotiations between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government have taken place on this matter and they are proceeding. Although we expect to get money this year, I imagine we will not get confirmation of that or be told how much we will get until the Commonwealth Budget is brought down.

HIGHWAYS FINANCE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Transport say what was the allocation of finance to the Highways Department of this State from the Commonwealth Grants Commission for the year 1972-73, as compared with the prepared budget for the year 1973-74? In view of the serious cuts in Commonwealth rural aid grants to certain councils for 1973-74, I am requested by the respective councils to obtain this information.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No moneys are made available by the Commonwealth, through the Grants Commission, to the Highways Department. However, as money is made available by the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, that is probably the source to which the honourable member is referring. This Act, which operates for a five-year period, has a schedule in which the relevant sums are set out. Although I do not have those figures at my immediate disposal, I can obtain them from the Highways Department. Alternatively, if after Question Time the honourable member cares to go to the Parliamentary Library he can see a copy of the Act, or I can get it for him from the library. Incidentally, this Act expires on June 30, 1974, as we are in the fifth and final year of its operation.

AXLE WEIGHTS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Transport say whether it is correct that when vehicles are weighed by transport patrol officers no weighbills are issued, even though any fine imposed is usually based on the extent by which the load exceeds the gross axle loading permitted? If this is the position, will the Minister consider having such weighbills issued so that offenders will know what is the precise nature of their offence?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I am not aware of the mechanical operation followed by inspectors in this respect, I will seek the information and supply it to the honourable member.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM

Mr. COUMBE: Last year, when I asked a question about the development of the Islington sewage farm site, I received a progress report. This area, which was previously under the control of the Minister of Works, is to be developed in various ways; part of it is to go to the Railways Department in connection with the standard gauge scheme, and other parts are to be developed for various purposes. Can the Minister of Works say now how far the Government's plans have proceeded for the development of this large area of land that is conveniently situated so close to the city?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although this land was originally vested in the Minister of Works, as the honourable member may be aware it was transferred to the Minister of Lands, as it reverted to Crown land. The Minister of Lands currently controls the allocation of land in this area. Although progress has been made, I will not try to set out the latest position. I will seek a report from my colleague and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

CALLAGHAN REPORT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week about the terms of reference given to Dr. Callaghan when preparing his report on the future role of the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that Sir Allan Callaghan was given the following terms of reference for his review of the functions of the Agriculture Department:

- (1) To examine the proposals outlined by the Director of Agriculture in his submission dated June 30, 1972, on 'The Future Role of the Department of Agriculture'.
- (2) In line with the proposed terms of reference set out on pages 5 to 9 of this submission, and following consultation with the Director and his staff, to advise on the most appropriate methods of adapting the existing organization and functions of the department.
- (3) To make recommendations on priorities for the implementation of the revised objectives and functions of the department and on the desirability and practicability of expanding or curtailing any existing activities.
- (4) To make such other recommendations as may be deemed appropriate to the adjustment of the objectives, functions and organization of the Agriculture Department to serve the changing needs of agricultural industries more effectively in the future.

The report referred to in paragraph (1) is a confidential submission to the Government by the Director of Agriculture on the possible reorganization of his department.

PIMBA ROAD

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Transport say what plans the Highways Department has to upgrade the road from Andamooka to Pimba? The Minister will know that, because of the heavy rains that have fallen in the North of South Australia, this road has been impassable for a considerable time. The road should be built up over many of the swamps and culverts installed so that vehicles, particularly semi-trailers that carry vital supplies, can get through.

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

MONARTO WATER

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation assure me without any doubt that there will be no infiltration into the Murray River of waters from the underground water table that will be established automatically under the new city of Monarto?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not think anyone has ever been able to assure the honourable member of anything without any doubt. He always seems to be able to express doubts. I am willing to ask the people involved in the planning of Monarto to give me as much information as they can about the question the honourable member seems so worried about so that he will have the advice of responsible officers rather than my own assurances, and perhaps that will satisfy him.

DRUG THEFTS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my recent question on drug thefts?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that there is a continuing increase in the theft of drugs. It is also suspected that there is an increase in the number of crimes committed to provide the means to obtain drugs but it is difficult to prove this. From information available it is not possible to show whether persons taking drugs are

more prone to commit crimes, or whether criminals are more prone than others to take drugs. Studies of cause and effect are difficult and the Police Department cannot assist at present in this field.

AYERS HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether it is proposed to give any more help, either in kind or financially, to the National Trust in connection with Ayers House? I was present at the opening ceremony of Ayers House, and I think on that occasion the sum of \$350,000 was mentioned as the cost of the renovations. I have since been told (I cannot remember whether I read it or was told, but I believe the information is reliable) that of the \$350,000 it has been estimated that about \$280,000 has been spent on that part of Ayers House that is being used as a restaurant. Certainly I have had complaints that the rest of the building has been restored to, to use the expression used to me, "an appalling standard". This morning I went to Ayers House and I was shown some of the things about which there have been complaints. The shutters on the windows on the western end of the building obviously have dry rot and have been painted over; salt damp in the kitchen has been painted over; the ceiling roses in several rooms have simply been painted over and not restored to their original condition with gold and red colouring; the staircase has simply been painted and is obviously not in the condition it was in, and should be in, in conformity with the rest of the building; cornices in various rooms have not been restored; the surfacing of the floors has been, to my unpractised eye, imperfectly done; and in one passageway the ceiling has obviously not been touched, as one can still see some of the wooden laths that hold the plaster in place. These are only some of the things I saw during a quick look at Ayers House. I understand (although I have not had the pleasure of dining there) that even in the restaurant, although it has been well restored to make it, in the Premier's euphemism, "a living thing", the prices are so high as to be almost prohibitive for most Adelaide people to use.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Could you use it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir, I could not afford \$35 to stand two people dinner.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's cheap.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, it is not cheap by my standards. I know there have been complaints, and the National Trust had hoped, because of the promises made to it by successive Governments, to be given the control of the whole of Ayers House. That has not happened. If the Government is to take credit for the renovation, not restoration, I should have thought it would be done properly. I therefore ask whether anything more is to be done to bring it up to standard.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's figures are incorrect but I will get him the accurate figures involved. Members of the National Trust sat on a steering committee with representatives of the Government and with the architects overseeing the restoration of Ayers House. The moneys committed to the restoration of Ayers House were outlined in a feasibility study prepared by the architect and accepted by the National Trust. The National Trust has indicated that it will be some time before it is able to make use of many parts of the building that have been committed to it. If the honourable member looks at the parts of the building that already had been committed to the trust, he will find that even in those parts of the building in the front where restoration has been

completed there has not been a complete furnishing by the National Trust. Undoubtedly there will be calls from time to time for further work to be done in relation to Ayers House, but extensive work was done in restoring the ceilings and the floor and gilding the woodwork in the two reception rooms and the State dining-room, which are committed to the National Trust. In fact, it was originally scheduled that more restoration work would be done to them than to the ballroom. The regilding of the ceiling of the ballroom was an extra that I ordered when I found the standard of the ceiling in that area was not equal to the standard of the ceilings in the area controlled by the National Trust. I point out that the National Trust has access to the ballroom, as it has to some parts of the licensed premises. Under the previous Government's proposals, the National Trust was to be handed the whole of the building but it was never promised any sum to enable it to restore the building. In fact, the National Trust's income was insufficient to pay for existing maintenance on Ayers House, apart from restoration. That was the position under the Government of which the honourable member was a member, and in addition that Government proposed to put the chest clinic on the ground floor of Ayers House, completely ignoring the historic nature of that building in consequence. That was complete vandalism. The Government has restored Paxtons Cottage as a centre for the National Trust. It has tried to restore the building in circumstances of which most people in South Australia can be proud. The position in relation to restoration within the place is as I have explained it, namely, that the work has been overseen on the basis of a feasibility study accepted by the National Trust and conducted by a committee on which the trust has been represented. Obviously the honourable member has seen some statements by the Secretary of the National Trust. Those statements were not conveyed to me by any official of the trust as being the trust's official views. In fact, officers of the trust have expressed the contrary view. No doubt as a result of that statement the honourable member has gone to Ayers House, but I suggest that, if he gives due attention to what this Government has done in restoration there and in other historic buildings in Adelaide, he will realize that we have done many times as much as any previous Government in the State has done.

EFFLUENT SCHEMES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works say whether there has been any change of policy or alteration in priorities in respect of the provision of sewerage or common effluent schemes for towns within the State? The Minister will be aware that he has announced to the House an extension of the original scheme that was to provide sewers or effluent schemes for the towns in watershed areas of the reservoirs. Subsequently, the whole State was involved. The Public Health Department, working through the Government Drainage Co-ordinating Committee, had undertaken surveys on behalf of several towns. In fact, in the specific case of Williamstown, a report, signed by Mr. H. L. Beaney, stated:

As a result of its (the Government Drainage Co-ordinating Committee's) investigation the committee recommended that Williamstown could be adequately served by a common effluent drainage scheme. After considering all aspects, including future commitments, the Director-General of Public Health and myself are in agreement with this recommendation.

More recently the council has been told that work has been stopped so far as the Public Health Department is concerned. This is because of some decision by the Engineering and Water Supply Department that it will now sewer the

area. There has been a financial commitment in respect of the Public Health Department survey on this matter, and that commitment was paralleled by the council's bringing the adjoining town of Lyndoch into the scheme with a view to using the ponding system at both Lyndoch and Williamstown concurrently. On this basis, I ask whether there has been a change of either priority or policy, so that people in the towns concerned will know where they stand in regard to this scheme.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: There has been no change of policy: the policy stands. There has been a change of thinking (I do not think this applies to Williamstown but it certainly applies in the South-East, where underground water is involved) about whether a common effluent system is as efficient in protecting the underground system as is deep drainage or sewerage. I certainly know of no such thought regarding Williamstown, but the department, because of a decision made, as the honourable member has said, in connection with Lyndoch, may have changed its mind about whether it should sewer the area or put in a common effluent scheme. I will inquire about the matter and let the Leader know the position, but there has been no change in policy. Of course, the matter is limited by the amount of funds available each year.

CRYSTAL BROOK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education give a progress report on the upgrading of the Crystal Brook Primary School? I understand that about 12 months ago plans were prepared, the intention being to upgrade that school by using solid construction. I should be pleased if the Minister would give me information regarding progress on this work.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member was good enough to communicate with my office about this question.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: A Dorothy Dixier?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My answer is not headed "Dear Dorothy".

Mr. Mathwin: Is it signed "Dorothy"?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. Sketches of proposed alterations to the Crystal Brook Primary School have been prepared and are now in the list for feasibility and cost studies. Further progress towards completion of the upgrading of the school will be made when funds are available, but no indication can be given of any timetable at this stage.

STRATHALBYN KINDERGARTEN

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Education tell the House what additional preschool facilities will be provided during the coming year and when the Strathalbyn kindergarten will be subsidized? I understand that it is the Commonwealth Government's policy that preschool facilities will be made available fairly quickly, and my reason for asking this question is to find out whether the Minister can tell me whether that Government has given any indication of what funds will be available for this purpose.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Preschools Commission has conducted a series of investigations but I understand the committee is still receiving submissions and that some time will pass before any report is made on the recommendations that the Commission will make to the Commonwealth Government regarding support for preschool education throughout Australia, so I cannot at this stage give any information about proposals for the development of preschools. I assume from the honourable member's question that the Strathalbyn kindergarten is

affiliated to the Kindergarten Union and is waiting for a subsidy. I suggest that the honourable member contact the Kindergarten Union, which may be able to give some indication of when a subsidy would be available to it. I do not participate in decisions of the Kindergarten Union about which additional kindergartens will be subsidized.

PENSIONERS' WATER RATES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works say whether it is policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to grant concessions in water rates to pensioners under the pensioner concession scheme when the water is supplied by a private irrigation authority such as the Lyrup Village Association? I assume that Renmark would be in the same position, but I desire to know whether the concession applies when water is provided by a local authority.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not certain about the position regarding a private supplier or regarding the Renmark Irrigation Trust.

Mr. Nankivell: I have only asked the question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and I will find out what is the position. Perhaps this matter has been overlooked, but certainly the Government intended that, where it provided the scheme, it would pay. I suppose the Renmark Irrigation Trust would be in a similar position. That is a trust and is not supplied by the Government, but Government irrigated areas supplied by the Lands Department would be involved. However, I will obtain details for the honourable member.

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister say whether the Government intends to extend the reduction of 50 per cent in water rates to include homes for the aged? This matter has been brought to my notice by the Secretary of Barmera Homes for the Aged Incorporated, who says that at present his home has to pay full water rates. However, he considers that, as most of the residents of the home are age pensioners, it should qualify on the same basis.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall place this question before the Government, as this is a matter of policy. Perhaps it could be claimed that, if a boarding house boarded age pensioners, it should be given an exemption on its water rates payment. That could happen, because on the honourable member's suggestion, as these boarding houses would care for the aged, the same principle could be said to apply. Although I shall have this matter examined, there is a limit to how far we can go with this sort of policy, which has been designed for pensioners who own their homes and who live in them. I am sure that the honourable member would appreciate that any policy must have an end, and I do not know how much further we can take this matter. I will examine the matter and see whether or not the Government is willing to consider it in conjunction with the matter raised by the member for Mallee.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Local Government say what action he will take when he receives the report of the Royal Commission on Local Government Boundaries? Although I would prefer that the Minister gave a reply to a previous question, perhaps he could join the two.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Two matters are involved, and the first refers to the new Local Government Act, which will be introduced as a Bill to replace the existing Act as a result of the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. The Parliamentary Counsel is now engaged in drafting the new Bill but, as this will be a lengthy

process, I cannot indicate its time table other than to say that it will be a lengthy job and that the legislation will be introduced as soon as possible. However, I would not expect it to be introduced this session.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister say whether he would support an amendment to the Local Government Act, which he has stated will not be altered during the life of this Parliament in its new form, to allow councils to use Loan funds in order to undertake the necessary requirements of zoning regulations? I understand that the Local Government Act prevents councils from using Loan funds to introduce zoning by-laws and regulations, which are an important part of the overall scheme introduced by the Minister of Environment and Conservation under State planning arrangements. Because the sum required to set up the regulations is greater than the amount that can be made available from normal rate revenues in any year, several councils could be prevented from fulfilling their obligations to ratepayers and, therefore, to the overall scheme.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope that my earlier reply was not interpreted to mean that we do not expect to amend the Local Government Act this session. I was referring to the new Act, because we expect to introduce further amendments to the present Act this session. The policy we have tried to follow for almost three years on the existing Act is to promote mainly those amendments that have some reason to be introduced immediately. When considering the many matters suggested as possible amendments, we try to separate those that have some urgency or special significance from those that are not so important. I do not know whether the Leader's suggestion has been examined by my officers, but I will ask them for a report on it.

NARACOORTE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week about the Naracoorte Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is expected that a contract will be let for the new primary school at Naracoorte this week. Provided the present programme can be maintained, it is hoped that the new school will be ready early in 1975.

POLICEMAN'S SHELTER

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Works say when it can be expected that the shelter for the duty policeman will be erected outside Parliament House? It is well known that the Minister has a personal interest in this matter, as I believe that, before I became a member, the Minister often asked a similar question. Now it has become a hardy annual. This is the third winter that I have been a member and, to my knowledge, it is the third winter that the policeman has been on duty outside the House. Why cannot this shelter be erected on the south-west corner of the building, as this would not interfere with any building and would be an advantage to the policeman and the House staff?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is a matter of great moment and, as the honourable member is aware, highly qualified architects have been working on it for three or four years, but they have not suggested building the shelter on the south-west corner of this building. Perhaps the National Trust would object to this course, as it would be similar to placing a chest clinic at Ayers House. I will ascertain what progress has been made, but with summer coming the matter may not be as urgent as the honourable member seems to consider it is.

OREGON VISIT

Mr. KENEALLY: As I have recently seen a report that the Director of Environment and Conservation will be visiting Oregon, U.S.A., I ask whether the Minister of Environment and Conservation can give the House the reasons for that visit.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The visit is associated with legislation that will be introduced later this year, as indicated, concerning deposits on non-returnable drink containers. Although we have been using as a guide the legislation at present operating in Oregon, we have had conflicting reports about its effectiveness and associated problems. Although the correspondence we have received from the Oregon authorities indicates that the legislation has been successful, reports received from industry indicate that it has not been as successful as was expected. However, as deposits on drink containers apply in other areas of the United States and Canada, I thought it desirable that the Director should visit the areas concerned to examine the problems associated with this sort of legislation before preparing our own, so that any queries that might be raised in this State could be properly settled.

MITCHAM WATER SUPPLY

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Works guarantee that the water supply in the Mitcham hills area is adequate to meet the demands of residents of this area during the coming summer months? The Minister is aware that at times last summer this water supply was inadequate and that measures had to be taken to solve the problem temporarily. As there has been a large increase in the number of houses built in the area, there will be an even greater demand on the water supply this year, and I believe that I should direct the Minister's attention to the problem before the summer arrives, so that we do not face the same problems as those that had to be faced last year. Can the Minister give this guarantee, or will he obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can give no guarantee at this stage without examining the matter. I do not know how the honourable member thinks that I could give such a guarantee, but I will obtain a report from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. As is customary with the department, every effort within reason is made to meet the demands of its consumers. That will be done in this case, no doubt, but I will check for the honourable member.

CASINOS

Mr. CHAPMAN: In the temporary absence of the Premier, I ask the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, whether the House will be informed of an early decision regarding the establishment of casinos in this State. In view of land speculation taking place, following a proposal to establish a casino in my district, I think it is in the interests of the State generally that this sort of speculation should be curbed and that the Government should urgently consider stating whether or not it will consider the establishment of casinos in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I assure the honourable member that this matter is being considered and that he will hear something on it from the Premier shortly.

JUVENILE ASSESSMENT FACILITIES

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General say what proportion of juvenile offenders is now assessed while on remand and what proportion is assessed while still in the community? Are these young people who are awaiting assessment while on remand kept apart from the other occu-

pants of Windana and Vaughan House, and is it intended that the new assessment centre will be predominantly an outpatient facility? With your leave, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House, I wish to explain the question, which is supplementary to a question I asked yesterday. I think authorities agree that it is desirable—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member did not seek leave.

Dr. TONKIN: With respect, Sir, I did seek leave.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

Dr. TONKIN: Authorities will agree that it is desirable that most young offenders, who I presume in these circumstances are mostly recidivists, since they have appeared before the juvenile court, should be assessed while remaining within the community, although some will require assessment in a closed institution, simply for the protection of the public. I am concerned to know whether separate facilities will be available when the new assessment centre is operating.

The Hon. L. J. KING: In view of the figures sought by the honourable member, I will provide a considered reply.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what stage negotiations have been reached with the Commonwealth Government in relation to transferring the Aboriginal portfolio to the Commonwealth Government and what are the reasons for the transfer?

The Hon. L. J. KING: As indicated previously, the Commonwealth Government has indicated a desire to assume full responsibility in Australia for policy, planning and co-ordination in relation to Aboriginal affairs. The Government of South Australia has agreed to this in principle, and negotiations are at present in progress concerning the terms under which that transfer will take place. When negotiations have been satisfactorily concluded, I will inform the House of the details of the matter.

NAILSWORTH SCHOOL

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Education say what is the latest position regarding Nailsworth Boys Technical High School, which is attended by students from both the Florey and Torrens Districts? Is the Minister aware that this matter has been the subject of lengthy negotiations, and can he now assure me that the programme as announced, I think, last year, is up to date and that the current planning is proceeding? This is important, of course, in relation to the girls school, which will eventually become co-educational with the boys school.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain information on the latest position.

STATE AID

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Education give an assurance that any students in the Davenport District who become displaced from independent schools as a result of the Commonwealth Government's stopping per capita grants to those schools will be accommodated at Norwood High School? A recent report that the Commonwealth Government will stop making per capita grants to certain independent schools as from the beginning of next year is rather surprising, because the report of the interim committee considering this matter recommended that such grants should be phased out over two years. Indeed, in my Address in Reply speech yesterday I referred to the injustices arising as a result of this decision.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Not all of Davenport is zoned for the Norwood High School. Any problems arising next year might necessitate changes in zoning, and these matters would be examined. As the schools that will receive more aid from the Commonwealth Government are much greater in number than those that will receive less, I expect that any changes in enrolments in Government schools will be small and that, if anything, the Government schools in South Australia may well have fewer enrolments as a consequence of certain independent schools gaining enrolments. I have no doubt that in a school system that already caters for 250,000 students (I refer to the Government school system in South Australia) the changes of a few hundred that are likely to be the maximum changes that would occur as a consequence of the recommendations of the Australian Schools Commission can be accommodated effectively by the Government system. However, I will not assure the honourable member that all the people in Davenport who want to go to Norwood High School will necessarily be accommodated at that school: it depends on the zoning arrangements that we make.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. GOLDSWORTHY

Mr. EVANS moved:

That three months leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Kavel (Mr. E. R. Goldsworthy) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 31. Page 106.)

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): In supporting the motion, I congratulate the mover, the member for Elizabeth. I believe that in this new member we have a person who will be a great asset to this House. Among the honourable member's attributes are his youthfulness and his sincerity, as well as a considerable knowledge of the law. I also congratulate the seconder of the motion, the member for Semaphore. In speaking of this member I am speaking of a man who has been prominent in the trade union movement in South Australia, and who has also had extensive connections with the trade union movement throughout Australia in connection with the activities of postal workers. Having been impressed with the great sincerity of this new member, I am sure he will contribute much to the debates of the House. He will also, I am sure, indicate his desire for a more humane and less acquisitive kind of society than the one in which we dwell at present.

I now refer to the loss of the friend of all of us, the late Speaker (Mr. Reg Hurst). A man of great kindness and sincerity, he was also a gentle man as well as a gentleman. He rendered signal service as well as doing much for the advancement of the political Labor movement in this State and, indeed, in the Commonwealth sphere. I can well understand the advocacy of the new member for Semaphore that there be some means of commemorating the great work that our late Speaker did for the political movement, for his constituents, and for the people of South Australia. I support heartily the honourable member's suggestion that there be established in the Semaphore District a communal library to which people can go and, as

they gain education and knowledge, give thought to the person who represented them so well during his sojourn in this House.

I also congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the highest office in this House. You have the necessary vocal equipment to keep members in order. I always feel that, when you utter the word "Order" for the third time, that is the time when even the most aggressive member would pale, quail, and conduct himself in keeping with the requirements of Standing Orders.

I congratulate also the member for Mount Gambier on his elevation officially to the position of Deputy Speaker. The honourable member having officiated on several past occasions as Acting Deputy Speaker and Acting Chairman of Committees, we know that he has acquitted himself well. Indeed, that was sufficient proof to us that he will acquit himself well in his new office.

The Governor's Opening Speech for the second session of this Forty-first Parliament reveals that this Government has no intention of relinquishing its reputation for protecting the community at large from the dubious practices engaged in by those in society who like to exploit the requirements and needs of the ordinary people.

Mr. Gunn: What about the stand-over tactics of some unions?

Mr. CRIMES: I am well aware that the honourable member for Eyre has no consideration for the ordinary people of this State, and his interjection indicates his staunch support of those whose dubious activities should, according to him, not be curbed. Of especial importance is the continuation of the Government's policy of establishing community welfare centres and increasing the number of officers representing those centres throughout this State. Charity is a wonderful thing, but I believe that private charity is something that ebbs and flows: it can never be genuinely relied on to satisfy the needs of people in unfortunate circumstances. It is therefore necessary for Governments to further their activities by establishing permanent organizations so that people who are genuinely in need can find someone to rely on and to help them when they have problems. These community centres are havens to which people (and there are many of them in the community) who feel that they cannot cope with the complexities of this rat race kind of society can turn. I am pleased that the Government is carrying on with this humane policy of extending the ambit of the activities of the Community Welfare Department. As a one-time representative of the trade union movement—

Mr. Keneally: And a very good one, too.

Mr. CRIMES: I am too humble to accept that remark. I merely say that I believe that I have done my best for my fellow man in the industrial sphere, and I am now continuing to do my best in the interests of the ordinary man in the political sphere, even though I am aware that some members opposite would wish my tenure of this seat to be very short lived. I now congratulate the Government once again, and I will do it again on many occasions—

Mr. Jennings: You can't do it too often!

Mr. CRIMES: True, I could not do it too often. I now congratulate the Government on not resting on its laurels in respect of the excellent standards embodied in the Workmen's Compensation Act—sponsored by this Government—legislation that has been the envy over a long period of workers in other States and in the Commonwealth sphere. As I said, the Government is not resting on its laurels: it is going forward to bring even further improvements to those who are so tragically affected by

injury and industrial diseases sustained in industry. With regard to workmen's compensation provisions, I must say that I resent the callous, conservative attitude recently exhibited by the Chairman of the Fire and Accident Underwriters Association of South Australia (Mr. A. G. Tanner). It hurt me considerably to read his statement, as follows:

It would appear that, with a high level of weekly compensation, there is less incentive in cases for a workman to return to work.

Mr. Venning: That's true.

Mr. CRIMES: Obviously Mr. Tanner and all those who agree with him would like weekly payments so low under the Workmen's Compensation Act that injured workers would go to their doctor, begging for a certificate to permit them to return to work before they had properly recovered from their injuries. That position obtained at one time when workers received the previously low rates of workmen's compensation.

Therefore, I say that Mr. Tanner's remark indicates a callous, brutal and typically conservative attitude towards workers who receive workmen's compensation payments. On the other hand, what Mr. Tanner said implied collusion between injured workmen and doctors, and members opposite and those of similar political opinions are always supporting doctors' organizations in their requirements for additional charges and imposts on the community.

Mr. Gunn: You think that all businessmen are rogues?

Mr. CRIMES: If the honourable member wishes me to hear his interjections, he will have to speak more loudly. I am pleased that this session a Bill is to be introduced to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. One clause will provide that industrial disputes shall be dealt with by industrial tribunals and that civil action with respect to those disputes will not be available. In addition, the amending Bill will seek to remove the penal provisions at present included in the Act, although the actions of this Government have already had an effect on those provisions. Conservatives want to retain the penal provisions because they want them always hanging, like the sword of Damocles, over the heads of union officials to prevent their carrying out the wishes of the members of their organizations. If what these conservatives regard as a crisis point arises in industrial relations, they hope to use the penal provisions as a means of breaking financially the union or unions involved.

Many people in Australia, including all members on this side, agree that Queensland could be reasonably equated with Vorster's South Africa or Ian Smith's Rhodesia because of the primitive utterances that flow from the lips of Premier Bjelke-Petersen. However, there is a paradox in the relative positions of Queensland and South Australia with regard to industrial matters. In Queensland, which we look down on because of its lack of progress, of social consciousness, and of any regard for ordinary people, whether black, white or brindle, for over 50 years the Statute Book has been free of the kind of provision that we are now trying to remove from our Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Therefore, there is a black blot on South Australia in the industrial field while that provision continues to exist in the Act. I suggest that we dare not allow this situation to continue. It is our duty to remove that provision, which takes unions into the civil court on disputes that should be dealt with by the industrial tribunal set up primarily for the purpose of dealing with them. We tried to have this provision removed last year. Although we still face an Opposition majority in the other place, as there has been some change in personnel there I hope that on this occasion there will

be no opposition (as there was last time) to the removal of this venomous provision.

Recently the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Fisher joined a person named McLeay in attacking people whom they described as bludgers on social services. The member for Fisher was quoted in the *Advertiser* as having said:

Just because a person's qualifications happen to be higher than those necessary to fill a job vacancy that exists, it should not be society's responsibility to carry him or her, because they are too proud to do a lesser job.

We have heard from members opposite a great deal about the freedom of the individual, but I suggest that the attitude of the member for Fisher is counter to any idea of freedom in respect of the choice of a job. Although I do not deny that there are many bludgers in this society, I suggest that if anyone wants to assess fairly whether or not there are bludgers he should look at the entire range of society from the bottom rung to the top. There are people on the make in all sections of society. In addition to looking at the few so-called bludgers who receive social services, we should also look at the commercial interests who seek to get the best they can out of the public purse by featherbedding by means of obtaining subsidies, tariffs, and special concessions. People who talk about parasites and bludgers should be consistent; they should take a look at all levels of the social scale. I suggest that the biggest bludgers would be those who handle the biggest sums and who represent the greatest wealth in the community. Certainly they would not be represented among those individuals who are forced by economic circumstances to seek the aid of very moderate social service payments.

I now wish to refer to a matter that has caused me great concern. Members of the public are becoming more and more concerned about the growth of violence in the community. Violence is bad enough when it is only physical but it is much worse when lethal weapons are used, particularly firearms. We have all noticed that we are slowly reaching a situation which exists in the United States of America today, though thankfully we are still a very long way from the desperate situation in which that country finds itself.

In California, in that tragic country, during 1970 as many as 20 police officers were killed in the line of duty and 46 persons were killed by the police. In 1971, 14 policemen were killed but the officers killed 70 suspects—an increase of 52 per cent of non-policemen who suffered the fatal effects of bullet wounds. A Los Angeles county sheriff has said:

I think officers are shooting more and taking more aggressive action simply because they are faced with more violence.

This is an example of the results of cause and effect or, more precisely, reaction. When we have a reaction from one part of society we get a reaction from another part of society. In Great Britain a Green Paper has been published recently proposing a ban on the sale of imitation guns, a tighter control on shot guns, and the continuation of a normally unarmed Police Force. In Great Britain the policemen are generally unarmed but, in times of emergency, I understand it is necessary to arm the police to deal with a situation that may be regarded as desperate.

The British Home Secretary (I am referring to the present Conservative Government) has said that, as criminals were turning more to guns, law-abiding people would have to accept restrictions and that, of 120 instances of armed crime recently investigated, 87 had involved shot guns.

A survey in Australia made five or six years ago showed that there were 346 shooting accidents in this country, 46 per cent of which were fatal. Today's *Advertiser* reports a shooting accident, fortunately not fatal, which involved a schoolboy. This gives weight to the remarks I have made about America and Great Britain. Under present laws in Australia good reasons can probably be found for making firearms available to police officers, and in this State they are available on a restricted basis to police officers. I know from his personal remarks to me that the Secretary of the South Australian Police Association opposes any extension in the use of firearms by policemen in the State of South Australia. I emphasize that this is purely a personal opinion expressed by Mr. Tremethick. Rigorous conditions apply to the use of firearms by policemen and, when firearms are issued, the policemen are expected to understand and act upon those conditions in times of extreme stress and abnormal excitement.

As the Secretary of the Police Association has pointed out, it is one thing to issue instructions. Of course, they can be issued with the greatest of good will. However, when people are issued with firearms to keep order and defend the law-abiding citizens in the community, we must understand that emotions enter the situation and at some crisis point a policeman, with the best intentions in the world, may unintentionally misuse the weapon that has been given to him.

The *Australian* of March 19 last contained a report that Police Commissioners in all States would ask the Commonwealth Government to introduce tougher controls over the importation and manufacture of replica firearms. This was decided at a conference of Police Commissioners from Australasia and the South Pacific region, a fairly wide area in our part of the world, and we can readily understand why this recommendation should have been made, because we have reached the stage with some of these replicas of firearms that, whether they are small arms, pistols, revolvers or rifles, it is extremely difficult to tell the actual weapon from the replica and if someone made a mistake and thought that a person holding up a delicatessen or a bank was holding a replica, when it was the real thing, tragic results could occur.

Mr. Jennings: It would be too late then to correct the mistake.

Mr. CRIMES: It would be, indeed. Once the finger is pressed on the trigger, there can be serious consequences for people nearby. The conference to which I have referred decided that recommendations should be made to all State Governments asking the Governments to declare a general amnesty on the possession of firearms. If I possessed any firearm, whether licensed or unlicensed, I should be pleased to surrender it. Being a pacifist by nature, I would not want to be a means of imposing such harm and death on people in the community.

I remember that, during the early years of the Second World War, the defence and police authorities, at least in South Australia (and perhaps I could assume that this was also done in other States), required that people surrender any such weapons in their possession. The decisions made by the conference of police authorities to which I have referred, surely shows how seriously the Police Forces regard the menace not only of firearms but also of implements which resemble firearms and which, because of their apparent threat, can be used as genuine firearms. I hope that every other member shares my feelings on this extremely serious matter.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I certainly do.

Mr. CRIMES: I am fortified by the support of the Minister of Environment and Conservation and I consider it apt that he should support me, because he stands for conservation and, when one thinks of conservation, one thinks not only of the conservation of what grows from the soil but also of the conservation of human life. I congratulate the Minister on making such a sincere and meaningful interjection.

To consider further remarks that have been made by extremely responsible people about this matter, I wish to quote the Federal President of the Bank Officials Association (Mr. Keith Remington). There seems to be a paradox here, because I understand that there is a concern called Remington small arms, but I assume that Mr. Keith Remington has no connection with the Remington Small Arms Corporation.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the Remington typewriter?

Mr. CRIMES: Many things progressive come forth from typing on the keys of the Remington typewriter when the keys are tapped by people in the community such as members on this side of the House. Mr. Keith Remington said:

Violent crime in Australian cities will reach New York city or prohibition Chicago proportion unless firearms are forbidden to the public.

I am sure that we must pay attention to the warnings constantly given to us regarding the increase in violence and the use of firearms in Australia. However, I sometimes think that, because we are warned so often and from so many authoritative places, we tend to become accustomed to those warnings. It is a similar position to that with the nuclear tests conducted by the French Government at Mururoa. Many of us now fail to grasp the seriousness of this operation by the French Government, because we have heard so much about it.

To draw another parallel, it seems that we are beginning to accept violence wrought on people in Indo China because we have not only read so much about it but we have heard so much on radio and television. Indeed, we have seen on television many of the evil and tragic happenings wrought on that country by the United States. The President of the United States has been speaking today with our respected Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) with a view to preventing a repetition of this grim and sordid operation in any other part of the world.

Mr. Mathwin: Talk to your friends the Communists, then.

Mr. CRIMES: Let me have a word with the honourable member. I am a friend of anyone, wherever he may stand, if he is standing four square on the need for peace in the world, because the honourable member is threatened just as I or anyone else is threatened if the evil doings of those who are building up atomic devastation in the world are allowed to continue. Let us get these things in our mind.

I was pleased that Mr. Whitlam, when he spoke to the President of the United States, said, "Let us get away from talking all the time in ideological terms and let us get down to reality." If the member for Glenelg tells me that I should speak to my friends the Communists (and I have friends who are Conservatives, too, because although they mean well they do not understand what they are doing) perhaps the honourable member ought to address his remarks of criticism and, perhaps, condemnation to President Nixon. He has mixed with that type more than I have done.

Mr. Mathwin: If the cap fits, wear it. I have given you some advice, and why don't you take it?

Mr. CRIMES: I am willing to accept advice from my very good friend the member for Glenelg (I am speaking in a social sense only and I emphasize that) if he is talking about something that he understands. I am a man of great patience and persistence, and should the honourable member confer with me, if we have strong and unreasoning ideological prejudices, perhaps we could find the means of being practical and consider the requirements of this world for a stable and peaceful atmosphere. We are all threatened by the things about which I have complained, so let us not be diverted from the intentions that have been exhibited by more and more people in responsible positions throughout the world, not the least of whom includes Prime Minister Whitlam.

I am sure that, if an approach was made to the State Government (and I am not aware of one having been made), it will firmly and sincerely consider any suggestion from the representatives of police authorities in Australasia and South-East Asia to rid the community of firearms possessed by individuals. I am aware that this problem cannot be dealt with merely by one State: it has to be approached on a Commonwealth basis. What would be the point of banning the use of or the holding of firearms in South Australia if there were means by which people in other States could bring lethal weapons into this State? I hope that what I have said will sink into the minds of every person who has listened to me. We do not want a situation to develop in the major cities of Australia similar to the situations in New York, Chicago, and other major United States cities.

I approve wholeheartedly of the electoral changes that have occurred concerning the Legislative Council, the Upper House. When I became a member of this House and made my maiden speech, I said that the fresh wind of democracy was blowing through this House. It was blowing, because the welcome change in the electoral arrangements enabled the election by a useful majority of the last Dunstan Government.

Mr. Jennings: Not the last!

Mr. CRIMES: No: by "last" I mean the most recent, and I appreciate the interjection. I do not see the previous Government as the last Dunstan Government, because we have now been elected as the succeeding Dunstan Government, and there will be many more Dunstan Governments and Labor Government in this State to place worthwhile and progressive measures on the Statute Book of this State. I am sure that members on the other side shivered and shook, because they did not appreciate that the fresh wind of democracy was blowing around them. Now, we can say of the other place that that fresh wind is whipping around the ankles of its conservative members, and it will not be long before the wind reaches their midribs and then entirely engulfs them. We will see political democracy finally and fully achieved in this State, and we will be able to hold our heads high. Having made those comments and having enjoyed making them (and hoping to make many more similar remarks in future Address in Reply debates), I say, briefly, I support the motion.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): In supporting the motion, I join with other members in the usual comments of condolence, congratulation, welcome and loyalty. Comments on these matters have been expanded by other members and, although my comments are brief, nonetheless they are sincere. I refer to the question of finance, because it is a most important matter and one that is worrying all Governments and many people in our community. I believe that the honeymoon is over concerning finances

between the State and Commonwealth Labor Governments. Before the recent election the Premier made many generous promises for money to be spent on numerous projects. His comments were based on the confident expectation that, because a Labor Government was in power in Canberra, cash would be readily available to enable him to undertake his election policies.

However, what a let-down he has experienced. He returned from the Premiers' Conference about \$20,000,000 short of the amount he expected and what he had considered was necessary to carry out the functions of State and to implement his policies. As a result the Premier had to introduce increased imposts on the people of this State: we are now serving under hard labour again. I refer to two Speeches by His Excellency when opening Parliament. The first speech opened the third session of the Fortieth Parliament, and in it, when referring to Commonwealth financial assistance to the State (details of which had been given to His Excellency by his advisers) he said:

... these increases were greater than those which may have arisen from the application of the customary formulae...

That was on July 18, 1972, when a Liberal Government was in power in Canberra. I then looked to see what His Excellency said this year, on July 24 last, and in a similar paragraph he stated that the refusal of the Commonwealth Government to provide other than minor additional revenue grants beyond those available through the application of the formula contained in the legislation meant that extra taxes would have to be levied. This is under a Commonwealth Labor Government! That is the stark position. We all recall the financial documents tabled in this place by the Treasurer last year in which, under the Snedden Treasury, this State received a large increase in funds. However, just the reverse has happened this year. I recall shortly after the present Commonwealth Government was elected to power that the Premier wanted a Premiers' Conference held, I think in February, but he was told that he would have to wait until June. In June, our Premier went along with other State Premiers and put up a case, but the cupboard was starting to get a little bare by that time and they did not get what they were expecting. Indeed, in the case of South Australia, we were a mere \$20,000,000 short! Therefore, the friends have fallen out and the financial honeymoon is over.

The Premier, when he returned from Canberra, had some pretty caustic comments to make about his erstwhile friends there, and I do not blame him for saying what he said. Sir Robert Askin, the New South Wales Premier, was reported in the press as calling it the "rape of the States". Judging by our Premier's comments and his attitude, I believe he agreed entirely with Sir Robert Askin in that regard. Although it may be a trite saying, it is an axiom that finance is government and government is finance. Finance is a basic factor of government from which flow many other desirable actions and reforms that can be implemented in various spheres. Although few members have referred in this debate to financial aspects, I believe that we in South Australia have had to face three major financial matters so far this calendar year, namely, the matters of State taxes, inflation, and tariff cuts. This is quite apart, of course, from the earlier revaluation of the Australian dollar.

Because the Commonwealth Treasury was not willing to maintain the rate of increase set last year by a Commonwealth Liberal Treasury, and because this State received at least \$20,000,000 less than it required, the Premier was forced to announce that certain State taxes would have to be increased. First, we were told that payroll tax would

be increased and that harbour dues (inward and outward) would also be increased. Water rates would be increased by 13.6 per cent, and there would be a levy on the Electricity Trust which, of course, meant that tariffs would be increased again. The Government announces that it will increase the levy, but it is left to the trust to announce by how much the tariffs will rise. In addition, hospital charges were to be increased. We have read in the Governor's Speech that gift duties are to be altered and, in fact, notice was given today concerning this matter.

Mr. Evans: They might be going to reduce them.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member must be joking.

Dr. Tonkin: Yes, I think he was.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who introduced gift duty in this State?

Mr. COUMBE: These are the increases that we know about.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Was it Mr. Hall, or was it the DeGaris wing of the Party?

Mr. COUMBE: Once again, the Minister of Education is displaying his abysmal ignorance of history; he does not know.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I do not know which wing of the Party it was; I know which Government it was.

Mr. COUMBE: We do not know what other taxation measures are to be introduced. I tried to get the Premier to indicate what other imposts we could expect, but he said that we would have to wait until the Estimates were introduced. Unfortunately, in addition to the prospect of paying extra taxes, all these measures add to the cost-push inflationary effects from which all States are suffering at present. I am not saying that State taxation will be increased only in South Australia, for I am sure that it will have to be increased in all other States, even in Western Australia, where there has been a close electoral contest.

Mr. Langley: A lot of people didn't vote.

Mr. COUMBE: I was wondering what excuse would be made. I refer here to the Commonwealth Statistician's figures in relation to the effect of State taxation in South Australia and to the taxation paid per capita: in 1969-70 it was \$58.76; in 1970-71 it was \$60.87; and in 1971-72 it had jumped to \$90.34. Of course, the figures for 1972-73 are not yet available (at least not to members on this side), but they could be well over the \$100 mark, and goodness only knows what they will be in 1973-74, when these taxation measures to which I have just referred come into effect. There is no doubt at all that the Government had no mandate for this following the last election. These measures certainly were not referred to and no hint was given about them to the electors during the last election campaign.

No statement was made at the time that State taxation would be savagely increased, as it is going to be; it was as though everything in the garden was rosy. Why were these measures not foreshadowed? The answer is simply that Labor was in power in Canberra, and Labor wanted to stay in power here. What a let-down we have received in this respect. I have referred to inflation, and I am sure that all members agree that this is an evil that we want to do away with. It is a serious matter which, I believe, has been overlooked too much in recent months. In Australia inflation has been running for several years at 2 per cent or 3 per cent annually. Last December inflation ran at just over 5 per cent. However, in July, 1973, this figure jumped

amazingly to more than 12 per cent. That jump is staggering and almost unbelievable in such a short time. Of course, it is pure coincidence that in that short time there was also a new Commonwealth Government, a Labor Government! I am sure that everyone believes it is a pure coincidence! However, this change did coincide with a spending spree by a Commonwealth Government unparalleled before in this country.

We today are witness to galloping inflation throughout Australia. Unfortunately, the measures proposed by this Government regarding State tax will have a cost-push effect on inflation. We are seeing almost unchecked inflation, indirectly spurred on by Commonwealth Government spending, especially in its own sphere. I believe that the Commonwealth Government should have moved much earlier this year regarding inflation instead of waiting for more than seven months before taking any action.

What action was taken? We all know that when the Commonwealth Government eventually took action it was a dramatic move: an across-the-board tariff cut of 25 per cent. I should now like to examine the effects of this move on our community not only here in South Australia but also in Australia generally. There are two main areas to be considered: first, what about the housewife, who is the person usually hardest hit by inflation? When she is buying her groceries at the supermarket, will she find that her requirements are any cheaper as a result of the tariff cuts? After all, about 95 per cent of her requirements are produced in Australia, and the tariff reductions will not affect those items. Will the housewife find that her vegetables at the greengrocers will be any cheaper as a result of the tariff cuts? Of course these items will not be any cheaper. Yet these items comprise the basic components of the cost of living index, and the tariff cuts will not affect the housewife in any way: they will not affect the major part of the cost of living at all.

I now turn to recent movements in the consumer price index. In the past financial year there has been an 8.2 per cent increase in this index, and a staggering 3.3 per cent increase in the June quarter alone, throughout Australia. However, the figure applying to Adelaide was higher: a 3.6 per cent increase, the greatest increase of all the capital cities.

Mr. Evans: That is over 14 per cent annually.

Mr. COUMBE: I am glad to have that confirmation, because it adds to what I am saying. Food prices increased the most, and food is the commodity least affected by tariff cuts. Those household supplies that could be affected by the tariff cuts made up the lowest increases in the index. What effect, if any, will the tariff cuts have on these items affecting the average man and woman, especially the housewife?

Mr. Evans: Are you advocating the slogan "Live cheaper with Labor"?

Mr. COUMBE: We certainly live harder with Labor. Until recently we saw in Australia a 2½ per cent annual productivity gain and a 2½ per cent increase in the consumer price index. We had an increase in the average weekly earnings of 6 per cent annually. However, I point out that productivity in Australia has now dropped to 1.6 per cent. This is a low figure indeed for a country such as Australia.

Mr. Evans: It is one of the lowest in the world.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member is right. The productivity of our Japanese neighbours has increased by 9 per cent or 10 per cent, and it is time we seriously considered this matter. I now refer to the

gross domestic product, which used to be made up by about 50 per cent wages. That wage component now takes up about 56 per cent. I have referred to this figure to highlight the position of the purchaser and the housewife.

Another aspect that we should consider is the second problem of the tariff cuts: employment in South Australia. South Australia could be the hardest hit of any State by the Commonwealth Labor Government's decision to implement tariff cuts. South Australia places great reliance on the automobile industry, on the pressed metal industry, and on the production of other consumer durables. We all know that we export the greater bulk of our production to the Eastern States, as well as overseas. Indeed, we are the State that does most of this production and, as a result of these tariff cuts, South Australia could be the hardest hit State, because of its reliance on the manufacturing sector and the subsequent competition facing it from some lower-priced imports. I can say that in an academic way, but I should now like to refer to the human side of things. What about the workmen and their families? What about the workmen who could, unfortunately, become redundant, especially in South Australia? True, a plan has been put forward by Dr. Cairns to retrain and relocate displaced workmen, but these same workmen face reclassification, perhaps, to a lower position. What will workmen feel if they are forced out of their jobs because cheaper foreign cars come into the country more freely (as we have seen already) as a result of the tariff cuts? Will people also be put off at some South Australian factories because of cheaper foreign appliances and consumer durables being available? This situation has arisen because of a deliberate move by the Labor Government in Canberra.

I submit that South Australian workmen want security of tenure of employment and peace of mind. Even the Premier has expressed his concern about the situation; I believe he is genuinely worried about it. This move by the Commonwealth Government, which was made to appear in the newspapers as the panacea of all inflationary ills and which has been received with mixed feelings in the community, seems to be of doubtful value at best. It is strange that the Commonwealth Government, on the one hand, is criticizing multi-national and foreign-owned firms that are operating in Australia, while on the other hand by its tariff cuts it is taking deliberate steps to encourage a flood of foreign imports into the country.

The action of the South Australian Government in increasing State taxation will accelerate inflation, as costs increase. I believe that the real solution to the problem is a complete income-price review. I am sure my Party would be willing to co-operate if a conference on this subject were promoted. It is important to remember that the Prices Justification Tribunal established by the Commonwealth Government is limited to companies with a turnover of \$20,000,000. Therefore, a fair slice of the business community is immediately excluded, although perhaps some subcontractors of various firms may be affected. I am concerned mainly with the average business and the men and women employed by it. Moreover, I believe that the joint committee on prices that has already been established in Canberra will have limited application. I firmly believe that to halt the rampant inflation that we are experiencing we must examine the impact of wages and salaries when we are reviewing costs; one cannot be considered without the other.

As I have already pointed out, the wage content of most commodity costs is such a high component of the whole. So far the point of view I have advocated has received the cold shoulder from the Commonwealth

Government. In South Australia, the Leader of the Opposition through the newspaper offered to co-operate with the Government and assist in tackling the insidious inflationary problem as it affects this State. The Premier replied through the newspaper that if the Leader had something to offer he would be willing to talk to him. As the Leader indicated yesterday, he made an offer on the same day, and that was about 10 days ago. To date, the Leader's letter has not even been acknowledged. Where are we going in this State? Surely there could be a little co-operation in dealing with this problem. Is the Government genuine in its attempts to deal with inflation, or does it simply want to milk the cow through State taxation? It would appear that the Government is two-faced on this matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How many faces did you have to have in order to become the Deputy Leader of the Liberal and Country League?

Mr. COUMBE: That comment is typical of the sort of comments made by the Minister. All members will recall the measures taken in relation to employment when the Snedden Budget was introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament last year. I recall that just before the last Commonwealth election Mr. Whitlam and the then shadow Minister for Labour (Mr. Clyde Cameron) made a couple of predictions that I am sure everyone will remember. Those gentlemen said that within about six months unemployment in Australia would reach 200,000. As Mr. Bill Lynch and the then Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Snedden) predicted, the opposite has happened. It gives me great joy to see the present low level of unemployment, but I remember the irresponsible predictions made by those Labor members in order to cause panic amongst the people of Australia.

The Minister of Education, who is trying to interject, leads us to believe that he is a learned economist, so he should know that these things do not happen overnight; they are the effect of long-term policies and of actions taken before the present Labor Government came into office. At present, in some trades there is over-employment. Only today questions were asked about the position of bricklayers. In some other trades, the dire shortage of tradesmen in various categories is posing a serious problem with regard to the development of the industries concerned, and the employment of persons in other classifications is also affected.

Along with the question of employment must also go the question of industrial disputes. Hardly a day goes by without one picking up a newspaper and finding that there is some dispute, whether legitimate or not. However, I was staggered to see the official figures for South Australia issued by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. For the January to March quarter of 1972, the number of working days lost in South Australia was 4,400, while the figure for the January-March quarter this year was 32,500. What a jump! Last year was a Commonwealth election year and perhaps the boys had been told to go quietly. These official figures show a staggering state of affairs and the sooner we can solve the problem the better for all concerned. The figures I have quoted have a direct bearing on the inflationary trend to which I have been alluding. I wish to deal now with transport, as several other members have done.

Mr. Evans: Not public transport! Nothing has happened.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member could not have spoken more truly. Transport has been the subject of several questions this session and some members have

mentioned it in debate, but I have not yet heard of any plan for metropolitan road transport.

Mr. Mathwin: That's taboo now.

Mr. COUMBE: It is. I read with interest the press release issued by the Minister of Transport a few days ago. It was taken up entirely with the electrification and extension of rail transport in metropolitan Adelaide. There was no reference in that statement to road public transport, which I consider to be of vital importance. The Government and the Opposition jointly have been promoting it, urging that more people use that form of transport. Adelaide needs not only an upgrading of the present system but also cross-city transport facilities in our road system. We must have more connections and feeder buses.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't mention dial-a-bus.

Mr. COUMBE: No, that has gone. No definite statement has come from the Minister or the Government about the Government's plans on road transport, apart from what the Minister has said about some road-widening plans. I suppose one could make an intelligent guess about the future, but in the 3½ years it has been in office the Government has had time to make definitive announcements. At this stage we in this House and the people outside do not know what the Government intends to do.

Mr. Gunn: It doesn't even know.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member may be correct. I do not begrudge the Minister his overseas trip. That is a good idea, but he should let us know what will happen. All the people in the State are wondering what will be done, and they are entitled to know the Government's plan. At present they take the view that, on metropolitan road transport, this is a no-plan Government. This is a matter of utmost importance to which the Government should direct its attention. It will be to its shame if it does not say what it plans. I have referred in this House to the North Adelaide road system and have asked the Minister what will happen about that, but I have got nowhere. Almost everyone who goes to the North of the State goes through North Adelaide in the Torrens District.

Mr. Russack: And what a trial that is!

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. Regardless of whether a person goes around Memorial Drive, along Jeffcott Street, along Margaret Street, along LeFevre Terrace, or along Mann Terrace and past the Buckingham Arms Hotel, it is a trial to go through North Adelaide.

Mr. Mathwin: The Bay team went through them a few weeks ago!

Mr. COUMBE: I pay that, but the last game is the one that counts. I have repeatedly asked the Minister to tell me about his approaches to the Adelaide City Council regarding transport. I refer to a report in the priceless newspaper (it is given away) circulating in my district. I did not submit the report, but it refers to my having pointed out to the Minister what the problems were, asking that he do something about them, and reference was made to the reply given me by the Minister's Press Secretary. Many people have telephoned me to find out what reply I received: the North Adelaide Society asked me that only last week. I have had to tell those who have inquired that, once again, the answer was that the Minister was still considering the matter.

I want to deal now with a matter affecting local government and I shall confine my remarks on this matter to the metropolitan area, because the circumstances there are different from those applying in the country. I refer to the contributions required of metropolitan councils for the upkeep of the Fire Brigade. His Excellency's Speech states that the Act will be amended, and it is about time that

that was done. I recall going with the member for Ross Smith, I think last year, on a deputation from several northern suburbs councils regarding these contributions. Members would be staggered at the impost that is placed on many councils in this regard, in addition to the compulsory contributions to the public hospitals of the State.

I represent parts of four council areas but I shall cite the example of only one of those councils. In 1971-72 its contribution to the Fire Brigade was \$1,373. In 1972-73 the contribution was \$5,471—an increase of 400 per cent. The information received so far this year is that the contribution will increase to the alarming figure of \$8,504—a further increase of 55.44 per cent. Whereas last year the council allocated 2.51 per cent of its rate revenue to Fire Brigade costs, this year the figure has jumped to 3.75 per cent. The underwriters pay five-ninths of the contributions to the Fire Brigade, local government pays two-ninths, and the State Government also pays two-ninths. However, in recent years the Government has made an *ex gratia* payment to assist councils. This means that councils are providing about 22 per cent of the contributions, and it must be remembered that in some council areas there is no Fire Brigade at all; of course, such council areas have access to a fire station nearby. I hope this serious anomaly will be rectified.

The Building Societies Act was referred to in the Governor's Speech last year, but it is not on the list this year. However, the Land and Business Agents Act is included again. I was a member of a Select Committee that sat for 12 months on safety, health and welfare in industry. I believe that more could be done to teach apprentices about safety and safety training.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you believe that more could be done on the job as well?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes; the scheme must be co-operative—in the school and on the factory floor.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you favour greater liaison between technical colleges and the job situation? Further, do you favour using liaison officers from the Further Education Department?

Mr. COUMBE: Those ideas have merit. For the Minister's benefit, I point out that I know what the Further Education Department is doing in this field. South Australia is facing the imposition of pretty solid State taxation. The Premier has already announced some taxation measures, and he has told us that there are more in store for us. Unfortunately, such measures will add to the inflationary spiral in this State. The honeymoon is over in connection with financial arrangements between the State Labor Government and the Commonwealth Labor Government. As in the situation between Elizabeth Taylor and Richard Burton, there could soon be a divorce.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I join with previous speakers in extending my deepest sympathy to the next-of-kin of the Hon. Mr. Kemp. I also want to extend my sympathy to the family of Mr. Reg Hurst. Unlike other members, I knew Mr. Hurst long before he came to Adelaide: he was a sub-branch secretary of the Electrical Trades Union in Whyalla before he came to Adelaide to be State Secretary of the union. Later he became a member of this House. I was associated with Mr. Hurst for many years. I will not be hypocritical enough to say that I agreed in all cases with Mr. Hurst's outlook in connection with the trade union movement, but one thing about that movement is that, after having a difference of opinion, members can leave a meeting and say, "The decision has been made, and we will abide by it."

Mr. Hurst was one of the gentlemen of the trade union movement who could have a difference of opinion with another member and still go out and have a drink with that member and remain friends with him. It is clear from the Governor's Speech that the Government intends to deal with a record legislative programme this session. I am sure that members on this side will stand up to the pressures of the session, but one thing has me considerably worried; I am looking at the crew opposite that we have to put up with. I want to deal with the real problems that exist opposite. It was enlightening to me to read in the *Advertiser* of March 13 what the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition said; ironically, what he predicted has come true. The article states:

Mr. Millhouse predicted yesterday he would be axed as Deputy Leader of the Opposition at the first Party meeting after Saturday's State election.

He obviously had a crystal ball, because that is exactly what happened. An article in the *Advertiser* of April 2 states:

Mr. Millhouse said last night he was surprised at the number of people at the meeting and at the strength of feeling.

Of course, the meeting referred to was organized by the Liberal Movement. The article quotes the member for Mitcham as saying:

I know there are people in the L.C.L. who are out to get me if I stay—and they may well succeed.

I believe that what the member for Mitcham said last night about the L.C.L. was correct. There is no Liberal Party as such that has governed in its own right: it has always needed a coalition. So, it will be interesting to find out what happens in connection with this coalition. Mr. Sneddon (Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament) has said that his Party would resile from the coalition with the Country Party federally and rule by itself. That will be an interesting situation.

Mr. Coumbe: He didn't say that.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The report continues:

During the afternoon Mr. Wilson, M.H.R., and Dr. Tonkin, M.P., both foundation members of the L.M., strongly urged delegates to remain within the L.C.L. Dr. Tonkin announced that he would remain in the parent body.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think the member for Bragg did a deal?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is possible, but what happens in the future will be interesting, because we should also consider the position of former L.M. members, such as the members for Torrens, Bragg, Heysen, and Glenelg.

Mr. Coumbe: Heysen?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am sorry, I meant the member for Hanson.

Mr. Coumbe: That's your second mistake.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Also, I wonder what the roles of the members for Rocky River and Mallee will be in the next three years. I should think that the member for Rocky River would be worried at the results of the recent election. It seems that he has to make up his mind either to get out of the L.C.L. and join the Country Party—

Mr. Hall: You are assuming that the Country Party will have him?

Mr. MAX BROWN: —or get out of politics. It seems that an interesting situation will develop for members opposite in the next three years.

Mr. VENNING: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I heard the Governor's Speech and it contained nothing about the member for Rocky River.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Rocky River should consider seriously this proposition. I turn now to another matter: it amazes me the number of times that other members have raised matters dealing with my district. From time to time the Leader of the Liberal Movement dives into my district, as does the Leader of the Opposition. I assure honourable members that I can look after my district. Now, the new member for Elizabeth seems to have taken some interest in it, and I refer to what he said in his maiden speech. I thought he did a good job in outlining the formation of the new co-operative glove factory.

Mr. Gunn: Is it true that it has asked for financial assistance from the Government?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I suggest the honourable member should look after his district. The James North glove factory, as James North Proprietary Limited, closed down and a co-operative took over; this has done very well. However, during the dispute certain people alleged that a militant trade union had gone mad and that many things were happening. However, nothing was farther from the truth. I checked that statement and found it completely without foundation. The so-called fisticuffs that occurred during the closing of the factory were caused by the manager, and that is a true statement. After the management of James North had decided to close the factory, it sacked the manager, who is now receiving Commonwealth unemployment relief, and as a taxpayer I am partly responsible for his pay.

I believe that worker participation in the management of what was the James North factory is worth while, and I believe that workers should participate more and more in management. I should like to have worker participation in the management of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, and assure members that I am working on that proposition. The city of Whyalla has had many firsts: it was the first real experiment in decentralizing industry in this State; it was the first to build large tonnage ships in this country; it was first in this State in having worker control of industry; but, most important, it was the first to have a mixed marriage. We can joke about this incident, but it is important.

I understand that the exclusive rights to the story have been purchased by a newspaper for a four figure sum. Before the marriage I had the job (shall I say) of interviewing these two people. The female of the marriage became unemployed and applied for Commonwealth unemployment relief. She was paid that relief, but subsequently work was obtained. However, it was through the rural unemployment relief scheme, working with a pick and shovel. It was put to me that this type of employment was completely unacceptable. Finally, she obtained employment as a waitress. For all practical purposes this marriage is supposedly legal, because medical evidence was obtained on the basis that one of the parties was female and the other male. [am quite serious about this. The important point that comes to my mind is that, if the legality of this marriage is not challenged and the marriage continues, how can we in this House or members in the other place continue to ban homosexuality? This is a most interesting question.

Mr. Evans: Why do you describe this as a mixed marriage? Surely it is just the opposite.

Mr. MAX BROWN: It could be an unmixed marriage; that may be true. However, it does pose the question of how we in this House, if the matter of homosexuality is

raised again, can ever properly say we will not permit homosexuality.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think the Attorney-General did a Lord Nelson?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not know, but the matter does open up certain questions. I am not a lawyer, but I would query the legality of this marriage. While it is not challenged, however, it remains, whether we like it or not. A major problem was discussed at length by the member for Torrens and to some degree, in his own way, he was correct in raising the problem facing everyone in this country: inflation. I do not disagree when he says that inflation is skyrocketing. That is true, and we must face it. I am not suggesting that inflation was not with us before any Labor Government came to power in the federal sphere.

Mr. Venning: But your Leader said when the Labor Party was elected it would cease.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Inflation has been with us for more than 20 years. It has simply become worse. I was interested in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition on the question of inflation. Here again I think the Leader, in his own right, honestly believed what he said. To my mind he was saying that we should curb inflation by reducing wages.

Dr. Eastick: Where did he say that?

Mr. MAX BROWN: He said wages should be pegged.

Dr. Eastick: That is your assumption.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Perhaps the Leader could tell us his assumption. The Leader of the Opposition told a television audience that if he were in power his first act would be to curb inflation by attacking wages and prices.

Dr. Eastick: I did not suggest any such thing.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I was not referring to the Leader of the Opposition in this place.

Mr. Coumbe: How many more mistakes are you going to make?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAX BROWN: There is a federal Leader of the Opposition. When everyone says wages are going up and thus causing inflation, let us have the truth about it. To my knowledge, the wage structure has been fixed since 1904. Many of my colleagues who have been trade union officials will agree when I say that before a wage increase is decided for the worker a case must be prepared. Invariably that case is based on rising prices. The case is presented to the court and it is perhaps six to nine months before a decision is given. At that stage, the case has been in existence for six or nine months and the worker is given an increase to take place perhaps three pays from the date of the decision.

Mr. McAnaney: What about over-award payments?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I will come to that, because it is an interesting point. Meantime, let us look at what the member for Bragg said last night when he was raving on here about the A.M.A. situation. I do not know what happens in other people's territory but I know what happens in my own. I estimate that any general practitioner operating in my area could earn between \$50,000 and \$75,000 a year, and that is not bad money in anyone's language. Assuming that the lesser amount is correct, a 26 per cent increase in his income would represent a further \$12,500 a year—not a bad sort of increase. I wish I could get that for the worker.

Mr. Becker: What about members of Parliament?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Even they cannot get it. The problem with inflation is quite clear. I believe that, if there is to be any wage fixation, we should be looking

at people such as company directors. Indeed, I read about an executive in America whose board of directors offered him a wage of \$150,000 a year and who said he was worth more than \$1,000,000.

Mr. Becker: If you were the head of G.M.H., wouldn't you?

Mr. MAX BROWN: If there has to be a curb on wages we should look first at people receiving wages far in excess of general wages in the community, and they do not have to go to any tribunal.

Mr. Becker: They have to answer to a board, and that is much harder.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is a matter of opinion. The Commonwealth Government is currently endeavouring to look at inflation.

Mr. Mathwin: That's about all it's doing.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The previous Commonwealth Government did nothing at all. The Commonwealth Government's first move was its decision to reduce tariffs by 25 per cent. Like the member for Torrens, I am not satisfied that that action is by any means the complete solution. Indeed, I do not think it is, and I do not think the Commonwealth Government thinks it is. Also, the Commonwealth Government has established a Prices Justification Tribunal, but that is not the complete solution to inflation either.

Mr. Mathwin: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am glad the honourable member said that, because ultimately the Commonwealth Government will have to look at price fixation by Statute. Unfortunately, existing powers are insufficient for the Commonwealth to do this. What we need (and we all know what is required even if we say that we do not) is for the Commonwealth Government to obtain such power: there must be a referendum. However, if there is a referendum the same situation will develop as previously developed. The powers that be, people like members opposite, will come out in great opposition to the idea of the Commonwealth Government's having powers to fix prices. That happened before, and it will happen again. Members opposite need refer only to the situation surrounding the referendum in 1948. Ultimately we must have price fixation on a Commonwealth-wide basis but, to have that, we must first have a referendum. Unfortunately, history has proven that Australian people, like people in many other countries, do not like to give additional powers to the Commonwealth Government, whatever its political complexion. However, unless there is power to curb price increases or to make people justify price rises, I cannot see how we can stop inflation.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN: One of the major problems facing us is inflation and in this respect I want to deal with two companies in particular. I know members will not be surprised if I mention one of them, but first I mention the General Motors-Holdens proposed price increase. In the *News* of June 27 last the following article appeared:

General Motors-Holdens is expected to agree today to submit a case to the Prices Justification Tribunal to support the recent increases in the price of Holden cars.

The important part of the announcement, to my mind, was the following:

But it is unlikely the company will drop the increase in the meantime. General Motors-Holden increased the price of its complete range of Holden cars by 5 per cent on Monday.

In other words, this company is saying: "The tribunal can go to blazes. We will increase car prices, and then we will go to the tribunal." I wonder what the working-class people would be getting today if they could have their

wages increased by 5 per cent and then go to the tribunal? The other question that arises from the G.M.H. proposed increase is, assuming it does go to the tribunal and the tribunal finds that the 5 per cent increase is too much, what happens then? Does G.M.H. say it will reduce the price of the car? I wonder.

I have not finished with General Motors-Holden yet, but I want now to refer to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: I thought the House would be surprised if I did not deal with that company, but this is the real cause of inflation. In the *News* of January 26 this year the following report appeared:

Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited is proposing an average 7.1 per cent increase in steel prices effective from February 1. The B.H.P. Company indicated this in its verbal submission to Mr. Justice Moore, who is conducting an inquiry into the proposed price increases.

In that article it is stated:

One official estimate is that the price rise sought would add about \$13 to the cost of steel in a new medium-sized car. Additional direct cost of various products and iron and steel products in a new 14 cub.ft. refrigerator would be 75c.

It is ironical that in a Letter to the Editor in the *News* (I have checked it with the gentleman who wrote it) on July 23 of this year a correspondent states:

An increase of 4 per cent in the price of steel from B.H.P. would result in an increase of \$200 in the cost of a \$14,500 house—

and a \$14,500 house is regarded as an ordinary house these days; there would be nothing flashy about it—

\$40 in the family car—

again, nothing extravagant—

and \$10 for refrigerators and washing machines, according to reports.

If the B.H.P. Company is successful in increasing its prices by 71 per cent, which is about double the 4 per cent, it is reasonable to say that in fact the inflationary trend of the prices quoted in that letter (and I have checked it out with an economist in New South Wales) would be double. Inflation is fostered and fed by the big monopolies, and there is no control over their price decisions.

The member for Torrens mentioned the little fellow who supplied the butter and the eggs, and I gave him credit for that in my few remarks. A report about such people appeared in the *News* of Tuesday, July 31. These are people who really sell the little things to the consumer: I refer to G. J. Coles and Company Limited, which this year set another record for its profits. I wonder whether we should not look at G. J. Coles also. I finish on inflation by quoting from an item that appeared in a small news sheet in my area. I will not go through the whole article, but the last part intrigues me; it is about the monopoly of B.H.P. Company Limited:

These sidelights from the past should remind us that the B.H.P. is not only Australia's biggest company but its toughest, and its contempt for national welfare carries on into the present age, when it arrogantly inflates the whole Australian price structure by raising steel prices.

I sincerely hope that the new prices tribunal set up by the Labor Government will work. Unfortunately, if we have to deal with the G.M.H. and B.H.P. companies and all those other people, I doubt whether it will work. Sooner or later, we must face the fact that these people, by putting up prices, cause the major problem facing us today—inflation. I hope that what the member for Torrens has said about inflation will prove to be correct, but I believe sincerely that what I said about inflation will come about.

I would not like to leave the B.H.P. company without referring to the *Advertiser* of Wednesday, April 4, of this year, in which it was reported that the new Commonwealth Minister for Labour and Industry had criticized the company about migration. This is an important matter. When the company was short of labour it immediately brought labour from European countries and elsewhere into this country, to Whyalla, thus easing its labour problem; but, as soon as some pressure was placed on the company by the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration, certain vital things happened. One was that the company was forced to try in its own peculiar way to attract labour to Whyalla. The company has done two other things as well. It has gone out of its way to employ women in the steel industry, and I did not think it would ever do this.

Mr. Venning: Are you discriminating?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not suggest for one moment that there is anything wrong with employing women in the steel industry; what I suggest is that the B.H.P. Company's policy was not to employ them. The other rather surprising step the company took was to advertise for youth labour, those in the 16 years to 18 years age group. In the past, other representatives of the trade union movement and I could never get the company to take this step, yet finally it has taken it. In a decentralized city such as Whyalla, with its industrial environment, the employment of women and youth labour is most important; it is really a responsibility of employers, especially major employers. The Commonwealth Minister for Labour (Mr. Cameron) has been attacked from every angle. The article in the *Advertiser* of April 4 states:

Mr. Cameron said there is a long history of complaints by the Whyalla Combined Trade Union Council of poor wages and working conditions at the B.H.P. plant.

I agree with that entirely. Although I do not wish to go through the whole history of the matter, I will refer to one instance of a claim on the company. This related to the unfortunate fire disaster with the *Amanda Miller* which was under construction in the yard. This was probably one of the worst disasters in the shipbuilding industry in this country. I do not think anyone in Whyalla wanted to see such a disaster.

When it came to fixing up the vessel after the fire, it became evident that certain sections of the ship had to be repaired or new parts found. With regard to the sections that had to be repaired, the union claimed that under the Metal Trades Award the ship repair rate, which included a small margin above the normal rate, should apply. The company stood firm, saying there was no ship repair rate involved, because in fact this was not a ship. I remember saying before Commissioner Winter that if this was not a ship what was it—a horse and cart or something of that nature. Commissioner Winter went to great lengths (about eight pages of the transcript) to describe that it was a ship and that we were in fact building a ship. This whole dispute, which cost the workers about two or three days wages, amounted to a financial burden on the B.H.P. Company of no more than \$50. That is what Mr. Cameron was talking about in this article, which also states:

It (the report) says it does not show any attempt by the B.H.P. to attract unskilled labour from Adelaide. "The same applies, and perhaps even more so, to labour in other capital cities," the report says.

This report was given to the Commonwealth Minister, and I could not agree more with what it says. I believe that the only attraction over the years for workers to go to Whyalla has been the low rental charged for houses that have been provided by the South Australian Housing Trust, and I do not think the B.H.P. Company can take the glory

for that. Also in the *Advertiser* of April 4, the following statement of the Secretary of the Combined Unions Council (Mr. Dickinson) appears:

The B.H.P. would not attract Australian workers while it fought wage increases and better conditions, it was claimed yesterday. The Secretary of the Combined Unions Council of Whyalla (Mr. S. Dickinson) said Australian workers had heard how bad industrial relations were with the B.H.P. and did not want to work in Whyalla. "The B.H.P. appeals against all decisions by the Arbitration Commission and it fights our cases for better wages and conditions along the line for as long as possible."

That is true. I also wish to draw to honourable members' attention that it is rather ironical that the following comment should appear at page 8 of the *National Over-Award Survey 1973* of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union:

A striking feature revealed by the survey (but one to which we have become accustomed) is the extent to which the arbitration system sets award rates of pay considerably below the actual rates.

In other words, the position is that if a company, such as the B.H.P. Company, sticks to arbitration and conciliation it need do nothing more than pay the bare minimum. I now wish to deal with a matter which I have raised in this place previously and which is vital to Whyalla and to the Commonwealth. In the past 23 years, under the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party Coalition Government, there was no policy on shipbuilding. Referring to this, the following article appeared in the *Advertiser* of April 10:

Shipyards in Adelaide and Brisbane were closing because of the policies of the McMahon Government, Mr. Hurford, M.H.R., said yesterday. These yards were doomed from the day the L.C.P. Government decided to pay subsidies to any yard, and not to the six recognized yards," he said. That is completely true. That remark of Mr. Burford's is relevant to the situation of the shipyard at Port Adelaide. That industry was fed with every subsidy and given every encouragement to build ships. It was then forced on to the shipbuilding market because the then Commonwealth Government had no policy on shipbuilding and no plans for the future. Therefore, that industry at Port Adelaide had to die. That is a terrible state of affairs; the industry was forced to take subsidies, and all of a sudden the shipbuilding programme was taken away. This was no good at all. The present Commonwealth Government has done a couple of things about shipbuilding.

Members interjecting :

Mr. MAX BROWN: Members can laugh. Although the present Government has not done enough, it will do more. One recommendation brought out by the Tariff Board report was that 40 per cent of products shipped between any other country and Australia should be transported in Australian-built ships. Under the previous Commonwealth Government it was estimated at one time that 17 per cent of the cargo shipped between Japan and this country was carried on Australian owned and manned ships, but, in fact, the figure is 1.7 per cent, not 17 per cent.

Mr. Duncan: They put the decimal point in the wrong place!

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is correct. Obviously, the fact that there will be an increase in the percentage of Australian products transported from this country in Australian-owned and Australian-built ships must greatly improve the shipbuilding industry in Australia. It is interesting to note that the present shipbuilding programme for the Whyalla shipyard, in my district, is better than it has ever been, and the management of the company will vouch for that. However, I refer to an interesting

development in shipbuilding, which was reported in the *Advertiser* of April 3 last. That report, headed "Australian National Line to build bulk carrier", states:

The Australian National Line soon will contract for an Australian-built bulk carrier of about 70,000 deadweight tons. Mr. Jones said on Sunday that Australia would build four bulk ships of more than 100,000 tons each to replace four huge ships imported for the coastal trade.

What happened was that the B.H.P. Company and the Australian National Line were allowed to purchase 100,000-ton (101 600 *t*) ships from Belfast, with the proviso that, when replacement was necessary, the ships would have to be replaced by ships built in Australian yards. This sort of decision is good for the industry, giving us stability and something to look forward to in the years to come. I hope that soon the Commonwealth Government will get this volume of trade up to 40 per cent. That is a massive contract: an increase from 1.7 per cent to 40 per cent will not be achieved overnight. However, the increase is our right.

We are the fifth largest trading nation, and at one time, under a previous Liberal and Country Party Government, we did not own one ship so far as an oversea line was concerned. I want to deal now with pollution, which I have mentioned previously in this House. Since I raised the matter on the most recent occasion, four incidents have occurred, and I want to refer to two cases in my district in which thousands of fish have died.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla.

Mr. MAX BROWN: On the first occasion, the fish died of cyanide and we found on investigation that the B.H.P. Company had sufficient cyanide stored to kill all the fish in Australia. The position was rather ironical, because the management of the company stated publicly at that time that the fish did not die of cyanide, and the only conclusion that I could arrive at was that they all committed suicide!

The other incident occurred in the shipyard basin and, when I examined this matter, I found that legally the shipyard basin came under the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Steel Works Indenture Act, which an L.C.L. Government had had passed in this Parliament. There were only two answers. The fish were trespassing and, under that Act, a case could not be legally taken out on behalf of the fish. The only other answer that I could arrive at was that we could put a sign on the entrance to the basin, stating that no fish were allowed to enter. However, the only difficulty about that was that the fish could not read!

I assure the House that fish other than those I have mentioned have died, and that the B.H.P. Company is not free of responsibility in this matter. I also assure the House that I will continue to do everything in my power to ensure that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Steel Works Indenture Act is repealed. I say in all sincerity that I hope that, once we get rid of that Act, never in the history of democracy will a similar Act be brought into effect.

I want to raise one other matter before I conclude, and I tell the member for Rocky River, before he interjects, that, although the matter is not mentioned in the Governor's Speech, it should have been mentioned. I refer to the great calamity to the American people in the Watergate issue and I say merely that, when the Opposition introduces a Bill for voluntary voting for election to this House, if the system is based on the American system of voluntary voting the Bill will not receive my support.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the member for Elizabeth and seconded by the member for Semaphore. I, with other members, extend my sympathy to the families of the late Reg Hurst and the late Harry Kemp. I congratulate the Ministers on their reappointment and I mention especially the Minister of Education, who has been given the additional portfolio of Minister of Fisheries. I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations on your appointment to the highest office in this House and I offer you my wholehearted support and co-operation at all times.

Last night the members for Bragg and Mawson engaged in a controversial debate about the medical scheme. I shall not enter that debate at the depth at which they entered it, except to say that I have been on the receiving end and I would like very much to reserve the right of choosing my doctor. I was pushed and shoved around to 11 different doctors until I was able to choose the doctor I wanted, and I had to suffer. The price of a home visit by a doctor is about the same as the price of a visit by a mechanic to fix a washing machine.

I should like to thank the electors of the Flinders District for their support at the last election. I think I may have been elected for standing up for what I believe and being forthright in my approach. I intend to deal with the electoral system for the Legislative Council that we have been saddled with and also with the voting system generally. Some of my remarks will not be accepted in a good light, but I offer them in good faith so that people can see what I and other members of my Party are trying to achieve. I intend not only to explain the political scene as I see it today but also to offer a workable proposal on how a non-Socialist Government can be returned to power. My primary aim is for the return of a non-Socialist Government; that is objective No. 1. Secondly, I aim to provide representation for non-metropolitan areas which today find themselves without representation of any real significance. Many Liberal and Country League members may find this a little hard to take. Sometimes the bitter pill of truth can be hard to swallow, but I offer my proposals in good faith.

Mr. Venning: What does Mr. Anthony say about this?

Mr. BLACKER: I will quote Mr. Anthony directly. What sort of representation have we? Dozens of times I have had views of dyed-in-the-wool Liberals presented to me about the 1932 merger between the Country Party and the Liberal Union, but that was 41 years ago. The political scene is vastly different today from what it was 41 years ago. Then, South Australia was a truly rural State, depending almost entirely on the man on the land and the associated service industries. The L.C.L. was able to serve this community well then, but that was decades ago. The structure of the State has changed, but the L.C.L., I am sorry to say, is still the same. It was apparent then that South Australia was to be industrialized, but still the L.C.L. lingered on with the same attitudes. Indeed, the State became so industrialized that the L.C.L. was forced out of Government by not catering for the new era that it had created.

Today, the Socialist people and the non-Socialist people can barely talk to one another with any degree of sincerity. Political factions on the non-Socialist side have grown even further apart, because they are trying to represent rural and metropolitan areas. One Party cannot represent all non-Socialist views. Today, we have a large Socialist vote and a large non-Socialist vote, and in between there is a sizeable proportion of swingers, who have been engrossed with the Labor Party's catchcry "It is time

for a change". The Socialist vote is largely a union-dominated vote, mainly representing specific workforce classifications. The non-Socialist vote represents the views of those who believe in free enterprise and in the opportunity for the individual to use his own initiative. If a non-Socialist Government is ever to regain power, it is imperative that—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders has the floor and I ask those members who are interjecting to desist. They will have an opportunity to take the floor at the appropriate time. The honourable member for Flinders.

Mr. BLACKER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is imperative that every non-Socialist vote be secured, and to do this we need a specialized approach. Before any group can appeal to the voting community, it must show that it is interested in and capable of providing for specialized needs. No group can provide specific representation for metropolitan and country areas, because their needs and views vary greatly, but the philosophies of anti-Socialism are similar. To secure these votes, it is necessary to direct our approach in a specialized manner through a coalition, the Country Party catering for the country vote and the Liberal Party catering for the metropolitan vote. In this way it is possible to gain the confidence of non-Socialists by ensuring that the metropolitan and non-metropolitan districts are adequately represented. I have been bitterly disappointed with the representation that we have received in recent years from the L.C.L. I should like to quote from a circular entitled "The L.C.L.—Your Political Heritage" issued by the L.C.L.; the last paragraph of the circular, which was mainly a straight-out dig at the Country Party, says:

Don't sell out the political heritage that has been handed to you. Take an active part in the L.C.L.—it is your only political salvation.

In fact, just the opposite is the real situation. The true colour of the L.C.L. has been shown through the recent amendments to the Constitution, dealing with the Legislative Council; the true colour of the L.C.L. is not a pretty shade of blue, but a rather cloudy shade of grey. The L.C.L. has sold out the country people, and it is proud of it. The following is an extract from a letter dated July 18, 1973, from the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council:

The time has come for a few straight facts about the changes which have been implemented in our State electoral system—changes which are of extreme importance and which the L.C.L. takes pride in having shaped.

A press release states:

The result is a system of electing the Legislative Council that my Party has wanted for a long time.

The L.C.L. is proud of it! I should like to outline exactly how the voting procedures will affect the country people. The Bill passed last session provides for full adult franchise in Legislative Council elections. Voluntary voting is provided for, but Legislative Council elections will be held on the same day as Assembly elections. Legislative Council voting is to be for a single State-wide electoral district returning 11 candidates at each election, and the period of office for each member will be two terms of Parliament. Votes are proposed to be cast on a group basis and not for the individual. This means that the traditional Party voter will vote for his group and will not have the chance to vote for the candidate of his choice. To me this leaves a situation that is wide open to abuse. If by any chance the extreme left should obtain control of the Labor Party, what is to stop them putting three Communist members

at the head of the list, and nothing could be done about it?

Mr. Langley: Who is a Communist on this side: name one?

Mr. BLACKER: I said "If by any chance". Although groups will be voted for by numbers, for example, 1-2-3-4, only the No. 1 preference will be taken into consideration, subject to the agreement reached in conference. This is first-past-the-post voting on a group basis. Each group can nominate as many candidates as it likes, and group positions on the ballot-paper will be drawn by lot. Individuals who wish to stand will be positioned by lot on the right of the groups. Any candidate or group who fails to receive half of the quota (that is, the total vote cast, divided by the number of candidates required, plus one—in this case, 11 candidates plus one) will be eliminated. To the resultant quotient, one is added to prevent a possible deadlock.

Under the agreement reached in conference the legislation now provides that, of those individuals or groups who are eliminated through failing to reach half of one quota, their preferences (if any are cast) will be allocated only to those remaining in the count. This is a partial attempt to salvage an otherwise disfranchised vote: however, the single transference from those eliminated to those remaining does not represent true preferential voting. Of the remaining votes, a new quota is established in the same manner. This means that the quota now required to elect a candidate is proportionally smaller than was the original quota. For example, if the total vote is 600,000, that is 100 per cent. The original quota would be 600,000 divided by 12, plus one, giving a quota of 50,001 or 8.33 per cent of the total vote (600,000 divided by $(11+1)=50,000+1=50,001$). Should there be four candidates or groups eliminated, each having 22,500 votes, or 3.75 per cent, there would be 90,000 votes, or 15 per cent eliminated. If preferences are not allotted, these votes would be lost. This leaves a remaining count of 510,000 votes. The new quota would be 510,000 divided by 12, plus one, giving a quota of 42,501 or 7.08 per cent ($510,000$ divided by $(11+1)=42,500+1=42,501$).

The effect of this is as follows:

Example: Group "A" receives 260,006 votes.

Example 1: Total vote 600,000 (100 per cent) 11 candidates to be elected.

Votes cast for group A, 260,006—43.33 per cent.

Original quota, 50,001—8.33 per cent.

Candidate elected, 5, plus surplus votes, 10,001.

Percentage of representation of whole quotas, 45.45 per cent.

Value of vote, 1.05.

Example 2:

Votes cast for group A, 260,006—43.33 per cent.

Revised quota, 42,501—7.08 per cent.

Candidate elected, 6, plus surplus votes, 5,000.

Percentage of representation of whole quotas, 54.54 per cent.

Value of vote, 1.26.

With a 15 per cent leakage of preferences, the value of the individual vote is raised from 1.05 to 1.26 or a 20 per cent increase. This means that the same vote has different values, depending on the number of votes lost in the transference of preferences. This example would no doubt only apply in extreme circumstances, but points out the anomaly of voluntary preferences and how it affects the overall quota. Under this scheme it would be advantageous for major Parties to advocate a "Vote (1)—forget the rest attitude".

It is part of my deep concern that the Government (with the Opposition agreeing with it) allowed to go before the people of South Australia a Bill with a clause that

capitalized on catching people who know very little about voting. There was no need to eliminate the other members except to create a catch so that the major Parties would be able to get more candidates elected. I may be accused of presenting an over-simplified situation, but one of the nearest systems approaching that which is proposed in South Australia is the electoral system in Israel. Using the figures from the latest election in Israel and applying the South Australian system, there would be 22 per cent of the vote eliminated through failing to reach half of one quota. This portion of the vote would rely on voluntary preferences to make them valid. This would be possible if the Government did not go to the people and explain what has happened.

Any group candidate or individual who receives the required quota will be elected. The votes cast for a group will be allotted to the first-named candidates, for example, if the quota is 50,000 votes and the group of 10 candidates receives 260,000 votes, the first five candidates will be elected. Should there be insufficient whole quotas, the sixth candidate could be elected, should he or she have a larger proportion of a quota than any other candidate. This system is first-past-the-post voting on a group basis with a weighted quota system. For a Party or group to obtain one of the 11 seats, it means that that group would gain 54.54 per cent of the representation, with considerably less than 50 per cent of the vote.

The more votes lost through not giving preferences, the smaller the eventual quota. Consequently, it is easier for remaining groups to gain quotas than was originally the case. I was concerned to note that during the debate on proportional representation, the L.C.L. crossed the floor and voted with the Government against the motion of the member for Mitcham proposing Senate-type voting. I believe this is Party politics. By abandoning the two-electorate system, opposing Senate-type voting allowing the so-called inaccurately named proportional representation Bill with preferential voting to be introduced, and giving in automatic enrolment, the L.C.L. has "sold out" non-metropolitan areas. One interesting outcome of this display of political strategy was that both the L.C.L. and the Labor Party claimed victory. I do not know who won, but I know who lost—all non-metropolitan areas. This raises the point concerning how this will affect non-metropolitan areas.

Taking the figures of the last House of Assembly election, it is reasonable to assume that Labor would secure six of the 11 seats; the L.C.L. three, possibly four; the L.M. one; and the C.P. possibly one. It would be unlikely that Labor candidates would be rural and, for that matter, neither would the L.M. candidates be rural. For the L.C.L. to be the all-embracing group capable of representing all areas of the community (as it claims), its team would have to be three to one city orientated. Therefore, from the major Parties we cannot expect to see more than one non-metropolitan candidate being elected.

Previously the Legislative Council Districts of Northern and Midlands were able to return four members each election, but the same area under the present electoral figures would support 2.53 members. In these two districts there is a total of 178,669 votes, of which 83,996 were cast for non-Socialist groups and 94,673 for the Labor Party. With a quota of 58,025 this means that, in order to obtain one non-Socialist seat, provided there was not a loss of more than 7 per cent through leakage of preferences; it would be necessary to gain all of the non-Socialist votes in the 12 electorates comprising Flinders, Eyre, Stuart, Whyalla, Pirie, Frome, Rocky River, Goyder, Gouger, Kavel, Light, and Chaffey.

If every voter on Eyre Peninsula (Socialist and non-Socialist) voted for the same person, there still would not be sufficient votes to elect one candidate. There are only 43,349 voters on Eyre Peninsula, including Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Woomera, and the quota is 58,025, so the likelihood of a Legislative Councillor coming from Eyre Peninsula is almost impossible. The L.C.L. has given the country people away, and this emphasizes the need for the Country Party. It is a case of survival of country interests.

The Country Party policy for the Legislative Council is for a two-electorate division of the State, metropolitan and country, with 14 seats representing the metropolitan area and 10 representing the country. The Country Party believes that candidates should be elected on a proportional representation basis similar to Senate voting procedures. This is the only system that gives as nearly as practicable an equal value for each vote cast within the respective districts. This system is the method known variously as proportional representation, the quota preferential system, the single transferable vote, or the Hare-Clark system. It has been used in Tasmania since 1907 and, in a modified form, for the Commonwealth Senate elections since 1944.

With this system the State is divided into electorates larger than those used at present, with each electorate returning a number of members, and it is generally considered that an odd number of members is to be preferred, so that five or seven is often cited as being the most satisfactory, although there is an element of self-delusion in this belief that detracts from the mathematical principles on which the system is based.

Voters mark the ballot-papers (which, because several members are to be elected, carry the names of a larger number of candidates) in the order of their preference, in the same way as they do for the system now used for State Parliament, but the difference lies in the way the counting is carried out. In this system a candidate is declared elected as soon as he has received enough votes to ensure his election, and votes in excess of this, being no longer necessary for his election, are counted in favour of the electors' second preference. Thus the surplus votes cast in favour of a popular candidate are not wasted, but serve to elect another member and, in the same way, votes cast for candidates who are not adequately supported are, as soon as their hopeless position is confirmed, transferred to their supporters' second choices.

The count proceeds by the successive transfer of surplus votes until as many candidates as there are seats to be filled have received a quota and been elected, and every elector will be represented by someone of his choosing, not necessarily his first choice, but rarely beyond his third. Every vote will have had a value and, unlike the present system when almost half the voters may consider themselves unrepresented, every elector will have a representative of sympathetic outlook, to whose election he has directly contributed.

But the system provides much more than satisfactory representation for each individual elector, important though that is. It provides also a high degree of mathematical correlation between the opinions held by the electors, as demonstrated by the proportion of votes cast in favour of candidates holding those opinions, and the number of seats actually gained by those candidates. It is for this reason that the system is referred to as proportional representation, and not because each shade of opinion in the electorate is reflected in the composition of the Chamber in proportion to the amount of support that is given to it by the electors.

Because of this feature, the system can play an important part in destroying the pernicious political corruption of "mandate" (that means by which a Party offers to the electorate a platform covering a greater range of promises than Mr. Heinz's celebrated 57 varieties, and which, after being voted into power by an electorate which supports one, two, or even 10 of these items, claims that it has a "mandate from the people" to introduce every one or, even worse, to introduce those for which there is little support from the public, but much support from the Party).

What of the quality of the Parliament that results from an election conducted by this system? The present single-member system makes almost every election a contest between the endorsed candidates of the two major Parties, and the elector's role is reduced to the mere endorsing of one of the two candidates who has been preselected by the appropriate Parties, a practice that, in the bitter words of G. D. J. Cole, uttered 70 years ago, "gives the voter all too often the right to choose between a rogue and a fool".

The greater chance offered by a multi-member electorate, and the fact that several candidates, and not one only, can win, leads to a widening of the field, and to an offering, as candidates, of men and women whose talents and training would be of inestimable value to the State, who are prepared to serve the community in this role, but who have not been able or willing to submit themselves to the Procrustean bed of Party science. Furthermore, we will be spared the waste that now comes about when a man of talent is discarded either by his Party, through failing to be preselected, or by the single-member system, which has deprived us of many an experienced politician.

Members may well ask, at this point, whether there are any drawbacks to this system. If there is one, it lies in the fact that the voting papers contain many more names than they do under the present system, but at the same time, because the result is more satisfactory, the participation of the voters is more meaningful, and I am sure that any society which can cope with the complexities of triellas and quinellas should have no difficulties in selecting from a list of names those who are known and preferred.

But the alleged complexity of the system is more imagined than not, and a demonstration of the simplicity of its principles and its application can be seen in this description of the earliest known example of an election by the single transferable vote. The occasion was at the election of a pupils committee at a boys school run by Thomas Hill, whose son, Rowland Hill, later to become a Colonial Commissioner for South Australia, was a teacher at the school. The boys were instructed to group themselves around the candidates whom they favoured. Those who supported the most popular candidates could see that their success was assured, and some took the opportunity to give their support to other candidates whom they also favoured. At the same time those who found that their preferred candidates had so little support that their chances were hopeless moved away to help the election of another preference who stood a better chance. Eventually (and it probably took a little longer in the doing than in the telling) there was left a number of candidates each surrounded by sufficient boys to ensure his election, the number being equal to the size of the committee required.

Such is the system, such its advantages, such its techniques. What are the possibilities of its being adopted for South Australian Parliamentary elections? For the

House of Assembly, they are not very likely. Despite its past espousal of electoral reform, the present platform of the A.L.P., to which the present Government is unswervingly devoted, is for single-member electorates and first-past-the-post voting—a betrayal of principle which many A.L.P. supporters, including some of high standing in the Party, find obnoxious.

In the ranks of the Liberal Party in the House of Assembly I can find perhaps even a little less support than on the Government side, although I was rather surprised to see that on page 50 of *Hansard* on July 26 the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, speaking in the Legislative Council, was referring to voluntary voting. He was prompted by an interjection, "What about first past the post?" and he replied:

Voluntary voting and first past the post may well go together.

I do not know whether he intends to do a deal on that one, but I hope not, because we will be sold out well and truly if he does.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who are "we"?

Mr. BLACKER: I refer to the non-metropolitan people, all those people living outside the metropolitan area. I now take this matter further to see how first-past-the-post voting systems would be involved. If, under a redistribution, we had a 50-seat House of Assembly, each member would represent 2 per cent of the voting population. Under a preferential voting system it would be necessary for each member to get at least 50 per cent of the vote in his district. Therefore, his winning vote would have to be at least 1 per cent of the total overall vote. In a first-past-the-post system, in a five-way contest it is possible that one person could be elected with 21 per cent of the vote—that is only .4 per cent of the total vote.

As only 26 members are required to form a Government, only 10.4 per cent of the total vote throughout the State would be sufficient to elect a Government, yet we talk about one vote one value. It is therefore on the Legislative Council that I pin some hope. The Legislative Council is seen, with some justification, to be a House of privilege. Despite the justifiable criticism of its method of election, I consider that the Legislative Council has a role to play, especially as a so-called House of Review, being less affected than the Lower House on burning issues of the moment. Because of the longer period between elections the Legislative Council need not court the favour of ephemeral public opinion. Ironically, it is when a self-styled "reformist" Government such as the present one is in power that a House of Review is most needed, because one of the Government's reforms is the abolition of the Legislative Council. A reformist Government implies a heavy legislative programme, a large number of Bills to be introduced and considered through every stage: Bills to introduce new legislation, to repeat old legislation and to amend current legislation. Whilst this is being done, each member of the Lower House has his other public duties to perform. A second Chamber means time, as much time is needed to consider each Bill, and if we consider that the time now spent in debating Bills in either House is largely a farce and a waste of time, I assure members that each Bill passed, whether amended or not, adds to the obscurity that is already enshrined in our Statute Books, and every hastily passed and inadequately considered Bill increases the number of legal loopholes. It adds to the possibility of injustice being done to the common man, against which the only counter is the cool, reasoned consideration by Parliament of every measure introduced. With a reformist

Government (or even with a possible reactionary Government following) and a consequent heavy legislative load, adequate consideration and debate can only be carried out in a single Chamber of Parliament by proportionately extending (probably at least doubling) the sitting time, thereby reducing the amount of time and attention that each member can give to his other and possibly equally important duties. The retention of an advocacy of electors' peculiar and special interests, as well as an opportunity for the ventilation and consideration of their grievances is most important.

Since having been elected I have been the subject of several personal attacks, mainly sniping remarks to the effect that, although I am a good fellow, I should not be out on my own with the Country Party. Such comments have persisted repeatedly, yet I have been unable to find real justification for them. On June 1, 1973, a former member for Flinders (Sir Glen Pearson) at a meeting in Port Lincoln said:

In South Australia the only Party which could defeat the A.L.P. Government is the L.C.L. The Country Party could not do it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You don't agree with that.

Mr. BLACKER: I was surprised that a man of Sir Glen Pearson's standing would make such sweeping statements, especially as he was involved when the last Government was defeated.

Mr. Chapman: Don't you know Sir Glen?

Mr. BLACKER: He was my neighbour. On June 14, Mr. Trevor Griffin made similar remarks to the effect that it was not in the best interests of either the country community or the whole community that there be more than one Party representing both country and city people. I now refer to what the Leader in the Upper House (Mr. DeGaris) said, as follows:

There is no possibility of increasing our ability to defeat the A.L.P. Government in South Australia unless that unity under one anti-Socialist political leader is again achieved.

I appreciate those sentiments, and I acknowledge that 41 years ago they could well have applied. It has been put to me also that by my standing against a sitting member I am wasting time and money for no useful purpose. Indeed, I know that a member of this House has said that it is no good voting for the Country Party, because it splits the vote. This is a blatant untruth that cannot be substantiated. It is a direct attempt to solicit a vote without telling the electors the facts. Attempts to reprimand me for standing against a sitting member deserve only one reply: at least I have the distinction of putting the views of my Party to the people. The members for Light, Kavel, Fisher and Eyre—

Mr. Rodda: Tell us the real reason why you won Light, Kavel, Fisher and Eyre gained their seats by opposing sitting L.C.L. members.

Mr. BLACKER: The L.C.L. has mounted a campaign in country areas claiming that a single undivided all-in anti-Socialist Party is the only hope of defeating Labor at the State and Commonwealth level, but the facts do not substantiate that claim. There is a coalition Government in New South Wales and Queensland, and in both States it operates successfully. That there is a coalition Government or that there is a two-Party Opposition does not mean much. The Liberal Party on its own has won in Victoria: it did a trade with the A.L.P. regarding preferences. In New Zealand there is a single anti-Socialist Party, yet the Labor Government has just been returned to the Treasury benches after a decade in Opposition. In South Australia, where the L.C.L. claims to be a composite

Party, Labor Governments have won three elections in the last decade. The present split in the L.C.L. highlights the dilemma that occurs when one Party tries to represent and speak for farmers, country dwellers and small businessmen on the one hand, and large city-based interests on the other hand.

In these changing circumstances there is a great and growing need for a Party which represents neither right nor left, but which stands up for the people who have made this country what it is: the butchers, bakers, candlestick makers, farmers, doctors, delicatessen owners and others who just want freedom to retain a climate in which some rewards can still go to those prepared to work harder and longer. This, as an increasing number see it, is the broader base, which is not just being sought by the Country Party: it is being demanded of it. There is a political vacuum to be filled. There is nothing incompatible about the traditional aims and policies of the Country Party and the groups to which I have referred. We do not have to vary our principles one iota to accommodate them; we need merely to expound and elaborate on policies that we already have. We do not need to be ashamed of our very definite views on such general matters as defence, education, Aborigines, international affairs, and so on.

Perhaps we in the Country Party have erred in leaving these fields to our Commonwealth coalition partners while we have concentrated on things more directly concerned with agriculture. We certainly have little to be ashamed of in performance. In over 50 years, the Commonwealth Country Party has had only five leaders—and not one split or “palace revolution”. Compare this with other major Parties. Few would deny which was the solid partner in the recent 23 years of Commonwealth Liberal—C.P. coalition Government. In the last two Commonwealth elections, the Liberal Party has lost 23 seats. The Country Party still holds the same number. Further, it is popular belief that, if the Country Party and Doug Anthony had led the coalition last time, the Commonwealth Labor Party would not be in power today. The Commonwealth Labor Party resents the prestige, power and integrity of the Country Party; hence its electoral reform legislation aimed at weakening the rural voice.

Here, I must pay a tribute to the Minister of Agriculture who, when opening the United Farmers and Graziers conference at Rothman Hall last Friday, in the course of his speech made several references to the Country Party. He did not have to mention the Liberal Party or the L.C.L. It was the Country Party that was putting the pressure on him.

The Country Party has positive policies, honours its pledges, and has let no-one down. Contrast this with the Liberal Party's hints and slurs in the Victorian election of a Country Party—A.L.P. coalition, and then itself making a preference deal with the A.L.P., thus to win the Country Party seat of Swan Hill. And here in South Australia, the L.C.L. is spending more time opposing and knocking the Country Party than the A.L.P. More and more people are coming to realize that South Australia has been disadvantaged because we have not had Country Party representation at State and Commonwealth levels. South Australia has been left alone by the Commonwealth Government because there was no Country Party pressure here. How else does one account for the smallness of our Cabinet representation (one junior Minister) and the lack of Commonwealth interest and projects, dams and so on for this State compared to others?

Having said that, I suggest that it may appear that I am anti-L.C.L. I am rather disappointed at the attitude of the members alongside me, because I believe the L.C.L. can play an important part in returning a non-Socialist Government. The problem has been identified; now we have to solve it. The task is to win the metropolitan vote. Here are some figures. There are 22 Lower House seats in Central No. 1 and Central No. 2 Districts. In those 22 seats, taking the figures at the last House of Assembly election, 198,150 votes were cast for the Labor Party, which is 58 per cent of the total votes, and 142,456 votes were cast for the non-Socialist group, which is 42 per cent of the total votes. My point is that Labor, with only 58 per cent of the votes, is holding 72.72 per cent of the metropolitan seats.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a gerrymander.

Mr. BLACKER: Yes. The L.C.L. has taken the charge of gerrymander from the Labor Party for years, but the same situation applies now the opposite way round in the metropolitan area. If I may digress slightly, one of my greatest concerns is the lack of public image that this Parliament presents to the public. A few months ago, a press release suggested that politicians would be getting a \$70 rise in their weekly salary. There was a public outcry because it was felt that the integrity of this House certainly did not justify a wage increase. It is a sorry state of affairs when the public of this State can ridicule their representatives and begrudge them a wage increase.

I do not intend to debate the merits of a wage increase other than to say that the wage should be commensurate with the responsibilities and obligations involved. Let us look at the reasons for the general public's dissatisfaction. Is the member playing his part? Is he representing the wishes of his people or is he being a “Yes” man to his Leader? When we look at *Hansard* and find that some members have been only of token assistance to Parliament, perhaps the public resentment is justified. Sometimes a member makes only one or two speeches during the whole session.

Mr. Keneally: They work hard in their districts, though.

Mr. BLACKER: That may be so, but it is the integrity of the members as it comes across that counts. The integrity displayed by many members in this House leaves much to be desired. Totally irresponsible and childlike behaviour is barely an accurate description of some members' actions. The irrational behaviour causes concern to the Leaders of the major Parties. For instance, on opening day, on Tuesday of last week, there was an uproar when the member for Kavel moved a motion to suspend Standing Orders. The Leaders were quick to send their Whips around the Chamber to restore order. The public galleries were full and it was not befitting that Parliament should be seen in such a turmoil.

The lowest of all insults came last Thursday evening when it was claimed on television that Parliament should not be broadcast on radio or be televised because it would be degrading to have the mentality and integrity of the State's politicians so widely publicized. I am very disappointed that such statements ever need to be made and I only hope that remedial action may be taken so that we can restore the public image of this House.

One of my greatest concerns, and one of the greatest problems facing people in remote areas, is the matter of freight differentials. The farther one is away from a capital city, the greater is the burden of freight, so much so that one pays for the privilege of living outside the metropolitan area. With a freight component added to the price of all commodities, the cost of living is substantially higher.

With the advent of the Labor Party's policy of one vote one value, we should be able to expect a vast improvement in services to people in country areas—the morning milk, bread, mail and paper deliveries to start with: and the elimination of varying freight differentials, produce and products being available to members of the public at standard prices irrespective of where they live. After all, if one man's vote is comparable to the next man's vote, why should there be any difference in the services provided and the cost of living? In reply to a question I asked of the Premier about the availability of Housing Trust houses, the Premier said:

One of our biggest problems on Eyre Peninsula is the difficulty of getting satisfactory tenderers for Housing Trust work. The cost of a Housing Trust house in Port Lincoln is vastly greater than the cost of a similar house elsewhere in the State. Shipping costs are very great, but the matter is constantly under review.

I thank the Premier for keeping the matter constantly under review. This is a burden that country people must bear. The statistical division of Eyre Peninsula has a good production record. Last year, which was by no means a good year, we still were able to produce almost 30 per cent of the State's wheat, 21.5 per cent of the State's barley, and 23 per cent of the State's oats. We have a major fishing industry there, so much so that we can claim the biggest fishing port in the South Hemisphere. However, unfortunately, I have to admit it has probably the poorest facilities. In the Flinders District, two new mining interests have recently been developed: jade at Cowell and kaolin deposits from Marble Range to Mount Hope. Both of these finds are unique in Australia, and I hope they will develop into worthwhile units. I understand that it is estimated that the kaolin deposits will develop into a \$3,500,000 industry. It is hoped that the ore will be railed out, if the rail services on the coast are maintained. Several other matters of concern to my district that have been foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech can be dealt with as they arise. I support the motion.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I, too, support the motion. With other members, I offer my condolences to the relatives and friends of recently deceased members of this House. I knew Reg Hurst well for many years; he was a prominent member of the trade union movement. I got to know Harry Kemp quite well, as he was a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, of which I am also a member. I did not know Mr. McLachlan personally. I think that when condolences are offered to the relatives of deceased members it is a credit to this House that, despite the different political beliefs of members and the squabbles that take place across the Chamber, there is an air of gloom and general sadness evident.

I congratulate the Speaker on his election to that distinguished office. It does not surprise me to see a person of his calibre in the Chair; he is a financial member of the Waterside Workers Federation, as I am. By his election, he adds lustre to the bright and honoured name of the federation, which has produced many prominent politicians in the State and Commonwealth sphere, even providing a Prime Minister of Australia.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The boilermakers union had a Governor-General.

Mr. WELLS: True, but I seem to recall that, before joining the boilermakers union, he was a member of the Waterside Workers Federation. I know our Speaker will find it easy to handle any problems that may arise in this Chamber because he was given a fairly solid grounding in the forums of the federation as an officer of that body and of the federal council. I do not think he will have

much trouble in controlling this House; his voice lends him authority.

I also congratulate the new members of the House and wish them well during their sojourn here. I am sure they will enjoy the atmosphere of and the business before the House, as we all do. I want to disagree violently with the statements made during this debate by the Leader about the member for Elizabeth. It appeared to me that the Leader attempted to denigrate the honourable member by saying that he knew little about his area, that he was not known there, and that he did not move around much, and the Leader suggested that the member for Elizabeth should do certain things. I can tell the Leader and all other members opposite that the member for Elizabeth is held in the highest esteem in the ranks of the Australian Labor Party. He is a prominent member of the A.L.P., having belonged to it since his boyhood. He is well known, liked and respected within the Elizabeth area. I assure members that they will hear much more of him in the future; I believe he has the ability to rise to great heights in his Parliamentary career, which he has started virtually as a boy. I believe that he will finally reach the peak of any politician's ambition, which I suppose is to occupy the front bench in a Government. I congratulate him on his election to the House and wish him well.

The Leader eulogized the member for Semaphore, saying he was a nice person. I eulogize him, too, because we know that he has been tried in the corridors of the trade union movement. He was an extremely good trade union officer. He has come to this Parliament highly recommended, trusted, and held in the highest esteem by the trade union movement and the Labor Party generally. I know that he, too, will leave his mark on the House before he eventually leaves.

It has rather surprised me that, during their speeches in this debate, members opposite have not referred at all to the achievements of this Government. I do not know why they have not referred to these achievements, because the Government can be proud of what it has achieved. During the past few years, we have done more for the State than any other Government did in the previous 20 years. Members opposite should recognize the value of the legislation we have sponsored. Although they have vigorously opposed many of the Bills we have introduced, at least they have been members of a Parliament that has enacted this beneficial legislation, so they can bask in that reflected glory. We are proud of our efforts. Some of the things we have done and intend to do are worth referring to.

Mr. Chapman: They're incredibly hard to believe.

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member will find them hard to believe; with his background he would find anything that was reasonable hard to believe. I have no doubt at all that that is his situation, and I understand that situation. As we give attention to younger people who are newly-married or who are intending to marry, we have provided for housing loans to be made available through the State Bank at an interest rate of 5½ per cent to those who satisfy the means test. Others who cannot satisfy the means test may borrow money at a rate of 6½ per cent interest, the maximum loan having been increased to \$12,500. This is an astounding legislative proposal that must bring much joy to the many younger people who are struggling to own a house. Because of the election of a Labor Government, their dream can come true.

Mr. Becker: On how much deposit?

Mr. WELLS: I cannot give the figure: I am not certain of it. Nevertheless, the money will be available at an extremely low rate of interest, such as 5½ per cent or 6½ per cent. We look after the country people: the member for Flinders need have no fear about that. He need not rely on the Liberal and Country League to look after country areas and rural workers. We have done it since we have been in office and we will continue that work.

The Speech states that there has been a greatly increased demand at good prices for the State's wool, meat, grain, and other agricultural products. That shows that this Government is determined to assist the rural sector. A large sum will be spent to upgrade facilities at the Port Lincoln abattoir, greatly assisting the people on Eyre Peninsula. The real reason for the high cost of living and the inflation has not been mentioned in this House, but the inflation that is besetting the country has been caused by the vicious, vile, give-away Budget introduced by the L.C.P. Government in Canberra last August to try to win votes. This country is now feeling the effects of that give-away Budget.

However, do not let us be concerned, because the Whitlam Government will put this country back on its feet after a long period of L.C.P. dominated policies. We have at the helm people who will go down in history as the greatest statesmen who ever lived, Menzies and all the others included. We were told that Mr. Whitlam would not be welcome in America and that he would be ridiculed, but the red carpet was laid down for him and the people cheered and played drums for him.

That is the type of Prime Minister that we have, and so we can look through the Cabinet. Mr. Crean is a capable man who will handle financial matters. Clyde Cameron is one of the greatest Ministers of Labour this country has had. He is a man who realizes the value of the workers to the country. He will see that they get their just deserts and a decent economic standard of living.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Tell the Opposition about the title of the new national anthem—"God save our gracious Crean."

Mr. WELLS: That is correct. Members opposite must blush and worry when they look at the front bench in this House. They must say, "How are we to match them?" It is laughable to look at the people on the Opposition front bench and compare their capabilities with the capabilities of our Ministers. I say, without fear of contradiction (and I am not given to boasting), that we could put on the front benches opposite members from our back benches whose ability would far outweigh that of the potential Ministers opposite.

I shall refer to the work done by our eminent skilled Ministers. A comprehensive welfare service has been undertaken, for the benefit of our citizens. I refer to the provision of further community welfare centres, district offices, and associated services. These have greatly alleviated the problems of the poor suffering people in most areas and certainly in my district, which is a working-class area.

In Aboriginal affairs, considerable progress has been made towards the autonomous administration of reserves and settlements by the Aboriginal communities. Many benefits will flow from this. In the last financial year, more major projects in road building were completed by the Highways Department than have been completed during any other financial year in the history of the department. Amongst these projects were the Kingston bridge, the

Port Augusta bridge, and the Stirling to Verdun section of the South-Eastern Freeway.

Mr. Becker: Who started the work?

Mr. WELLS: We start and we complete, under the skilled leadership of the Minister responsible. That is a sore point with many Opposition members. Our Ministers do not take the word of their departmental heads as gospel: they want proof. Our Ministers take the departments firmly in hand to administer them. They do not leave that to people who have not the capacity or authority that they have.

Mr. Mathwin: I would like Geoff Virgo to work on Morphett Road, if he would.

Mr. WELLS: The Minister likes the member for Glenelg and, if the honourable member were to speak to the Minister, the Minister would probably do anything for him. On road safety, this Government is concerned about the problem and is using every endeavour to curtail road accidents and tragic road deaths, and it will continue to work confidently with the Road Safety Council to reduce the toll.

Mr. Becker: How is the road toll going?

Mr. WELLS: It is bad, but is the honourable member suggesting that the deaths on the road should be attributed to this Government or to the Minister responsible?

Mr. Becker: You said you would reduce the toll.

Mr. WELLS: Exactly, and through the agency of the Road Safety Council legislation will enable the Government to curtail the road toll.

Mr. Becker: But you said you would do it in the previous three years.

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member ought to listen. I am speaking of what the Government intends to do. I refer now to something else in which all members opposite will be interested. Indeed, I am sure they will support me in this. We want worker participation in industry. Do members opposite agree with this? I hope to see soon the formation of a joint consultative committee to attain for the workers of this State a say in the management of the industries that they serve. The workers should have a direct voice in the management of any company whose profits they help to make.

Mr. Gunn: They can get that voice by buying shares in that company.

Mr. WELLS: They should not have to buy shares, because it is their sweat and their broken limbs and mangled bodies that make it possible for the shareholders to receive profits. Of what use would the shareholders' capital be without the workers' labour? Members on this side form a Socialist Government. The member for Flinders referred to Socialist and anti-Socialist forces, and he also referred to the anti-Socialist amalgamation. We are not ashamed of the fact that this is a Socialist Government; we are dedicated Socialists, and the Commonwealth Government is a Government of dedicated Socialists. Socialism will be the salvation of this country. Socialism does not mean that someone will come along and steal the farms or sheep of members opposite.

The workers have a right to know the policies of the firms for which they work and to have a voice in projected rationalization schemes. They want to know when farmers plan to shear their sheep and when they plan to reap their wheat. The workers want the right to know the forward planning of companies, and they want the right to intervene in suggested policies that may produce redundancy. The workers demand the right to secure adequate and suitable on-the-job training. I know that this is very distasteful to some members.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn members to be reasonable. I have been reasonable for the last hour, and I hope that all members will be reasonable, Loo.

Mr. WELLS: Unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, members opposite are often unreasonable. For too long the workers have been forced to accept blindly decisions that have a direct bearing on their standard of living. The workers should have a direct voice at management level in the companies for which they make profits. This does not mean that the workers should necessarily have seats on the board of directors, but at least they should be given a voice in determining the policies of their industry. They should be consulted on every move where their livelihood is at stake.

Mr. Becker: Who will do the work?

Mr. WELLS: Those who always do: the workers who sweat and toil will do the work. The member for Whyalla said that Australia was the only island continent in the world that did not have an international shipping fleet. We had a national line, but Mr. Bruce, a former Prime Minister, gave it away. The rural people do not seem to understand that the Conference Line, which takes their products from this country, has a policy of charging what the trade will bear. As a result the farmers are robbed right and left. If we had a national shipping line manned by Australian seamen and carrying Australian products this country would be a much better place, and there would not be the terrible results that some members opposite seem to fear.

Mr. Nankivell: Did the Labor Government take the national line out of the conference?

Mr. WELLS: That happened because the competition was not great enough. Everyone was heartened years ago because Russia was going to bring its ships into the southern hemisphere; it was thought that Russia would lift the cargoes. Everyone said that there would be genuine competition, which would force freight rates down. However, freight rates were not forced down, because Russia joined the Conference Line. So, they are all in it for a quid; they will all rob someone if they can. We want a national shipping line; we should have had one 20 years ago. I say that we will provide a national shipping line, and it will not be confined to interstate trade. We will lift the cargoes, including wheat and wool, from Australia and carry them to all parts of the world.

I am delighted to know that the Government, with a clear mandate from the people, will enact amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to expunge from the Statute Book what is to my mind the most vicious, terrible, repressive Act of suppression and intimidation ever placed on any Statute Book, the law of tort. This absolutely disgraceful law has been perpetrated on our workforce. The iniquitous law of tort permits a democratically elected union official obeying the instructions of his organization to be dragged before a civil court with no right of redress and to be gaoled. This is a disgraceful state of affairs in an enlightened country like Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: The official wanted to tell another person what he should do with his wool. Do you call that justice?

Mr. WELLS: What a narrow outlook! If there is industrial trouble, the Industrial Court is the place where it should be dealt with. It should not be dealt with in a civil court, where there is no right of redress. I hope to see soon that the courts will be deprived of their right

to impose penalties on trade unions. The law of tort has been implemented by certain employers, not for their benefit and to protect themselves but to protect scab workers and, if employees had been *bona fide* members of a trade union, the position would not have arisen. If a person works under an industrial award and receives the benefits but does not join the union, he is a scab and is not worth a zac, and that opinion goes for anyone in that category. We will see that the law of tort is abolished from the Statute Book, and I shall be disappointed if members opposite are not honest enough and fair dinkum with themselves to vote to get rid of this iniquitous provision.

We will probably hear pious arguments from some Opposition member defending the right of employers to send a worker to prison, as that is precisely what has been done and what they want to do in future. The law of tort originated in England, was amended and finally jettisoned, but it still operates in this State. However, if this law is implemented in South Australia again members will see the greatest industrial upheaval that this country has known, because workers will not tolerate their leaders being imprisoned.

Mr. McAnaney: Mob rule!

Mr. WELLS: No, it is not mob rule, but it will be an action to ensure justice to their fellow workers and their leaders.

Mr. Becker: What about stand-over tactics!

Mr. WELLS: I congratulate the Government, because it intends to undertake redevelopment of the Northfield wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, situated in my district. I know of the difficulties that have confronted the dedicated medical officers and staff, and when the Government's plans are brought to fruition they will provide a complex that will be of great benefit to the patients and staff, with a resulting improvement in the welfare of the patients in particular. This work is essential, and I congratulate the Government for undertaking the project, and should like it to be completed as quickly as possible.

I have had the pleasure and honour of seeing new schools built in my district and many up-graded. I would say this of any Minister if my comment applied to him: the present Minister is held in the highest esteem by all of the school staffs in my district. The headmaster of every school that I have visited (and I have visited them all in turn) has stated that in our present Minister we have a man of foresight with the ability to put education on a plane on which it should be placed in this State and in every other State. I congratulate him, and I am proud to be associated with him.

Mr. McAnaney: That sounds—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to give the member for Florey a chance. I think the member for Heysen has been allowed a fair share of interjections, as have one or two other members, and I ask honourable members to give the member for Florey a reasonable go, as he has 25 minutes only left of his time. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know whether that is an invitation to sit down or to carry on.

Dr. Tonkin: Take it as you see fit, Charles.

Mr. WELLS: The interjection reminds me of something the member for Bragg said last evening when he referred to the member for Gilles in speaking about the Commonwealth health scheme. The honourable member said that the member for Gilles was parroting A.L.P. policy. I would be surprised if the member for Gilles was not enunciating Labor Party policy, but the member for Bragg

did more than enunciate his Party's policy: he blabbed and blabbed about the A.M.A.'s policy on the health scheme. No doubt he is proud of that scheme, but we are also proud of the member for Gilles for supporting A.L.P. policy. I do not know whether the member for Bragg would be proud this evening if he had seen Dr. Sando interviewed. It was obvious to me and to everyone who saw the programme that Dr. Sando is convinced that, with one or two minor anomalies corrected (and he will confer with the Premier on these matters) the scheme will be accepted by the A.M.A.

Dr. Tonkin: As an interim measure.

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member did not say that last evening when he viciously attacked the report of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs and tried to tear holes in it. The *Hansard* proof is on the table, and the honourable member should read it and see what he said. He tried to ridicule and denigrate the Commissioner's report.

The Hon. L. J. King: And the Leader said that it was all we could expect from a Socialist Premier.

Mr. WELLS: That is exactly what was said.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They say the first thing that comes into their head.

Mr. WELLS: Obviously, members opposite say things in desperation, but the next day they are forced to run for cover, and it is unfortunate to see this. We have not had the chance to talk of the results of the election that returned the Labor Government with a handsome majority. Some people are circulating stories that the Labor Party had an advantage because the Opposition was having domestic troubles and because it had problems which it found hard to resolve and which caused divisions in the Party. Members should not forget that we have had our share of these problems. People have said that this situation was the major cause of our victory, but the truth is that, after our first term of three years, voters in this State met us with warm affectionate regard and complete trust, and returned this Government for those reasons. That is why we are here and why we will be here for the next 20 years, anyway. The voters had confidence in the South Australian Labor Party, in this Government, and in each and every member of it, and that, combined with the policies we put forward for their approval, for all of which we were given a very clear and decisive mandate, is why we were returned. We will carry through these mandates and keep the promises we made to our electors. I support the motion.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): In supporting this motion, I congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your elevation to that position. Also, I congratulate the Speaker on his elevation to his present position. I pay due respect and offer my condolences to those people left after the passing of a member from the other place, the Hon. Harry Kemp, and of course our former Speaker in this House; Mr. Reg Hurst, whose death was indeed a great shock to every member of this Parliament. We on this side are affected just as are his colleagues on the Government side. It was a great shock to us all, and I sympathize with those he left behind.

I congratulate, too, the new members in this Parliament. It is not long since I was a new member, and I am sure they will find, as I did, that all members in this Parliament, no matter from which side, will be most helpful to them. At times members get abusive, but it is all part of the game. While I am congratulating people, it would be remiss if I did not congratulate the electors of Glenelg on their very wise choice of a member for the district, and of course I need

not add that things this year are going very well at the Bay.

The Hon. L. J. King: There were not as many wise ones this year as there were last time.

Mr. MATHWIN: These things happen, but we had another advantage. Sometimes the history of the people put up by the Labor Party is quite an interesting tale. I do not include, of course, the former member for Glenelg. Earlier, we had Mr. Charles, who had been Vice-President of the local Liberal and Country League branch but who was endorsed by the Labor Party. The first candidate to oppose me was Mr. Sexton, who was a financial member of the Liberal and Country League when he was endorsed by the Labor Party. At the last election we had Mr. Crawford, who was not eligible because he could not comply with the rules: he had not been in the Party for two years and therefore he was really not eligible, under the rules and regulations, to stand. Up to the present time he has still not been endorsed, because I understand he has to wait a couple more weeks before he is eligible. However, that is in the passing of time, and it is quite correct. I am glad the member for Spence agrees with me.

Dr. Tonkin: You wouldn't want them to put anyone else up. You know him.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, I think we can cope with Mr. Crawford. Nevertheless, we had a very good election campaign; I would not suggest it was a bad one. It was a good clean fight on both sides, and these congratulations were conveyed at the appropriate time. I am pleased that Parliament has been recalled after such a long period—since last December, except for the one short sitting, Parliament has been in recess, and this enabled the Premier to be a dictator in his own right. This must be a great position to occupy.

I should like to speak of possible improvements in certain areas of our welfare services dealing with older people. There is a great need for help and assistance regarding accommodation for the aged, particularly in places catering for people by supplying accommodation but not meals. In many parts of the metropolitan area, not only in the city, these places leave much to be desired. These people find great difficulty in cooking, and many have to go outside from their rooms to get to the kitchen or to the bathroom and the shower. This is difficult for older people. However, one must be careful in dealing with this situation, because they are getting cheap accommodation, as they realize.

I firmly believe that many elderly people are frightened to complain in case they are put out and have to seek alternative accommodation, perhaps in a home or elsewhere, losing their independence. Some do not like cooking in communal kitchens and therefore take into their rooms kerosene stoves and methylated spirits stoves, constituting not only a health hazard but a safety hazard. Something should be done in this area. I would define these places as lodging houses. A lodger is defined as follows:

A person who occupies rooms in a house of which the general possession remains in the landlord, as shown by the fact that he retains control over the street or outer door.

I consider, therefore, that these places are a type of lodging house. The Adelaide City Council and the Port Adelaide council have by-laws to control such places, but I do not think many metropolitan councils have this control. A set of standards under the Health Act should be compiled and licences or certificates given for this type of accommodation. Above all, the dignity of the aged must be preserved at all costs. Consideration should be given to making available cheap money, perhaps by loan, to upgrade these lodging-houses, or even to provide a

hostel-type accommodation for the many charity organizations that do this type of work, such as the Salvation Army and various other charities.

During the recess much was written in the press about the dial-a-bus service, and in this time and in the sitting of this Parliament we saw the coming and going of this service. The Minister of Transport promised South Australia that we would have dial-a-bus operating by Christmas. He did not say which Christmas, although last Christmas it seemed possible that we would have had the service operating, but the Minister has failed us in this matter. He was told by many people this type of transport would not work. I told him of the experience I had had in this area. I know that the \$12,000 Breuning novel produced for the South Australian Government said that dial-a-bus was a possibility and should be considered, but the Minister had the opportunity to see this type of transportation when he was travelling overseas, which he told me was two years ago. I cannot understand why, unless it was the pet baby of someone else in Cabinet, he should have persevered with it for so long, only for it to fail, as it has. He fostered the idea right through like a ducky hen and eventually we saw the whole project collapse. At present, with the planning of transportation and roads, we see that transport is now in and roads are taboo. I understand that some bridges are to be built on the inlets and outlets to and from the city, which are to be made smaller by reducing the number of traffic lanes in them to control motorists coming into the city. I suppose this is one method of controlling them but, sooner or later, the Government will have to face up to the fact that we must have a proper road system.

The Minister is soon to investigate what is happening overseas. I hope he will take some note of what is happening there, not only in Los Angeles, which is his favourite haunt in this regard, but also in places in Europe where the big road systems are. He can see them being built in Switzerland, Germany and France, where there are cantilevered six-lane highways out from the side of a mountain. If he sees that type of construction, he will realize it must be faced up to; the Government will have to accommodate the cars because, whatever the Minister believes or tries to control, he cannot stop people bringing cars and other vehicles into the city.

In line with my suggestion that roads are now taboo, I point out that the Minister of Transport has washed his hands of his former title—Minister of Roads and Transport. It therefore seems apparent that he will finish up the road system and not proceed farther with it. The Minister of Local Government is responsible for the appointment of a Royal Commission on boundaries. Whose suggestion was it; who asked for this Royal Commission on boundaries? I agree, as I think most people who are interested in local government would, that it is imperative that in many cases there should be some review of local government and its boundaries in country areas, but all metropolitan councils are viable and operating with excellent results. One of the matters to be considered by the Royal Commission is ratable value or what rates are derived by a council. I suggest to the Minister that this is not the be all and end all of everything, that several small councils are doing a fine job in the community and are getting a reasonable amount of rate revenue.

There is in the Commonwealth, and in South Australia in particular, a general shortage of well-trained manpower, and this is now proving the breakdown of the

apprenticeship scheme. One cause of this, I suggest, is the failure of the Minister for Immigration (Mr. Grassby) to grasp the situation. He is more concerned with trying to make himself a "good guy" than he is with getting on with the job. It is obvious that, where we have a shortage of labour, whether it be unskilled or not—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Whom would you like to bring out to Australia?

Mr. MATHWIN: It would not be your father. There is a shortage of all building tradesmen, and particularly bricklayers, in this State.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Whom do you blame for that?

Mr. MATHWIN: I would blame, for one, the Minister for Immigration. It is time he got on with the job and brought out migrants willing and able to come. I am sure the industry of Australia, and particularly of South Australia, is able to receive them. I will deal shortly now with State aid. Here again, we see the Commonwealth Government paving the way for the abolition of private schools and putting an end to the right of people to choose the type of education they desire for their children, whether or not it be a Christian education. The Minister of Education in South Australia agrees to just a little surgery for this type of education, but from a little surgery it will go on eventually to the slaughter of private independent schools.

The Government tells us that, as far as it is concerned, religious instruction should be a matter for the church and the parents—it wants nothing to do with it; religious instruction in schools is not its concern at all: it says it is the responsibility of the church and the parents. But there is a different outlook by the Government on sex education. It then says, "The parents and the churches should have nothing to do with this; they know nothing about it. We, the Education Department, will teach the kiddies all about sex and those other things they should know." The Education Department can do this. It can tell them how to deal with contraceptives and where to purchase them. It can stimulate their interest and curiosity in these things. That is all in the set plan of Socialism. The Socialists always say that this is a matter for the State, for the department, to consider.

The State Government, of course, has made great play of Sweden as a country and for its education system. Particularly in education the State Government says that Sweden is the be all and end all of the matter: it is a shining example that we should follow. Every time and at every given opportunity when a Minister goes abroad, whether on behalf of the Commonwealth or on behalf of the State, he makes a bee-line for Sweden. I suggest that Ministers go there, first because they have heard there is nude bathing on the beaches and, secondly, to get some information about the type of progressive education in that country. But, if we were to read Mr. Ragnar Pahlman, who was a Swedish lawyer, a refugee from this progressive Sweden, we would see that he says:

The object of the Swedish Government has been to destroy the independent schools, leaving education a State monopoly. The method used has been the slow "democratic" one of giving State aid to independent schools on the needs formula—

which we all know is another phrase for the means test; it is the same thing but it sounds a little nicer. The article continues:

which has recently become popular in Australia.

And, I add, in South Australia. The article continues:

The Swedish Social Democrats rejected the *per capita* payment system used in the rest of Europe (and in Australia) because it leaves the independent schools too

independent. Applying the needs formula, the Government has attached strings to the aid, with the subsidy conditional on the schools satisfying all sorts of near-impossible requirements. Frequently, according to Mr. Pahlman, the aid has been delayed and arrived after the school has had to close down. One way or the other, the State has reduced the number of independent schools from 50 to 20 in the past three years. Meanwhile within the Government education system, shortly to be the only system, the Minister of Education has stated: "The school is no longer there to teach how to read and write but to teach equality." Or as another commentator put it: "The school shall be the arrow to form and shape the socialistic human being." The teachers as well as the textbooks and curricula must all have political rather than academic approval, just as the journalists must have political rather than professional approval. "Can there be," asks Mr. Pahlman, "a more effective and speedy brainwashing technique than that which takes place in Sweden, in which the State monopolizes education, school curricula and textbooks, and also the public media . . ."

This is what is happening. This is the type of education given in Sweden, yet the Premier of this State said that we will make South Australia the Sweden of Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Whose comments are you quoting?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is in *Hansard*. I have quoted a Swedish lawyer, Mr. Ragnar Pahlman, a refugee from progressive Sweden.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He is not an educationist.

Mr. MATHWIN: He is a lawyer, and I presume he knows what he is talking about. The Minister of Education is an economist, yet we assume he knows something about his job. Of course, he is a product of the London School of Economics and we know what that school produces. I now refer to a report on Sweden in this morning's *Advertiser*, highlighting the high costs in that country, as follows:

The cost of living is brutal in Sweden, even for the employed. Meat is particularly expensive and good grilling steak now costs the equivalent of about \$4 a pound at present exchange rates. All alcoholic drinks are savagely taxed (spirits especially so, about \$10 a bottle) and petrol is about \$1 a gallon. Cigarettes cost between 80c and \$1 for 20.

I would not argue with that. I would make them \$2 for 20. The article continues:

Two complaints about life under a Social Democratic Government surface time and time again in conversations with Swedes. One is the high rate of personal taxation and the other, less expectedly, the alleged political manipulation of the schools system and of the Government-run radio and television channels to implant Social Democrat propaganda in minds of all ages. There is no way to measure the extent, if any, to which the Social Democrats are using the schools to breed more Social Democrats, although I know parents who swear that the whole range of teaching in social sciences is now coloured pink.

In discussing Socialism and other extremes, it is difficult to find where the pink finishes and where the red begins.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why are you so rotten on Sweden?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am most concerned because, on so many occasions, Sweden has been referred to in this place as being Mecca, as being the ideal that this State should copy. It has often been stated that we should become the Sweden of Australia. I am trying to show honourable members what is wrong with Sweden and its education system. I hope that the Minister of Transport, when he leaves these shores soon, will go to Sweden and look at its education system. I hope only that he will remember what he has seen when he comes back.

I now refer to education and State aid and to a report published on June 19 in the *Australian* regarding comments of the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and

Conservation (Dr. Moss Cass), under the heading "Clergy's control must be broken", as follows:

Catholic schools should be removed from control of the church bureaucracy and developed more as community schools according to the Federal Minister for Conservation (Dr. Cass). He said teachers and parents should have more say in running the schools which, in some areas, should also accept non-Catholic students.

As far as I know, Catholic schools in Adelaide accept non-Catholic students, anyway. The report continues:

The non-Catholics would be instructed in their own faith at the same times as the Catholic children were given religious instruction. Dr. Cass said in an article in yesterday's *Catholic Worker*: "In essence, they (the Catholic schools) should become part of the Government, but not State, education system. It eliminates the narrowness based on social status or religious denomination of the private schools and allows greater autonomy for individual schools, staff and parents.

So much for what Dr. Cass said about independent church schools. We must resist the Socialists' obvious intention to integrate the entire education system through their traditional ideology of the levelling down of schools. Obviously, from what the Minister of Education has said, he and his colleagues are concerned not so much with the upgrading of schools as with the downgrading of the independent schools that are on a higher level. Indeed, this is the basis of Socialism: Socialists do not grade up, they grade down, pulling the rest of the community down with them, and this is something about which we must be concerned.

In effect, the dust has now settled on the recent A.L.P. conference in Queensland, and the Socialist Government of South Australia is now settling down to the task of considering taxation, the very backbone of Socialism. Indeed, higher taxation represents Socialism: the public's dollar in the Government's pocket. This fact was preached many years ago, high taxation and inflation being the Socialist's friend. In 1917 Lenin said that the Socialists must apply higher taxation and that, if they wanted to defeat Capitalism, they must inflate the country. We now see the adherence to this philosophy by the Socialists in this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Duncan: Where is the authority for saying that?

Mr. MATHWIN: Members opposite cannot suggest for one moment that they do not believe this, because this is the basis of Socialism. The difference between Socialism and Communism is slight: the only difference is that Socialism takes a little bit longer to achieve the same result. If members opposite were honest with themselves they would follow the example of the Socialists in Italy, who, when there is an election, include the hammer and sickle on their street banners.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We had some of your crowd putting it on the Trades Hall.

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not think that is correct.

Mr. Crimes: And you were a painter.

Mr. MATHWIN: I think it is an old trick for a political Party to do something like that itself and then blame another political Party for doing it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've had a ton of experience.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, in more ways than one. Let me get back to Lenin.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why not get back to the debate?

Mr. MATHWIN: As this is the Address in Reply debate, I am allowed to cover a wide area. Unfortunately, the Minister was not in the Chamber earlier when I dealt with transport matters, including dial-a-bus. No doubt first thing in the morning he will read what I said.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I've more important things to do.

Mr. MATHWIN: At present we are facing the highest level of inflation that Australia has ever seen, and the position is getting worse. Every week a housewife has to pay more and more for less and less, and all the time she is confronted with rising prices. Even if one asks for a pie and pasty, one is likely to be asked for a deposit because pies and pasties cost so much to buy now. There are only two ways of tackling inflation, as most members know, although obviously the Commonwealth Government does not know. The first way is not to do what the Labor Party suggests and slap price control on everything, with no restrictions on wages; that is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Duncan: We already have a control on wages.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is a mis-statement of fact if I ever heard one. I do not know where the honourable member heard that; I am sure the member for Spence did not tell him that, because he knows that there is no control on wages. What about over-award payments, for a start?

Mr. Crimes: There's a control on the major part of the wage of every worker.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member knows that when unions seek a wage increase they estimate what they will get and add a percentage to take account of inflation, so they inflate the wage themselves. They do not apply for what they expect to get: they apply for three times that amount. The member for Spence knows this, having done it himself when he was a union representative and, when he loses his seat, he will do the same when he goes back to being a union representative.

Mr. Crimes: I'll still fight, wherever I am.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am sure that the honourable member will. I am surprised that the Labor Party has never learnt that it is simply useless to have a policy to control prices if it does not also control wages. Such a policy would be akin to producing the opera *Marriage of Figaro* without having Figaro. To apply price control on its own simply bankrupts small businesses. If honourable members opposite do not want to have price control and wage control together, the alternative means of halting inflation is to cut down Government spending. When we consider this Government's attitude to spending, we should call for two minutes silence, because the Government has appointed more committees and boards than have ever been seen before. It would be interesting to know how many more friends the Government has that are not now members of a committee or a board. If there are any of these friends left, I suppose they will be made members of the new boards and committees that have been fore-shadowed.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: There might be a position for the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. L. J. King: Would you like to be a member of one?

Mr. MATHWIN: As a member of Parliament, I am not allowed to be a member of a board or a committee. It is obvious from what the Premier said the other day that there will be price increases; he was preparing us for the crunch. The Government's policy of high taxation brings us again to the basis of Socialism, which is high taxation. That is the position, and that is what we are faced with for the next three years. I support the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Speaker. I admired your work before as Chairman of Committees, and I appreciated

my association with you when we were both members of the Public Works Committee. However, I point out that during my 10 years in this House Standing Order 125 has been completely ignored. Standing Order 123 puts certain limitations on a member when he asks a question. Standing Order 125 states:

In answering any such question, a member—
and I presume "a member" refers to a Minister, because Ministers answer questions—

shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

Yet, in reply to questions, we hear from Ministers virtually second reading explanations and speeches. Last week the Minister of Education called someone a half-wit. If this practice by Ministers could be eliminated the proceedings before the House, which I am sure will be improved under your jurisdiction, Sir, would be conducted much more smoothly. I am disappointed in the Minister of Education. In the first speech he made in the House he abused everyone he could think of. I gave him a bit of fatherly advice, telling him that he could differ with people without being abusive. I told him an anecdote about what happened to me in New York (I will not go into the details of that now), and I thought I had educated him. However, during the last year or so he has greatly disappointed me, for he has been abusive again, and almost childish.

I pay my respects to the late Reg Hurst, who was a conscientious Speaker and a good member, and to the late Harry Kemp in whose Legislative Council district my district is located. He and I clashed on numerous occasions because of our different opinions, but he was a great expert in agriculture, having had much experience in that field. He was consistent in every statement that he made, and this is becoming an extremely rare quality in public life. This evening we have heard a new member criticizing the Parties and saying that the Liberal and Country League and the Australian Labor Party have made a deal and that the Country Party and the Democratic Labor Party had made a deal. If a member is consistent in this House, he will succeed.

The Hon. L. I. King: But if you start off wrongly, you will remain wrong for the rest of your life.

Mr. McANANEY: That does not mean that a person cannot change his attitude. I get most annoyed when someone tells me that *Hansard* shows that 10 years ago I have said something different from what I am saying now. If a person does not learn in 10 years and does not adjust his ideas, he is not worth two bob to himself or to the Parliament.

The Hon. L. I. King: That's the reverse of what you were just saying.

Mr. McANANEY: A person must be consistent in his attitude on basic principles. Unless someone can show that the principle is wrong, the person should stick to it and not be pragmatic, thinking he might pick up a vote or two by going against his principles. The late Harry Kemp was consistent in adhering to the basic principles in which he believed.

I welcome the new member from "overseas", the member for Alexandra. We do not know whether he is still overseas or whether he has a connection with South Australia. I also welcome the member for Gouger, who has had experience as a member of the Legislative Council. We welcome back the member for Chaffey and we welcome the member for Flinders.

However, I disagree with the statement by the member for Flinders that we need two Parties for the non-Socialists to win an election. No other member of this House has

spent more time in primary producer organizations and in activities connected with primary producers than I have done, but I consider that the Labor Party will never be a great success, because it represents a sectional interest. No members of this House who represent a sectional interest will be a success. I represent the District of Heysen and—

Mr. Rodda: You are Heysen!

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, and I am a great artist! Incidentally, yesterday I saw some paintings done by retarded children, and those paintings would have won a prize at the Art Gallery.

If we are to win election as a non-Socialist Government, we must be in one group. The great majority of people in the District of Heysen are urban dwellers and I admit that they owe their existence partly to the fact that there is a strong country element there that co-operates. Not many districts are held by the Country Party, and it is far better for members to be in one Party, where they can express a view. I have never known a member who can put a good case for the area that he represents to be defeated in an argument or to be unable to get his view across.

The press people are developing as stirrers, trying to stir up ill feeling within Parties and, if we had two or three non-Socialist groups, the press would always be trying to stir up one group against the other. If we are to win election, we must be expressing our views in one Party. I have a certain amount of respect for the Country Party, but no-one has done more harm to the country people than has Sir John McEwen. He advocated having tariffs as high as possible and giving the country people subsidies when they were in difficulties. However, how can we subsidize the wool industry when the cost of what must be bought is above world parity? Tariffs must be realistic in a manufacturing country, but we even have tariffs on industries that do not exist.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about the railways!

Mr. McANANEY: No, I have solved all the problems of the railways. If the Government made me Railways Commissioner or put me in charge of the railways, the Minister of Transport would not have to go overseas to get expert knowledge. In the 10 years that I have been a member of this House, many reports on the railways have been submitted. They have all been full of sound advice and, if that advice had been followed, the railways would be in much better position now. The transport requirements of South Australia would have been satisfied and we would not be in our present unholy mess.

The Treasurer has said that he wants another \$20,000,000 from the Commonwealth Government but, if this State Government and previous State Governments (I must be fair) had put the railways on a satisfactory and competitive basis, the Treasurer would not need that money. He would have saved that amount on the railways and he could have used the money for more effective purposes.

I must admit that the member for Flinders left me in the dark when he spoke about 29,000 votes here and 34,000 votes there. I did not quite follow some of the points that he was making, but I am not criticizing him: I am getting older and may not be able to comprehend. I will read his speech tomorrow and hope for the best. I consider that we now have an unsatisfactory voting system in South Australia. If the Labor Party and the Liberal Country League each had 12 members elected to the Legislative Council at an election, how many days would members of the Council spend when they first met in arguing about who would volunteer to be the President? The Party from which the President came would lose control of the Council.

I emphasize to the member for Flinders that, if the non-Socialist group in the Council is split, a member from the Liberal Movement or from the Country Party could be President. That would mean handing over control of the Legislative Council to the Labor Party. In this respect some people have outsmarted themselves. If a person does not get 4.16 per cent of the vote he is virtually wiped out. The system that has been adopted is an improvement on what the Labor Party originally proposed, as preferences are counted. If there are four groups that qualify and if the preferences are not counted from then on, it is possible to win a seat with 4.3 per cent or 4.4 per cent, it is fantastic that a position like this should have been created. A person may not win with 4.2 per cent, but he could win a seat with 5.5 per cent or most likely with 6 per cent. If a smaller Party qualified with 4.16 per cent, it would get a seat much more easily than it would if there was a scientific vote of the kind that the honourable member was advocating.

It has been suggested that the House of Assembly should be modernized. What right has the House of Review to say that the House of Assembly has a poor voting system? Assembly members are elected by the people, and the House of Review should not tell us what our voting system should be. I believe that the House of Review is entirely necessary and has done much good for South Australia, but it should not let power go to its head. Let it be a House of Review, without interfering with the South Australian Government.

The Heysen District has few problems, except when a freeway or a watershed catchment area is established there. At such times the people may become hostile, but they are very good citizens. Development is now taking place in the district. There are two or three viable industries at Mount Barker. Industries are being transferred from some other parts of South Australia to other States, but a Mount Barker tannery has actually closed its plants in other States and is concentrating its activities at Mount Barker. The Housing Trust has provided some houses, but it has not satisfied the demand for housing there. There are hundreds of people unemployed at Port Pirie, but Housing Trust houses are still being built there.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: There is an eight-month waiting list for a Housing Trust house at Port Pirie.

Mr. McANANEY: What a wonderful place to live in! There is a two-year waiting list at Mount Barker; people must travel many miles (kilometres) to work, yet the Housing Trust and the brains trust in the Premier's Department say, "We will build houses where there is an eight-month waiting list although there are no jobs for the people there." It is clear that the planning is out of touch with the needs of the people. A new planning area is now being created. The Director of Planning (Mr. Hart) visited the local council recently and he more or less said, "You will do what I think you should do." Mount Barker should remain a lovely little country town. Actually, the loveliest country town in South Australia is my home town of Langhorne Creek.

Mr. Langley: Tell us about the pub there.

Mr. McANANEY: It has recently changed hands. When I first went there, one could not see the place for boxthorns. However, I became a member of the local council and told the people to get rid of the boxthorns. Was I popular! Shortly afterwards I was a candidate for election to Parliament, and I asked a man whether he would vote for me; he said that he would put a boxthorn on my grave when I died. However, as I have lived longer, I will not get the boxthorn! Some people in Mount Barker have

been told that their blocks must have an area of 10,000 sq.ft. (930m²), not 6,000sq.ft. (560m²). They have been told that there must be a couple of trees in the backyard. However, surely there could be some small blocks, on which trees could still be planted. My new home is on a block with an area of 20,000sq.ft. (1 860 m²), and I am not looking forward to the area of lawn I have to cut.

In view of the increase in water rates, people on large blocks will be liable for excess water charges that they cannot afford. A widow in Strathalbyn was told that she had used 252,000gall. (1 145 617.2 l) on a little block. How she could do it is beyond my comprehension. Water will become so dear that people will not be able to afford to grow vegetables in their own backyards; they will buy them much more cheaply from Tom the Cheap. The people of Mount Barker should be able to decide for themselves what they will do with their town. They do not want people to live there and travel to Adelaide, because these people would not develop local community interests. People in Mount Barker wish to be allowed to develop as they want to develop. I believe in town planning, which should ensure a planned town with recreation and green-belt areas, but it is not a town planner's job to tell people, especially at Mount Barker, what they should do with their town and now they should do it.

The modern idea is for the main road to by-pass a town, but in Mount Barker the main road will be constructed through the town. The district council suggested that it be sited east of the town, but the Director of Planning has not agreed to this suggestion. If the road is constructed to the south, there will be no access roads and the town will not develop in that direction, which is the logical direction for it to develop. I agreed with the general principles of the town planning legislation. I said that with town planning there would be a restricted number of blocks available for sale and the price would increase as it had increased in other States. This is exactly what happened. As many as 900 applications have been received to subdivide blocks in Mount Barker, and these have been held up for nine months.

It seems that Monarto is to be allowed to grow, but that no development is to be allowed at Mount Barker. I agree that we should have a watershed catchment area so that the Adelaide Hills will not be spoiled, but Mount Barker, which is in the open, should be allowed to develop to a reasonable size, because the people want it to be developed. In the district I represent are situated many recreation parks, and in the area of the District Council of Meadows are many forests and the Engineering and Water Supply Department reserves. The people of Adelaide use the roads in this area, particularly at weekends when even the back roads are congested, although few people use the roads during the week. Although the district council is not allowed to increase its revenue, it has to provide facilities for people using the area for recreation. In an area of many national parks and commercial forests planted by the Government, the council should be compensated for the rates it does not receive from these areas.

I have indicated that this will be my last Parliament unless there is an earlier election for any reason. I would be the endorsed candidate if there were an early election, but I may be tossed out. In the circumstances perhaps I may be allowed some liberty to generalize on politics. On my record of voting in this House I can claim to be a liberal. Although I was rated as a progressive by Blewett and

Jaensch I do not know what they knew about it, but they based their views entirely on my attitude to social questions. If it had not been for one or two members like me on this side (although the Government has taken all the credit), the Totalizator Agency Board and 10 o'clock closing would not exist today.

Mr. Langley: Whom are you kidding?

Mr. McANANEY: Several Labor members would not have voted for these measures, and I name the member for Murray as one. At one time Minister of Agriculture, he lost his seat because in public he told people to vote against the introduction of lotteries. The Labor Party would not have been able to pass all this legislation had it not been for the progressive Legislative Council, which allowed some of it to be passed. Although all the liberals are not on this side, the Labor Party is a most conservative group. Is there really a liberal philosophy or course of action? I have read many articles, particularly one by the Leader of the Liberal Movement in *Checkpoint* in which he suggests the solution to our problem by saying that there must be two Parties. He is 50 years behind the time in that respect, because there was a plebiscite held in the Legislative Council Southern District and country people, most of them farmers, attended the meeting and elected a lawyer as the candidate, and he is a fine candidate. Before that they had elected a doctor, and that is good. I now have more cosmopolitan friends on this side.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I thought you were a liberal.

Mr. McANANEY: That is one and the same thing. The pattern now is that many country people do not have the old parochial ideas that they used to have. Perhaps 500 miles (about 800 km) to the North of the State one may find people with a parochial attitude. I have never been able to pinpoint what liberalism is or what people think of it. Last week the Commonwealth Liberal Leader and one of the newer members on this side advocated price control and freezing wages. I think this is diametrically opposed to liberalism. How can one speak in the same breath of freedom of the individual and private enterprise? Yet price control is to be introduced. When I ask members on this side why they vote for price control they say that it will mean cheaper superphosphate.

If price control were placed on beef and mutton tomorrow these same people would scream. They should be consistent. If a person placed price control on meat now, he would be the biggest rogue known in history. Beef and mutton are expensive today because for four years or five years of the last five years or six years the price of these meats has been below the cost of production, and few farmers produced lamb and beef. It could not be sold overseas at a profit. Unless beef prices are reduced and a guaranteed cost of production is introduced, it would be roguery to introduce price control on meat. Then control would not serve its purpose. People would retain their stock and not place it on the market and, in the short term, the price of meat would be higher.

The question arises as to the degree of individual freedom one can have in a modern society. Very few will advocate a policy of *laissez faire* nowadays and it is generally accepted as being outdated. On the other hand, it has been proved that a system of Government controls and meddling with the economy has been equally destructive to the economy and frustrating to the individual. It is a frustrating existence at the moment. We cannot get materials and we cannot do things without being held up. In building a house, by the time one gets through town

planning and all the paraphernalia, life becomes unbearable and freedom is no more.

We have two major Parties at present in South Australia and two minor groups, one representing themselves for themselves and the other the very pleasant member for Flinders, a poor unfortunate man representing a sectional interest. I sympathize with him. He should represent South Australia and he can best do that by looking at the general interest of the people of South Australia. My *Oxford Dictionary* states that the Labor Party is that Party claiming to represent the wage-earners. It has become the new establishment. It represents the trade unions, so now we have the new establishment instead of the old. It says that the Liberal Party is favourable to democratic reforms and the abolition of privilege, but the Australian Labor Party cannot claim that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You cannot read the *Oxford Dictionary* to define liberalism as it applies in the L.C.L., because most of your people have never heard of it.

Mr. McANANEY: I have a great deal of respect for the member for Brighton in some ways, but he does put his feet where angels fear to tread. I trust that my viewpoint will ultimately produce what will be the Party of the future. I think that the Party of the future will be the one that adopts those principles first. The A.L.P. will have to discard its ties with the new establishment. I think that the Adelaide Club was called the old establishment, but I do not know where it is, although I was invited there once for dinner and that has been my only contact with it. The Party that becomes truly liberal will be the Party that will ultimately govern Australia.

A Liberal Conservative is described as a member of the Conservative Party not ill disposed to maintaining existing institutions. We have progressed on this side of the House. Those of us who advocated adult franchise have achieved what we set out to do. The conservative group that split the Party over this issue came around and now supports us, so we are making great progress. Yesterday the member for Mawson said we were dictated to by a Party and we must do as we were told. Those who voted for adult franchise against the Party platform are still here. Three weeks ago members of the Legislative Council went entirely against the platform and principles of the organization, but those members are still in it.

The Hon. L. J. King: The member for Mitcham told us what happened to him when he voted against adult franchise. He said he was carpeted.

Mr. McANANEY: Anyone who behaves like the member for Mitcham has behaved over the past three months would get his head chopped off wherever he was. He has been disloyal to his Leader, disloyal to his principles, and disloyal to everything else, and you always get your head chopped off when you do that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You would have chopped his head off if he had not resigned?

Mr. McANANEY: I will tell why I would have chopped his head off. It was not because he was in the L.M., but because he was not living up to the standards in which I believe. The Labor Party is elected at present by a majority and controlled by the new establishment, the trade unionists, a minority group. We have heard the member for Florey tonight. He wants them to have a different set of rules from those applying to the rest of the community.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think the member for Mitcham was led astray by the member for Goyder?

Mr. McANANEY: I have a great respect for the member for Goyder in many ways. More and more decisions are being made by planners and the bureaucracy, and the average citizen is interfered with and hindered in his normal day-to-day decisions and Big Brother is on the way, although I have been told that he is on the way out in Sweden. The Party that has been successful in many ways in governing Sweden, and in producing a good motor car, has found that people cannot exist under the Socialistic scheme where more and more people live on what the Government hands out to them while more and more people are under extreme pressure to provide goods to satisfy the group living off them. This position cannot continue or be successful.

We have heard people raving on about price control, and I have already criticized certain statements on this. Less than a year ago in Australia savings were high, with money coming in from overseas and plenty of money in the banks, but people were not willing to spend at that time. They were worried and there was no confidence in what might happen; therefore they would not spend. As a consequence, unemployment was high and A.L.P. politicians (for political reasons) and some experts (for unknown reasons) were forecasting 200,000 unemployed in the new year. This also happened in 1970 when the Premier, then the Leader of the Opposition, said in Millicent that there would be much unemployment if a Liberal Government were returned.

Such talk creates an atmosphere in which people are not willing to spend, even though they have the money. During the depression of the 1930s I worked in the National Bank, and there was money in the bank despite what people say now. I worked at the Nailsworth branch and the only people who came to borrow money were builders who had built speculation houses, rented them out at a nominal rental, which they could not collect, and then approached the bank to increase their overdraft to meet the interest on it. There must be an atmosphere of confidence. At that time a farmer refused to buy a new header because he had no confidence in the future. No person can estimate what the demand for goods will be in a few months time because it is the attitude of the people or the circumstances that influence such things. At present people are willing to spend their available resources and inflation is increasing rapidly. I should not get personal in my speeches, but I am about to build a house if I can get some materials. We have bought the carpets and the refrigerators and everything else because we think there will be a shortage in the future and that prices will rise. Perhaps we are doing something we should not be doing or we would not do if we had a stable economy or a well balanced economy going along normally.

I stress this point again: it is impossible for the planners, and others who decide, to do certain things in view of the unwillingness of people to spend their available assets or resources, and a better way must be found to achieve the necessary balance in our economy when there is a demand for goods that balances our capacity to produce them and there is very little, although some, unemployment.

Australia has a fairly good record in this respect. A few years ago we won an award for being the most efficiently managed country in the world. Our employment rate was relatively low compared to that of other countries and we had made reasonable progress; but we have not yet reached perfection, by a long way. What do we try to do to combat inflation and maintain the balance I am talking about? Efforts have been made to do it by raising or lowering income tax. When there is

an excessive demand for goods, if we raise income tax it reduces the demand and *vice versa*, if we lower income tax, it gives the economy a boost. But this is not accurate enough, although with "pay as you go" wage-earners it is good practice because we immediately increase or decrease the spending power, as the case may be. However, many people pay provisional tax, which is assessed 12 months later when there may be an entirely different situation and, instead of a boost or a slackening, it may be just the opposite and will produce an increase in purchasing power at a time when there should be a reduction; so it is just a hit or miss method of achieving this balance. We have had some success over the past two decades, but it is too slow a process to correct the imbalance and too difficult to assess what its effect will be on the demand for goods.

Then we can try to do it by an increase or decrease in indirect taxation. Often, an increase in an indirect tax means cost inflation, and that is what we achieve when we try to prevent demand inflation. There was the occasion of the petrol tax being raised, which immediately increased transport costs in Australia. Then a sales tax was imposed on motor cars, and, although it may be said that such a tax does not increase current expenses, it is entirely guess-work as to what the effect on the community may be. A solid sales tax was imposed on the motor industry. This is where we have Government planning as against private planning. Private planners can assess a situation very well. Every month they call in their sales managers and assess the market; they can assess it, plan their production and get the most efficient production if they can assess the situation with no Government interference. But, immediately the Government takes action, such as imposing a sales tax as an indirect tax, we upset the private planner and create unemployment, and we do not know where it will end.

Then we can try to achieve a satisfactory result by raising or lowering the interest rates. This, too, is slow in its effect of maintaining the balance because, if we increase the rate by 1 per cent, we do not know how many people this will prevent from borrowing money. If we increase the price of houses for young people, it creates difficulties for them and they cannot have the house that they want because they cannot afford the interest rates; so we lose the demand for houses, which shows that this is an ineffective way of dealing with the problem.

Then there is the freezing of bank funds, putting more money into reserve or letting it out. This has been done recently when immediate action has been needed; but it may be months before the bank situation becomes effective. I have said this over the last 20 years or more, and I suggest it again: we can achieve a balanced economy with a minimum of interference with the individual and the planning of industry. I emphasize that. A balanced economy can only be effectively achieved not by Government planners but by private enterprise in static conditions assessing what the market will be.

It is essential, in order to achieve a balanced economy, that the Commonwealth Budget be divided into two sections: day-to-day expenditure and capital expenditure. The first section would be the day-to-day business of Government and taxation, preferably income tax, raised to balance the expenditure every year as nearly as possible. Although it is impossible to assess the position exactly, we can come somewhere near the mark. If the Government desired to increase its expenditure on social and other services, a transfer of purchasing power from the taxpayer to the Government would not affect the demand for goods

or upset the balance of the economy. The Premier said the other day that he had to raise taxes so that he could have money to alleviate unemployment in South Australia, but surely he is not naive enough to think that, if he takes \$10,000,000 away from the taxpayers, they will buy \$10,000,000 worth fewer goods and create unemployment and only balance up with the \$10,000,000 of the taxpayers' money he is going to spend. That is not a logical or reasonable argument. So, if we keep this day-to-day balance going, we are not upsetting the economy or the demand for goods. The average man does as he wants to.

The second section of the Commonwealth Budget would deal with the Government's capital expenditure. As far as possible, there should be a steady growth in capital expenditure by the Government to meet the requirements of the increasing numbers and higher living standards in the community. However, it is in this section of the Budget that a balanced economy can be achieved with a reasonable degree of accuracy without affecting the planning of either Governments or private industry. A formula could be established based on the numbers of unemployed and job vacancies and, when there is a lesser demand for goods than is necessary to keep the pre-determined levels, no loans would be floated, and national credit would be used for Government expenditure.

We have the League of Rights and other people saying we can issue unlimited credit, and they quote what some ex-bank manager has said—that the banks can issue credit. Of course, the banks and the Government can issue credit under certain conditions but, if they issue credit when there is already a demand for goods equal to the capacity to produce, we get into unholy trouble and rapid inflation. In Australia, other than the hire-purchase companies we have good control of the banks in this respect. If no loans are floated, the money stays in the bank system. The banks want to use it, so they lend it to people wanting to buy houses. By creating that demand, the right amount of employment can be made available. When there is insufficient demand, unemployment follows. As soon as there is a greater demand for goods and services and manpower is available, loans can be floated. If money could not be obtained by means of long-term loans, because people were not willing to lend unless a high interest rate was paid (and this would create inflated interest rates), it could be obtained by short-term loans on a high rate of interest. That would take care of the money that needed to be drained off.

If the country, however, has a balanced economy, or something near that, it does not get into the situation we were in a year ago when there was too little demand. There would not be excessive demand, as we have now, either. Therefore, the adjustments made would only be small, but they would be made on a weekly or monthly basis. The experts, who would follow a formula, would decide whether pressure or restriction was needed. After experience in these matters, we could create a balanced economy, and we would not have periods, as we had 12 months ago, when people were not willing to spend money, or periods as we are having now when people are too keen to spend money and there is a resultant shortage of goods.

What I believe is true Liberal policy is to remove all barriers, whether created by Government policy or private monopoly, that in any way stifle competition, whether it be between individuals, industries, or private enterprise and the Government. Competition is essential to determine which industries are to be developed in a country and their degree of efficiency; it is also the best form of profit and

price control. I have asked questions in this place about the prices of groceries and various other items. On each occasion, the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs has said that there is a fair price because there is competition.

We all realize that some restrictive trade practices exist and should be eliminated. We should have strong restrictive trade practice legislation. We should guard against associations of people who get together to fix prices. Although the member for Bragg may not agree with me, when associations or a group of industries get together to fix prices, an independent tribunal should be called in to assess a fair price. The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs said that doctors' fees should not be at the same level in South Australia as applied in the other States, because our cost of living was lower. However, a few months ago the Minister of Education, without recourse to arbitration, said that teachers must receive the same wages as teachers in other States received. That is absolutely inconsistent.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's not.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister is reported in the *Advertiser* as saying this.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We have lower wages than teachers in the Eastern States.

Mr. McANANEY: I checked my recollection of the matter by referring to the *Advertiser*, and I will produce the relevant reference tomorrow.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're talking through the top of your hat.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister cannot have it both ways. He has boasted that he brought the salaries of teachers up to the level applying in other States; he cannot say now that he did not do that. He did that outside the arbitration system. We should have legislation to control restrictive trade practices, and no price control. Competition will achieve control of prices. We also want competition from oversea companies. I go right along with what the Commonwealth Labor Government has done with regard to tariffs, which I believe are entirely old fashioned. I do not agree with the argument that tariffs must be imposed to keep out cheap goods. Poorer countries in the world are producing cotton goods, and so on. If we are Christians, we will encourage them to produce these things. We must get into sophisticated industry, producing goods at a price that will be competitive on world markets. If we reduce tariffs gradually and remove subsidies and so on, we will become a competitive nation. Then we will grow instead of being a piddling little country as we are now and will continue to be if we do not make some changes.

I think that the highest tariff applied is about 45 per cent. Wages have increased by 50 per cent in the last five years. If tariffs had been eliminated over this period primary producers would now be at a stage where, instead of requiring assistance from the rest of the community, they would be creating the capital to finance secondary industry and consequently be better off. Workers would be better off on lower wages, and would be producing goods that would compete on world markets. They would have been able to engage in large-scale production, which would have been cheaper, and living standards would have been much higher than they are today. We have to be realistic in looking at these matters.

What is liberalism? If we are to have liberalism, we must work out how we can create conditions where there can be freedom for the individual and where private enterprise can be maintained. The member for Whyalla talked a lot of rubbish about Broken Hill Proprietary

Company Limited. That company makes less profit on its capital than the Government pays as the interest rate on Government loans.

The SPEAKER: Order! In calling on the honourable member for Alexandra, I point out that he will be making his first speech in the House of Assembly. In accordance with past practice and procedure, I expect honourable members to give him the same courtesy as that extended to all other honourable members when they have made their maiden speech. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): During the speeches made by various members in this debate, considerable noises have been made about the political aims and objectives of their respective Parties. I do not intend to attack individuals because of their political affiliation; instead, I will seek the co-operation of the Government members, who temporarily hold the reins and control the revenue. Perhaps here and there I will constructively criticize the approach they may be adopting in governing the State, and I may refer particularly to matters affecting my district. However, before delving deeper into this field, I wish to express my support for the motion and add my personal respects to the expressions of sympathy made on the passing of the late Messrs. Hurst and Kemp. I extend my condolences to their respective families.

I also take this opportunity to extend my appreciation to all members of the House and of the House staff for their courtesy, guidance and assistance to me, a new member. Some previous reference has been made in another place to my being the first islander ever to enter the South Australian Parliament. I do not believe that that in itself is significant, but what I do believe is significant is that an islander has replaced one of the most sincere politicians of this State. I am indeed proud to be the successor of the Hon. David Brookman, who will be remembered by people, islanders in particular, for a very long time. The media and even some members of this Parliament have referred to Mr. Brookman as the father of the House of Assembly. While he has doubtless earned that title in the House, I have learned to see him acting the role of father of the House outside the House as well.

Until February, 1972, I had not had much to do with him, although I knew him, as we all did. On a few occasions when I sought contact with him as our member, the result of our meetings seemed a little slow in coming and I admit that I did my share of complaining. However, with some short experience in local government and even less experience in politics I can now appreciate and understand the tedious and slow process through which one must go, especially with Government departments where public expenditure is involved. Despite this, I respect Mr. Brookman, and repeat the words recently expressed to me about him: "He always did what he said he would do."

On behalf of the electors of Alexandra, I officially record our thanks for his contribution and representation over the past quarter of a century.

I wish to bring several matters to the attention of this House, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for affording me this traditional privilege of proceeding without interjection. Planning in South Australia, as in all areas of population and development, is of extreme importance to the future thoughtful development of primary and secondary industries alike. It is also important for housing, roads and transport and, last but not least, tourism. The Planning and Development Act, passed in this House

in 1966 and later amended, provides adequate scope for reasonable and responsible Ministers to develop this State on behalf of its residents. However, I believe that the Act, if loosely handled, provides too much scope for irresponsible Ministers and their authorities, especially if such authorities exercise their powers without sufficient regard for land developers, house builders, local government and secondary industry involved in the ordinary course of agriculture and progressive development and enterprise. However, I raise this matter in sympathy for certain members of the Public Service who are obviously directed and controlled by a Government misguided and inexperienced in the management and development of many areas of the State.

I have further raised this matter to bring to the attention of this House real examples of irresponsible planning to which members of the community have recently been subjected, especially regulations that have been developed to implement those misguided plans. Kangaroo Island, which was the first land settled in South Australia, has been developed, in some cases, by up to five or six generations of primary producing families. Indeed, the island is seen by tourists from all over the world as a paradise of natural beauty and primary producing enterprise existing side by side. Despite the existence of well-preserved areas and well-managed assets, islanders have been recently invaded and insulted by proposals that threaten to take away their rights and destroy their proven initiative. These landholders not only have more than a genuine interest in their community: they are more experienced in managing their own affairs, more appreciative of the true balance of conservation, preservation and production, and have certainly a greater awareness of these factors in their practical priorities than administrators removed and remote from the island.

It would be wrong to conclude that the basic principles of conservation and preservation of natural beauty spots are not supported by the islanders: on the contrary, over the long period of settlement the inhabitants of Kangaroo Island have shown a great sense of responsibility about conservation and preservation. Indeed, there is strong local community feeling and a real sense of pride in all that the island has to offer. I believe that this feeling and pride should be fostered and used to great and good purposes and not offended by distant authorities.

True, following submissions of this kind to the State Planning Authority, a promise of favourable consideration has been given to the redrafting of the planning regulations applying to this area. I hope that the Minister of Environment and Conservation will observe the common-sense approach of the Kangaroo Island local government authorities and have due regard for the island's citizens in their ordinary course of agriculture and progressive development. Already 22 per cent of the island's area comprises public reserves, fauna and flora reserves, national parks and other conservation areas.

I ask the Minister to consider the many areas of stone, sandhill and other terrain, which are uneconomic to develop as primary producing land. I further point out that every additional 1,000 acres (405 ha) taken over by the Government for the purposes already outlined involves 1,000 acres less of ratable land for local government and, even more important, it is 1,000 acres no longer available for production. It is on these matters that we have based our attempts to keep the community viable under the pressures that have been applied, and I will make further reference to this matter.

Having every regard and respect for the Government's attempts to preserve and conserve the natural fauna and flora, I point out that this is only the first part of its responsibility. Proper and continuous management of these reserves is vital, and a clear demonstration of such management must be exercised to the fullest extent before I will support the further take-over and acquisition of rural lands in this State. In citing further examples of the mismanagement of currently held reserves, I refer to areas on the western end of Kangaroo Island which, in particular, are swarming with native wallabies, kangaroos, goats, wild pigs and any other fauna the Minister cares to name. However, it is physically impossible for the local ranger and his minimal staff, efficient as they are, to cope with the management required.

Indeed, in fairness to neighbouring property owners, the Government should take steps to control these animals, it should provide earthen water tanks on reserves, establish pasture within the confines, adequately and effectively fence the reserves and arrange strip burning in many areas for the general safety of the community. Alternatively, the Government should arrange the finance for this work to be done by the local people whose properties are invaded by these animals. Certainly, some indication of the upholding of the responsibilities in this regard should be evident before any further acquisition takes place.

My references so far have been directed particularly to Kangaroo Island. However, the same principle and viewpoint apply across the State. A similar proposed plan to that to which I have referred is presently circulating on the Fleurieu Peninsula, the other part of the most valuable primary producing district in South Australia. I make no apology for the reaction and concern that certain responsible citizens of the community have already shown. The very manner in which the outer metropolitan draft plan has been introduced to our area does not encourage co-operation. Understanding and involvement by all concerned, and all surely to be affected, are surely basic factors in selling the idea.

I ask the Minister of Environment and Conservation to consider seriously and urgently appointing to the State Planning Authority at least a balance of experienced rural representation. I have dealt mainly with rural aspects of State planning as it applies particularly in my district. I fully appreciate the wide coverage of the Planning and Development Act and the powers and responsibilities of the Minister with respect to its other vital part.

I find the Planning and Development Act in its present form (it has been amended several times) still subject to further amendment. At the appropriate time I shall be submitting to this House certain amendments to it. For example, provision is made for the Government to acquire (compulsorily if necessary) and proclaim large areas of land in the country council areas for various reserves. In regard to land acquired and proclaimed for recreation purposes, it would be perfectly obvious to assume that such land would be open space and thereby open to the tourist, the bushwalker, the day traveller, and the people who buy their food and drinks in the city and spread paper wrappings and cans in the country.

Who cleans this up? Who provides the picnic grounds? Who installs and maintains adequate toilet facilities? Who provides services generally for metropolitan families touring in the outer metropolitan area for the day? Invariably, responsibility in these matters falls totally or partially on the council. Upon whom does the council depend for its revenue? It depends on the local ratepayers and, in this case, the local ratepayers, those on the south coast of

Fleurieu Peninsula, are, generally speaking, poor farmers. Adequate protection for councils must be provided for in the Planning and Development Act as soon as possible.

Decentralization of secondary industry and the establishment of secondary facilities are all-important and fully recognized. I suggest, Sir, that the proposed outer metropolitan area draft plans to apply in this state are somewhat restrictive and lack sufficient regard for future productive development. In fact, they tend towards an extremist's level of conservation instead of a flexible and acceptable balance. If primary producers wish further to process their products in the field, and/or near the site of production, why should they not have the opportunity to do so? Having raised this question, I am led to my favourite subject, one that I believe is vital to the interests of the State generally and to the meat producers in particular. I refer to the establishment of regional abattoirs and the ultimate abolition of the Gepps Cross works.

I raised this subject in my pre-election policy speech. I raise it again here today, and I shall keep on raising the subject and the merits of establishing such a proposal until I get results, so be prepared, gentlemen, to be sickened of hearing about it or convinced. I am a reasonable fellow as most members already know, and they are thereby given a choice! Previous reports to this Parliament have recommended the establishment of such decentralized works. Other States have adopted the principle, and I seriously seek the co-operation of all State members in getting on with the job.

I was pleased to hear in paragraph 4 of the Governor's Speech, read at the opening of Parliament on July 24, that some release of funds for upgrading the Port Lincoln abattoir was forthcoming. I hope this is only the beginning of a master programme to upgrade such existing works and to establish further regional abattoirs. This is certainly the greatest contribution that can be made towards offsetting the ridiculous transport costs in moving livestock, and I hasten to mention the thousands of pounds (kilograms) weight of sound meat spoiled, bruised and wasted by such handling and hauling in this State annually. For the benefit of those members who may not be aware of this, I point out that tens of thousands of sheep and cattle are left to perish on the properties during the poor seasons, directly as a result of the present uneconomic system of carting our stock into the industrial centre for processing. I commend the initiative of the people of the South-East in their recent Naracoorte enterprise.

I seek the co-operation and assistance of this Government in providing the funds for a thorough feasibility study on Kangaroo Island, with the view to establishing a meat processing and chilling works there. South Australia is a great contributor to the nation's export meat trade, and it is in our collective interests to see this trade expand. I further seek the Government's co-operation in providing or financially assisting private enterprise to provide adequate regional abattoirs near the site of production, wherever feasible and economically possible throughout the State.

The Gepps Cross works has proved an embarrassment to the Government, and it is certainly a financial burden on a large sector of our meat producing community. Much criticism has been directed at the financial losses incurred at the Port Lincoln works, but I wonder whether the convenience to local graziers, the savings in freight and the avoidance of bruising by transport of livestock to Gepps Cross have been fully considered and measured before the critics have rubbished that Port Lincoln site in the past. Gentlemen, true decentralization of an industry

makes a significant contribution to the State and the nation as a whole. Community interest and support of such works is naturally a vital factor. I believe sound bold steps by the Government in this regard will be recognized and appreciated to the ultimate benefit of every producer and consumer in the State. It can be done, and it has been done elsewhere.

Recently I had the opportunity of visiting and viewing the King Island abattoir operation in Tasmania, where livestock resources are limited and are far below those of many meat producing areas of this State. The primary producers in that area are enjoying the receipt of their livestock, slaughtering, chilling, and the air-freight delivery of the carcasses to the Melbourne market more than 100 miles (160 km) away, for very little more cost a pound (454 g) than the yard fees and slaughtering charges applying at Gepps Cross, South Australia.

For those who may not be aware of the yard fees applying at Gepps Cross, I shall supply some details from an account forwarded for yard fees applicable on March 18, 1973. A consignment of 20 head of cattle arrived from Kangaroo Island on that day. Seventeen yearlings were sold on Monday, March 19, and the remaining three cows were sold on Wednesday, March 21. The paddocking for the 17 yearlings for two nights (34 feeds), and the paddocking for three cows for four nights (12 feeds) amounted to \$18.40. In the following week a further consignment of 23 head was sent from Kangaroo Island to the abattoir; two yearlings were sold on Monday, March 26; three calves were sold on Tuesday, March 27; and 18 cows were kept over until Wednesday, March 28. The paddocking fees amounted to \$32.80. The droving amounted to \$1.80 and \$2.00 respectively. Those figures will make some members aware of the charges applicable to the inadequate works to the north of this building.

Mr. Dean Brown: Surely members opposite are aware of the situation.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, but it is a matter of whether they accept the position. In my humble opinion it is ludicrous to continue pouring good money after bad in the indefinite upgrading of the Gepps Cross abattoir. I recommend to this House that immediate and positive action be taken.

Several questions have been directed to Ministers regarding fishing activities around the State. It appears there is considerable confusion as to the State rights in this matter and, while I appreciate the various explanations given by the Premier on this subject, it seems that urgent attention should be directed to the welfare of many interested parties and their respective requests for various fishing permits. The industry is valuable, and it is my contention that South Australia is not gaining full benefit from its resources initially, nor are we giving sufficient serious attention to processing and marketing this valuable natural resource. It is part of the primary industry that I, for one, consider has been grossly neglected. The South Australian fishing industry deserves credit for the self-development it has achieved up to the present, but there is a great potential for further development. To achieve this potential, fisheries should be under one department responsible to one Minister.

Our fishing industry is one of the important export industries, but it has recently received two financial blows because of the financial policies followed by the Commonwealth Labor Government. This, of course, also applies to other export industries, but the reduction in net returns to the crayfish industry in particular is quite serious.

To expand our fishing industry, we must provide research assistance at least at a level comparable with that in other States. South Australia is well behind other States in the provision of fisheries research facilities. Tasmania, Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia all have well-equipped marine research laboratories. South Australia has one room set up as a laboratory where limited research is undertaken in the Fisheries Department. It is totally inadequate and a joke, by comparison with facilities in all other States.

All other States have at least one fisheries research vessel. South Australia has one 15ft. (4.57 m) trailer boat of its own for abalone research. Let us compare the research personnel in each State. In New South Wales there are 17 scientists; in Queensland, seven scientists and nine technical assistants; in Western Australia, nine scientists and 11 technical assistants; in Tasmania, three scientists and eight technical assistants; whereas in South Australia there are only two scientists and only one technical assistant. Those figures are taken from the South Australian Fishing Industry Report, June, 1972. Incidentally, at this stage we have not even got a Director of Fisheries. The South Australian fishing industry generally deserves a better deal.

The next item is one of importance to the whole of the nation, the matter of industrial relations. As an employer of a limited permanent staff, but some 60 seasonal employees, I appreciate the need for a satisfactory employer-employee relationship and the serious implications and detriment to industrial output and community welfare, if this does not exist. It presents the greatest challenge in this country at the present time. It affects the whole social system and indeed our way of life, and while our side of politics simply criticizes the trade union movement as embodied in its militant leadership (and I believe this)

and the other side of politics with its latent and persistent efforts to destroy the free enterprise system, we are never going to improve the position. If ever there was a need for compromise, gentlemen, it is in this regard.

Originally, I had not intended to refer to the unfortunate Kangaroo Island incident but, following some interjections, I shall comment on the black ban imposed there which affected the whole community. Mr. Woolley and the Kangaroo Island people generally won their case, and I praise the farmers and the workers, because they were united against the militant and irresponsible union leaders. The men stuck to their employers, and farmers helped one another. Union members and non-union members alike had the same feeling. The employer-employee relationship must be fostered throughout the country if we are to see industrial peace again. I ask each and every member in the House, as responsible representatives, to give serious thought to this issue.

I have proved over a period of 20 years of employing men in one of the toughest industries in this country that unionists and non-unionists can work satisfactorily side by side, as the member for Adelaide well knows. There is no real justifiable need for compulsory unionism in Australia. Most of us have firm views on this subject, and I certainly have mine, but in the interests of the community some bending and compromise must apply. The employer-employee relationship must be fostered throughout the country if we are to see industrial peace again.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 2. at 2 p.m.