

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Wednesday, August 8, 1973

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

**QUESTIONS**

The SPEAKER: Before calling for questions from honourable members, I have been asked to inform the House that the honourable Minister of Works will not be available during Question Time today; the honourable Minister of Education will reply to questions on behalf of the honourable Minister of Works.

**PREMIERS' CONFERENCE**

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the Premier's expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of financial assistance made available by the Commonwealth Government to South Australia following the Premiers' Conference last June (it was stated to be at least \$20,000,000 less than the sum required), the direct result being heavy increases in State taxation, will the Premier join with other State Premiers in calling for a further Premiers' Conference later this year in an endeavour to obtain a more realistic allocation of funds for South Australia from the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If there is a request for a further Premiers' Conference at which new material will be put before the Commonwealth Government, I will certainly look at the matter. At this stage, however, we are faced with the fact that the Commonwealth has said that it does not expect to meet us again on financial matters before the normal time of the Premiers' Conference next year, and I refer to the mid-year conference; we cannot expect that the Commonwealth will see us in February. We are expected to budget for contingencies. Unless there is something new to put before the Commonwealth Government, it is not very much good simply going to a conference to reiterate what has already been said. What I had to say in Canberra on this subject was certainly not mealy-mouthed; I made my position clear. If a further conference is proposed and there seems to be something new to be put before it, I will certainly have a look at the matter, but I have not heard from my colleagues in this connection.

**VIVISECTION**

Mr. GROTH: Will the Minister of Education arrange for me an inspection, relating to vivisection, of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute? Because the council in my electoral district is sending stray dogs to the institute for the purpose of vivisection and because of the opposition to vivisection from many people in my district, I desire an inspection so that I can ascertain exactly what is taking place at the institute.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On the honourable member's behalf, I shall be pleased to contact the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide to see whether an inspection can be arranged. I am sure the honourable member will appreciate that I am not able to direct the university on the matter, but I have no doubt that the university will be willing to accommodate him.

**GLENELG INFANTS SCHOOL**

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about bituminizing the schoolyard at Glenelg Infants School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Tenders for bituminizing the yard at Glenelg Infants School close on September 14. The project is part of a group contract involving two other similar works.

**STIRLING NORTH ROAD**

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, obtain a report from the Highways Department indicating when the road from Stirling North to Wilmington will be upgraded? The road is currently in a poor state of repair and, with its many spoon drains, it presents a real traffic hazard. The problem is being accentuated by the increased volume of traffic that the road is currently required to carry.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the question examined and provide the honourable member with a report.

**MASSAGE PARLOURS**

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General say whether there has been a marked increase in the reported incidence of venereal disease during the last six months, to what extent it is considered that the increased activities of massage parlours are responsible for any such increase, and what steps, if any, the Government intends taking to control the activities of massage parlours? There has been much press publicity, which I am sure all members will have seen, in the last week or so about the activities of massage parlours; it has been alleged that some are quite legitimate but others are no more than open brothels. It is said that the incidence of venereal disease has increased markedly and that some massage parlours are hotbeds of venereal disease. It is also said that the scope for increased criminal activity associated with vice is increasing. The Government should inform the House what action it contemplates taking in connection with these serious matters.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall refer to the Minister of Health that part of the question which deals with the incidence of venereal disease and the alleged increase in the incidence of that disease, and inform the honourable member of the result. I have discussed the problem of massage parlours more than once with the police authorities, who are well aware that there is such a problem. As always with this type of offence, the question is the ability to obtain evidence that massage parlours are conducting illegal activities. The police are well aware of the problem and are not in any sense neglecting it, but there are difficulties, not the least of which (as I have said before about this type of offence) is that there is no victim in the ordinary sense and no-one to complain to the police. This makes law enforcement more difficult, but I am sure that the police are doing everything in their power to deal with the problem. The only course any of us can take is to leave it in their hands. The Government has considered whether any change in legislation would be useful in this regard, but none of the suggestions that have been made seem to assist in solving the problem. Basically, it is a question of law enforcement. The existing law is adequate but, if the practices to which the honourable member has referred are being conducted by massage parlours, they are unlawful, and it is a question of detection and proof, as it is with so many other offences. The police are doing their best, and all we can do is express our appreciation of their activities. Beyond that, I do not think any action can be taken.

*Later:*

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General confer with his colleague the Chief Secretary to give the police and

Public Health Department officers power of entry to check the activities of massage parlours?

The SPEAKER: I rule that question out of order. It has already been asked today.

Mr. BECKER: It is a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: And the subject matter is—?

Mr. BECKER: Massage parlours, supplementary to the previous question asked.

The SPEAKER: If it is not the same subject matter as the previous question I shall permit it; otherwise, it is out of order.

Mr. BECKER: I understand that, of the numerous massage parlours that advertise daily in the press, only two are considered legitimate. I also understand that massage parlours charge \$5 for a massage, \$1 extra for relief massage, between \$20 and \$35 for intercourse, and that some of the girls employed in these establishments are aged between 16 years and 18 years. It has been stated to me that some parlours may have peepholes and that photographs of certain activities may be taken. According to some advertisements, arrangements can be made for motel visits, and I understand the masseuse charges \$5 for a taxi and between \$25 and \$35 for sexual activities, with a half-hour time limit. I have been told that some advertisers have answering services handling their telephone calls and on one occasion a telephone number listed in an advertisement in November, 1972, was that of the Government Garage. I believe it is difficult for police to obtain entry to massage parlours in an endeavour to ascertain whether any existing laws are being broken. Although there is no evidence of racketeers operating these premises or that some persons are living off the earnings of prostitution, unless massage parlours and persons employed in them can be examined, how will the police or the Public Health Department authorities know whether such places are other than what they claim to be and whether they are hotbeds of venereal disease, as stated by the member for Bragg in an earlier question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Although I am willing to confer with the Chief Secretary about the matter raised by the honourable member, I really do not know what is the problem. If they entertain a reasonable belief that an offence is taking place, the police now have the right to seek a warrant to enter premises. I do not know of any problem that arises in connection with this matter that does not arise in detecting any other offence that is committed on private property. Although I will certainly speak to the Chief Secretary about it, it seems to me that the existing law already covers the matter to which the honourable member refers.

#### WITTON BLUFF

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation any information about what the Coast Protection Board intends to do about Witton Bluff and the Moana cliffs? Some concern has been expressed locally, particularly in relation to the Witton Bluff area, about erosion of the cliff surfaces, and people are concerned that any corrective measures could be aesthetically disfiguring to that part of what is a beautiful coastline, hence my interest in the matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know that this is one of the areas that has been examined closely by the board, which is concerned with the problem of erosion in the Moana cliffs area, particularly at Witton Bluff.

The board has decided to give this work priority, although it will be a large project. It is expected that work to protect Witton Bluff and the Moana cliffs area is likely to cost more than \$100,000, but because it is important that the work be properly designed, in order to ensure that the fears held by the honourable member are properly considered it is expected that, whilst time will be taken to design the protective work, much progress will be made during the forthcoming year in this area.

#### VIRGINIA BASIN

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier make a full Ministerial statement outlining the situation of the underground water basin at Virginia and in the surrounding districts, the relationship to the need for that basin to be supplemented by additional supplies, and the possible supply from the sewage treatment works at Bolivar? I represented the district of Virginia and a large part of the irrigation industry based there until 1970. I resumed that representation early this year after a break of three years, and have found that little has been done effectively to come to any conclusion concerning the supplementing of supplies from the Bolivar scheme. It seems to me, from conversations I had before 1970, that some further substantive work should have been done. I know that further representations have been made to the Minister since 1970, but it seems at this stage that nothing further has eventuated. So that the situation can be reviewed by those interested in it, and so that I may be guided as the local member representing a substantial part of the irrigation industry in that area, I should like the Premier to make a Ministerial statement outlining fully all aspects of health, availability of supplies, and the consequences of depletion of the basin, and bringing up to date from the Government's viewpoint all other factors.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The situation in the Virginia area, the northern water table of the plains immediately to the north of Adelaide, has been the subject of a whole series of Ministerial statements. I appreciate that, as the honourable member's attention was often being directed elsewhere, he might not entirely have followed what was taking place. Full Ministerial statements on local meetings were given in 1970 outlining the existing situation when quota systems for the use of water were introduced. It was pointed out that the situation would be reassessed following investigations into the draw-off from the water table and the amount of recharging that occurred. The situation was reassessed, and new provisions governing the maximum use of water were notified to users in the past few months. Public meetings concerning this matter have been held. The Minister of Environment and Conservation attended those meetings and fully explained to local people just what the dangers were. Because the existing draw of water was considerably in excess of the rate of recharge of the water table, despite the restrictions that had been placed in the area, we endeavoured to find means of recharging the water table. On the present state of our information, it would certainly not be safe to use Bolivar effluent for irrigation.

There has been a series of reports to the House regarding the nature of the investigations being made by Government departments into the use of Bolivar effluent. Regarding that matter, I will bring the honourable member up to date on the nature of the experiments. Ever since it took office, the Government has continued with experiments into the use of Bolivar effluent, but we have been advised by the Agriculture Department that there is a limited

proven safe use at present. The department queries several purposes for which people have sought to use the effluent. If the honourable member is unaware of those experiments and of the reports that have been made in relation to them, I will let him have that information.

#### **HIGHBURY SEWERAGE**

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Works to obtain from the Engineering and Water Supply Department a report on the plan for sewerage a small area of Highbury that includes Paradise Grove? Records will show that I have raised this matter previously. On August 29, 1972, in reply to a question I asked, the Minister of Works said that the department had decided to defer further investigations into this matter for about a year, by which time there might have been developments that would make a sewerage scheme more feasible. Many houses have been built in this subdivision since I last raised this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to my colleague and obtain a report.

#### **HOSPITAL PATIENTS**

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to investigate the procedures adopted by Government hospitals when notifying relatives and local doctors of the discharge of hospital patients? Recently an elderly constituent of mine arrived home by ambulance from the Royal Adelaide Hospital, unbeknown to her family and her local doctor. The family was unable to cope with the situation, because the patient was still quite sick. Later that evening the local doctor came to visit her and immediately had her admitted to the local hospital. Is this normal procedure and, if it is, will the Minister take the necessary action to improve this situation?

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

#### **QUEEN ADELAIDE STATUE**

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the Government will consider commissioning a statue of Queen Adelaide and, if it will, whether the statue can be placed in the grounds of the Adelaide Festival Centre? I understand that there is no statue in this city of the Queen who gave Adelaide its name. Because the Adelaide Festival Centre has been established I consider it would now be appropriate to have such a statue erected in that area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The works of art being established in the environs of the festival centre are a matter for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. A major sculpture of world standard is about to be established there (a Dame Barbara Hepworth sculpture), but it is certainly not of Queen Adelaide. I do not know whether that is an appropriate place to put a statue of Queen Adelaide. Frankly, she may have been a very gracious lady in her day but we do not know terribly much about that. Certainly, she was not the most beautiful looking woman. However, I will give the matter some thought, but I think it highly unlikely that we will be commissioning a statue to go there.

#### **RURAL YOUTH SERVICE**

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture, obtain a report on attempts made to fill vacancies in the Rural Youth Advisory Service? I was told yesterday that there were three vacancies that had occurred in the normal establishment of the service, and I wondered what efforts had been made to fill them. There is a general tendency to think that the Government is allowing the service to fall down in its

role, as is instanced by the failure of the Government to be involved with developments at the Rural Youth Centre at Northfield.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

#### **MONARTO**

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Premier say whether the Government will buy land at Monarto at the rate at which owners want to sell it, or has the Government set a limit on the amount it will spend on the purchasing of land in that area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The basis of this matter has been set forth in the legislation already passed in this House, and that is the price at which we will buy; the price is fixed subject to that procedure. It is certainly not possible for us to purchase at any price that people may care to charge us, but they will get a fair price. That legislation was passed without objection in this House in establishing the basis on which we would be purchasing the land. We have not set a limit to the amount involved in the purchases. There is a limit to the total that we shall be spending but we have provided for initial land purchases and expect these to continue for some time now as people want to sell to us.

#### **ABORIGINAL CONGRESS**

Mr. EVANS: I direct my question to the Minister of Community Welfare. Can he state on what basis a person will be allowed to enrol in the Commonwealth Government Aboriginal Congress when it is established? As reported on July 16 or 17, the Commonwealth Government intended to establish an Aboriginal Congress, in which Aborigines would be allowed to enrol. I do not know whether they will be compelled to enrol or whether enrolment will be voluntary, and whether they will be allowed to vote to elect their own representatives to the congress. By what method is it determined that a person is an Aboriginal—is it full-blood, half-caste or quarter-caste? If the Attorney does not have that information, will he obtain it from the Commonwealth Minister so that we shall know?

The Hon. L. J. KING: As the honourable member points out, that is a Commonwealth matter and I have no personal information about the basis of selection. I shall, however, ascertain whether my department has any information from the Commonwealth Office of Aboriginal Affairs and, if it has, I will let the honourable member know.

#### **RESERVOIR STORAGES**

Mr. LANGLEY: I address my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Works today. Can the Minister give details of the present water supply position in South Australia, comparing last year's holdings with the present holdings? I know the Minister is pleased that the divine right for rain, which formerly blessed only the Liberal Government, has now blessed the Labor Government with excellent rains this season for the people on the land. Also, many home gardeners hope they will receive plenty as well.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was aware of the honourable member's abiding interest in this matter of metropolitan reservoir holdings, so I made sure I had the information with me today when I knew the Minister of Works would not be present. The figures that I give are in megalitres and, if any member is interested in what a megalitre is, if he cares to put the matter in writing I will find out for him. The present position is that Mount Bold reservoir has 37 192 Ml.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How many gallons is that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Shall I tell the Minister?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education. Any interjection is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Happy Valley reservoir is holding 11 222 Ml, Clarendon Weir has 270 Ml and Myponga reservoir is holding 21 806 Ml. Other holdings are: Millbrook—11 625 Ml; Kangaroo Creek—4 225 Ml; Hope Valley—2 515 Ml; Thorndon Park—510 Ml; South Para—22 690 Ml. Members will be interested to know that they were the holdings yesterday morning, the total being 116 528 Ml. Last Monday morning the holdings totalled 113 516 Ml, compared with 114 078 Ml last year. So today the holdings in the metropolitan reservoirs are slightly up on last year's. The position, therefore, is entirely satisfactory for the coming summer.

#### COMMUNITY WELFARE ACCOMMODATION

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say when it is expected that improved accommodation will be available for the Community Welfare Department and its head office? I have received complaints recently, and at other times, about waiting room facilities at the Community Welfare Department in Rundle Street. As the staff is overworked from the point of view of caseload, it appears, as a necessity, that people must wait for attention. I can understand their having to wait, but it seems that the waiting facilities are still not up to standard and are causing concern.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The accommodation at the Community Welfare Department has been a matter for concern because the existing building provides poor accommodation. I have never been able to understand, since becoming Minister of Community Welfare, how anyone ever attempted to accommodate a Government department in that building. Departmental officers have to deal with the public and very often some members of the public need comforting and decent surroundings in which to compose themselves. The Government considered the existing accommodation and the initial plan was to upgrade the building, as it was believed that that would be the quickest way to provide satisfactory accommodation. However, because of many factors the initial estimate of cost has been revised. It became apparent that it was uneconomic to upgrade the existing building. Arrangements have now been made to lease premises to accommodate the department in a building on the north-western corner of Gawler Place and Grenfell Street: those arrangements have been concluded and the space is in the course of being fitted out for occupation by the department by the end of this year.

#### YANKALILLA SCHOOL

Mr. CHAPMAN: Has the Minister of Education an answer to a question I asked on July 24 regarding Yankalilla Area School facilities.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Change rooms with toilets and showers for Yankalilla Area School are listed with a number of other schools for the preparation of a feasibility report. When funds permit they will be included in the schools design programme, but in view of the pressure to provide urgently needed classroom accommodation, no indication can be given at this stage as to when building will commence. Awnings for the home science block are listed in the minor works programme and when these are provided they will improve conditions in the present building. When the next priority list of timber buildings is being drawn up, the need for a new home economics centre at Yankalilla will be considered.

A Commonwealth library was erected and was occupied at the beginning of April last year. No advice of dissatisfaction with the work was received at that time. However, the Public Buildings Department has indicated that electrical wiring for audio-visual equipment and carrels is in place in the building but is not yet connected to these items. This will be done in the near future. I understand that the school also considers that a retaining wall is necessary although no previous request has been received for this work. The matter is being investigated and appropriate action will be taken.

#### STRATHMONT LIGHTING

Mr. WELLS: I address my question to the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who is acting for the Minister of Transport, and it involves the street lighting facilities that exist adjacent to the Strathmont Centre, which is located on Grand Junction Road, between Foster Road and Walkley Road. These roads, I believe, are about half a mile (0.8 km) apart at the points where they meet Grand Junction Road and Foster Road and Grand Junction Road and Walkley Road where there is overhead lighting, but there is no lighting between these two points. The vehicular traffic now proceeding to and from the centre has greatly increased and, especially on a dark night or if the weather is inclement, I am sure that, unless satisfactory lighting is provided at the gates of the centre, a serious accident may occur involving visitors to the centre, as well as staff members, who enter the gateway from Grand Junction Road.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the matter examined and to see whether anything can be done to relieve the position, and I will inform the honourable member in due course.

#### ADELAIDE GAOL

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier say what is the Government's policy, if any, on replacement of the Adelaide Gaol? Recently, in its first report, the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia, dealing at page 198 with sentencing and corrections, stated that the Adelaide Gaol had become "entirely inadequate for the pressures upon it" and that the "physical conditions are poor". Indeed, I am sure that any member who has been admitted to the gaol (purely on a visit, of course) will entirely agree. The committee also recommends that at least one new prison should be built in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Although this is certainly not a new subject, I should like to stress to the Premier the concern of many members of the community about conditions at the Adelaide Gaol. Although the committee makes recommendations concerning other uses of the gaol eventually, I think it would be worth while if the House were informed of any plans or policies the Government has in mind to replace the present Adelaide Gaol.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly share the honourable member's concern about conditions at the Adelaide Gaol: they are, in some parts, Dickensian, to say the least. We have not at this stage taken a policy decision on exactly what our course will be in regard to the timing of a replacement building, because until we had the report of the committee to which the honourable member has referred it was not clear what sorts of building we should provide to fit in with the overall proposals of the committee about correctional procedures. Now that we have the report, it is being evaluated and we are examining our building programme for the future to try to provide a proper alternative in accordance with new sentencing procedures and new penal methods that will replace the present

use of the Adelaide Gaol. However, the honourable member will realize that, as the report of the committee is only just to hand, it has not been possible in the time since we have received it to make the necessary replacement plans.

#### **CLARE PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on August 2 about the Clare Primary School? This primary school is in the old high school buildings, there being a new high school at Clare and, as plans were made to upgrade the school, I should be pleased if the Minister would give the reply.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I cannot add much to the reply I gave the honourable member last week. Clare Primary School is on the schools design programme but no date can yet be given for the calling of tenders or for the availability of accommodation. In regard to the demands being made on available finances, it seems unlikely that the upgrading of Clare will proceed for some time. When it comes to a comparison of the Clare school with one or two other projects in the country areas of the State, the fact that Clare has ample accommodation, even if not all of it is entirely satisfactory, must be considered, especially when comparing the needs of, say, Clare with those of schools at Naracoorte, Snowtown, Tumby Bay, Streaky Bay, and the like.

#### **STREAKY BAY SCHOOL**

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Education inform the House whether a successful tenderer has been selected for the construction of the proposed new school at Streaky Bay and when work is expected to commence?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think a contract has just been let, but I shall check the matter out and bring down a report.

#### **ON-THE-SPOT FINES**

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation introduce legislation during the current session for on-the-spot fines; if not, will he consider including this in the expected Bill on the disposal of containers? The Minister is aware of the problem. It seems that at past conferences of the Australian Labor Party the possibility of this type of legislation has been supported. Will the Minister consider this, as well as other facts, and will he consider including it in any legislation on this subject?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is not intended to introduce legislation during this session to cover on-the-spot fines, nor is it my intention to include such provisions in the legislation being prepared for deposits on non-returnable drink containers. The honourable member is not correct in saying that decisions of the A.L.P. Council have supported legislation of this nature; that is not the case. The honourable member has asked similar questions in recent years and I have pointed out to him that, before I would give my support for legislation covering on-the-spot fines, I would need to be satisfied that the legislation would have the effect that we would wish it to have and that the honourable member and many other people perhaps imagine it would have. I have reported to the House previously that we are at present making a study, with an officer of my department visiting each State that has legislation for on-the-spot fines, to determine exactly how that legislation is working. The interim report I have received from the officer doing this work is that while the legislation is on the Statute Books in some other States of Australia it is not being acted upon and not having any effect at all on

the problem of litter. Until such time as the final report is available I shall not contemplate preparing legislation for on-the-spot fines.

#### **NOMINEE SHAREHOLDINGS**

Mr. McANANEY: Is the Attorney-General satisfied with the legislation passed last year or in the previous year regarding nominee shareholdings? Has it been effective in South Australia? If not, does the Government contemplate amending the Act? A number of takeover bids have been made in South Australia that are not in the interests of South Australians. Legislation is to be introduced in Great Britain to tighten controls on such transactions. Does the Government contemplate amending the existing legislation?

The Hon. L. J. KING: In the previous session the honourable member for Mallee asked a similar question which I answered on that occasion. The effect of the answer which I gave then and which I now repeat is that, at the time of the discussions for the purpose of producing the uniform amendments to the Companies Act which we passed in this Parliament last year, a great deal of consideration was given to these provisions and the conclusion was reached, on the advice of the Company Law Advisory Committee, headed by Sir Richard Eggleston, that the previous provisions incorporated in our Act were the most effective which could be devised, that it would not be practicable to go further, and that the specific suggestions made by the honourable member for Mallee were not really practical suggestions and could not be enforced. That is still my view, although it is a matter which perhaps will receive further consideration. However, the present position is that plans are well advanced, as I understand it, for the passing of a national Companies Act and, as I indicated to the honourable member for Mallee on the previous occasion, it is not the intention of the Government to pass any substantial amendments to the South Australian legislation pending a decision by the Commonwealth Government as to its intention regarding the national legislation. It may be that we will have to deal with one or two minor matters of a machinery nature which have become urgent, but it is not intended to embark on any substantial amendments to the Companies Act until we see what position eventuates in the Commonwealth Parliament regarding national legislation on companies.

#### **RENMARK CROSSING**

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation, representing the Minister of Transport, have a study made of the Tarcoola Street and Cootamundra Street crossing at Renmark West to provide the necessary safety signs to reduce the high danger level existing there? About 20 accidents have occurred at this crossing, and two deaths have resulted. The Renmark West School is a short distance from the crossing, which is used by many school-children. Residents in this area have suggested that "give way", "school crossing", and "school ahead" signs should be erected to try to prevent further fatal accidents. Will the Minister have this matter investigated?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the matter examined and inform the honourable member of the outcome of such examination.

#### **NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING**

Mr. CHAPMAN: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, can the Minister of Education say whether the Government will consider using South Australian country newspapers for the purpose of advertising the concessions that have been made available to pensioners with regard to council rates, land tax, and water charges? It

would appear from comments made to me by a representative of the country newspapers organization that columns 16in. (406.4 mm) x 4in. (101.6 mm) have been paid for by the Government to advertise along these lines in the *Advertiser* and the *News*. From what I have been told by this representative, it seems that provincial newspapers have not been used for this purpose in the past. Therefore, on behalf of those country newspaper editors, I ask the Minister to look into this matter with a view to advertising in country newspapers so that country pensioners may be informed of these concessions.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to my colleague. With regard to water, sewerage and council rates, and land tax, eligible pensioners should obtain an application form from their local council office or from the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, on completing the form, they should return it to the relevant authority concerned with the charges involved. I think that, whatever happens in relation to a reply to this question, the honourable member could be asked to be responsible at least for seeking publicity in his own local newspapers as to the concessions that are available. I know that several members have already done this, using the local newspapers as a means of getting this information across.

### UNIONISM

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether it is still the Government's policy to grant preference to members of trade unions? Will he assure the House that the Government will not put into effect the suggestion of the member for Adelaide that all workers, as a matter of policy, be forced to join a trade union?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It is correct that preference to trade unionists is the Government's policy.

### CAR FINANCE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General investigate the present practice followed by some used car dealers, or people associated with that trade, of advertising that no-one is refused credit? A pensioner constituent has complained to me that when he went to a car yard, wishing to purchase a car, he was refused credit. On page 52 of today's *News* the following advertisement appears (and this is not the party with whom my constituent was involved):

Wanted. Bankrupts or people with bad previous credit. Immediate car finance available. Nobody refused. Phone now till 7 p.m.

A telephone number is then given. In the case to which I have referred, the pensioner, who is not a young man, had to travel from my area to the city and then out to one of the suburbs, only to be refused credit. Although his failure to buy a motor car might be considered a good thing, the point at issue is still relevant.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Instead of asking the honourable member for the address and telephone number supplied in this advertisement so that I can apply, I will refer the matter to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs.

### TORRENS RIVER FLOODING

Mr. COUMBE: In the absence of the Minister of Transport, can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what plans, if any, the Government has to solve the problem of crossing the river when flooding occurs in the upper reaches of the Torrens River, making the present crossing facilities in the area dangerous or unusable? As the Minister is no doubt aware, this problem arises nearly every winter. A few weeks ago it

was highlighted when a car was swept off a ford crossing into the river bed. As I believe that it is beyond the resources of local councils to deal with this matter, I now ask what plans the Government has to alleviate this extremely dangerous situation that affects not only residents who live near this part of the river and the river crossing to which I have referred but also through traffic that uses this crossing.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Although I think I can recall the report of a statement by the Minister of Transport after the accident to which the honourable member has referred, I am afraid I cannot remember exactly what he said about this crossing. I will have an inquiry made through the Minister's department and provide the honourable member with a report.

### LIBRARY SUBSIDIES

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Education say how many applications for financial assistance for subsidized libraries in council areas the department expects this current financial year? What is the maximum sum that the Government has allocated for this purpose? Has the proposed committee yet been established to consider a joint school-community library and, if it has, who are its members? I understand that, on August 2, in a speech to the South Australian branch of the Australian Libraries Association, the Minister said:

From the beginning of July this year State Government subsidies for local public libraries have been considerably increased. For a first subsidized library in a local government area the maximum dollar for dollar subsidy has been increased from \$14,500 to \$40,000 for capital subsidy, from \$6,500 to \$10,000 for administration expenses, and from \$9,000 to \$13,500 for purchase of books.

Although I concede that it is only a few days since he made that statement, the Minister said that a committee would be established within the next few days to consider the development of the school-community library. He added:

I hope that the broad outlines of an effective scheme can be adopted towards the end of this year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member himself gave the reply to the second question, concerning the maximum subsidy for libraries; the figures he quoted are correct. The maximum subsidy for a first library has been increased to \$40,000, as he said. I believe that the figures he gave for the increases in subsidies for administration expenses and for purchases of books are also correct. These new limits will be implemented as from July 1 this year and appropriate adjustments have been made in the budget of the Libraries Department so that that can be done. In his first question the honourable member asked how many libraries had applied for a subsidy or were expected to apply for a subsidy this financial year; I will get that information from the State Librarian and bring down a reply.

In reply to the honourable member's third question, relating to the formation of a committee, I am still awaiting information from the Institutes Association as to the two members it intends to nominate for the committee, which will be representative of the Institutes Association, the Libraries Board and the department. The committee will investigate the proposed establishment of joint school-community libraries for area schools and small country high schools. The idea is that in some places small institute libraries are not functioning well and are difficult to operate. The local community is not well enough off to be able to establish a subsidized library but, if the local community and the school got together, better facilities

could be provided. For example, an area school library could be upgraded so that it could act as a library resource centre for the school and the local community as well. I am asking the committee to investigate this whole question in relation to area schools and small country high schools. The proposal also involves the fact that each area school is serviced by a series of bus routes, and the buses could be used to distribute books to the community and bring them back to the library. Unless such a scheme is instituted, we shall not be able to establish effective library services in the more remote country areas.

#### **COUNTRY WATER RATES**

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Education obtain from the Minister of Works a report on the sum that would be lost if the 94 per cent water rate charged in country towns were reduced to the metropolitan rate of 74 per cent? What would be the estimated gain in excess water revenue if the rate were changed? I realize that the amount would vary from year to year, but I would appreciate an estimate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to try to get that information for the honourable member. The assumption is that, on the 94 per cent rating, the price of rebate water remains the same. So, the rebate entitlement is higher on a 94 per cent rating than on a 74 per cent rating. I would thank the honourable member for his help in ascertaining precisely what information he requires.

#### **ROYAL VISIT**

Mr. BECKER: I ask the Premier whether consideration has been given to inviting Her Majesty the Queen to open a session of Parliament when she visits Adelaide in March, 1974.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Government consider inviting Her Majesty to open a special session of Parliament during her visit to this State next year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it will not. The session of Parliament involved will be the present session, and we do not intend to have a special session of Parliament at that time. Submissions concerning Her Majesty's visit to South Australia are already being considered at Buckingham Palace and this matter has not been included in the list.

#### **PENSIONERS' WATER RATES**

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Minister of Works to my question about the application of pensioner concessions on water rates in areas where the water is provided by private or local schemes, such as that operated by the Lyrup Village Association?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The pensioner concession scheme operative from July 1, 1973, which provides for a 50 per cent concession in water, sewerage and council rates and land tax to eligible pensioners, is applicable to recognized private irrigation authorities, including the Renmark Irrigation Trust and the Lyrup Village Association. Eligible pensioners should obtain an application form from their local council office or from the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, on completion, return same to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

#### **NORTH ADELAIDE SPECIAL SCHOOL**

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the interest shown in the North Adelaide Special School in Barton Terrace, North Adelaide, can the Minister of Education say what is the future of that school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get a report.

#### **COMPANY INVESTIGATION**

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General have an inspector from the Companies Office investigate the affairs and operations of a company called Co-operative Travel Society Limited? This company commenced operations in 1968; I believe that the founding Chairman of Directors was a land agent who subsequently lost his licence. The idea of the scheme is that the shareholders contribute to the company, which invests in land in Tasmania. After eight or nine years the land is to be sold and the proceeds divided among the shareholders. An examination of the company's balance sheet shows that \$709,000 worth of shares has been allotted and that the uncalled capital at June 30, 1972, was \$414,796. So far \$51,452 has been invested in land and \$122,680 has been invested in several companies that have similar directors. The company is committed to \$250,980 worth of shares to be called up in connection with these companies. In view of the present situation and the accumulated losses of \$24,665, will the Attorney-General have an officer from the Companies Office investigate the matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have the matter investigated.

#### **MOBILE LIBRARIES**

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education inquire into the possibility of using some of the buses, now redundant, as mobile libraries for the use of schools or the public in general? Last year I asked the Minister a question regarding using such buses to transport handicapped children, and I was pleased to see last week or the week before a press report that some of these buses are now being used to transport people who work at Bedford Industries. However, several of these buses, being redundant, are idle, whilst there is a great need in the community for mobile libraries for schools and elderly people. It would seem that this idea could be fostered by the Minister and good use made of these buses.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will have the matter examined to ascertain whether the suggestion is feasible. At present our aim is to establish proper library facilities within each school and, indeed, we are now doing that. The use of mobile libraries is a matter of providing services for the community. Several mobile libraries operate in my district, and the Baden Pattinson mobile library is operated by the Marion council. I am familiar with that library and campaigned in it at least twice in 1965. However, I recollect that that mobile library has a larger interior capacity than is available in an ex-M.T.T. bus. I will have the matter thoroughly examined and obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### **GUARDIANSHIP LEGISLATION**

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Attorney-General intend this session to introduce amendments of the law on wards of the State and legal guardianship?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No.

#### **POLLUTION**

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation investigate the renewed practice by the Electricity Trust power station and the Imperial Chemical Industries plant at Osborne of cleaning boilers at these plants whilst adverse wind conditions prevail? Although assurances had been given by these instrumentalities at earlier representations that their boiler plants would not be fired whilst the wind was from a northerly direction (in order to reduce air pollution), I understand that this

practice was recommenced recently, thereby causing residents inconvenience from the fumes and smog that results in material damage and physical harm.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have someone from the Public Health Department discuss the problem with the bodies concerned in order to ascertain whether these conditions can be relieved.

#### COUNCIL GRANT

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation, representing the Minister of Transport, say why \$3,000 of grant money, unspent by the District Council of Mount Barker, was cancelled last May, and will the department consider making a fresh grant of \$3,000 to that council during the present financial year? This money was to have been spent on the road from Kanmantoo to the Kanmantoo mines: at present the road is half completed and half sealed. The council intended to construct that road with the \$3,000 that was cancelled last May. This important road will be used for an important industry in the area, and I am sure the Minister will consider seriously granting another \$3,000 for its completion.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will have this matter examined and inform the honourable member of the outcome.

#### TRAMWAYS BUSES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation, representing the Minister of Transport, obtain a report from the Municipal Tramways Trust on whether the trust intends to continue to purchase buses that have a width exceeding the Australian standard maximum width of 8ft. 2½in. (2.5 m)? Recently, a newspaper report stated that a small engineering firm in South Australia was converting old M.T.T. buses so that they could be sold to private enterprise and other organizations in the Eastern States. If the buses that have been purchased had a width below the Australian standard, they could have been sold immediately without requiring extra work to convert them. At present the buses used have a width of 8ft. 6in. (2.6 m), which is 3½in. (9 cm) over the Australian standard, and these buses are used by only one organization in Australia, the M.T.T. I believe that a report from the M.T.T. is required indicating why it intends to continue purchasing buses that are excessively wide.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will ascertain what the department intends to do and inform the honourable member.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Hon. G. T. VIRGO

Mr. LANGLEY moved:

That one months leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Ascot Park (Hon. G. T. Virgo) on account of absence overseas on Government business.

Motion carried.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 7. Page 229.)

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the motion, which once again shows what progress the Labor Government has made and the wonderful way in which Ministers and Labor Party members have once again won an election easily. In fact, most Government members increased their majorities at the last election. When presenting the Address to His Excellency the Governor at Government House, I realized what an excellent man the Governor is for the

State. At all times, His Excellency has been a great help to the State, and I hope that he will continue to perform so well for the benefit of the State.

Mr. Becker: He's a worthy ambassador.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and I hope that he will remain in office for many years to come. I offer condolences to the family of the late Harry Kemp, whom I knew for some time and who carried out his duties efficiently. I am sure that he will be missed by his colleagues in another place. I also offer condolences to the family of our great friend and a great friend of mine, namely, the late Hon. R. Hurst, the former Speaker. Mr. Hurst was a member of the Electrical Trades Union. He came to my house early in my political life to ask me to stand for the District of Unley. With his help, I was able to win the seat of Unley for Labor after many years of Liberal occupancy. I congratulate the Speaker (Hon. Mr. Ryan), who was the Deputy Speaker in the last Parliament and whom I greatly admire. Although he barracks for the wrong football team, I do not hold that against him.

The Hon. L. J. King: So do you.

Mr. LANGLEY: Do I? One thing about my Party is that its members can have differences of opinion on football matters. I also congratulate Mr. Burdon (member for Mt. Gambier) on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. I commend another member of Parliament, Mr. Crimes, who on more than one occasion has helped various members. In fact, I see that he is doing so even now as Acting Deputy Speaker. I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion. I also congratulate the new member for Elizabeth (who, I am sure, will be here for many years) on his contribution to Parliament. I also congratulate the new member for Semaphore who, I am sure, will be another worthy member of this place. His voice may not be like that of his predecessor, but he has a strong voice and I am sure that he will be a strong voice in the House.

I also congratulate the new member for Flinders. I am not sure whether Opposition members are pleased with him, but he is a likeable man who will be a worthy addition to the House. I congratulate the new members for Davenport and Alexandra, and the member for Chaffey on his return to Parliament. I wish them all well. That does not mean to say that we will not be trying to unseat them, because I am sure there will be a chance to unseat some Liberal and Country League members. Only time will tell. Even though they won at the last election, their majorities were considerably reduced. Recently, the member for Rocky River asked me a question, about my visit to his district. However, I did not do any electioneering there.

Mr. Gunn: You shouldn't have, either.

Mr. LANGLEY: Possibly it was a little early for that, but we will fight on that account later. I enjoyed my visit to the Rocky River District, during which I spoke mainly about sport. When passing the home of the member for Rocky River, I thought that any time the honourable member wanted to challenge me to a tennis match under lights I would be ready. If he wants to give me a share in his farm this year, I shall be pleased to share it with him.

Mr. Venning: There's a lot of hard work involved.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, but I am used to that, being an electrician by trade.

Mr. Nankivell: You'd get more than a farmer.

Mr. LANGLEY: Electricians are permitted to charge \$4.24 an hour.

Mr. Venning: You'd short-circuit the work on the farm.



Mr. LANGLEY: No, I do not want to short-circuit anyone. Electricians' charges are controlled by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. I am sure that at least some doctors charge more than \$4 for every hour they work. Recently, when going through some papers, I was reminded how marvellous it is that some people's political lives change. I will quote from the leader in the *Advertiser* on June 20, 1967, under the heading "Ready for the final round". I will not read the whole article, because it is for and against both sides. The final paragraph, which I think gives an idea of what would happen in the future, states:

Mr. Hall has the support of a loyal united Party. He and the Opposition Leader in the Upper House (Mr. DeGaris) promised to develop competent teamwork. It remains for the Liberal Parliamentary Party to show that it is bent on its own resurgence and has a distinctive approach on important issues of policy. The Opposition cannot afford to reply solely on Labor's faults and the Government's shortcomings. It must know where it is going and convince the people of its abilities.

How times have changed. Just prior to the last election, one united Party, the L.C.L., was split in twain. Every Opposition member in the House said that the L.C.L. was one Party. At that time, I am sure that it was a worry to the Opposition, and I am sure that it is still a worry. Bickering was taking place and meetings were being held in different corners of this building. It was something like the time a member of this House held a public meeting in a telephone box. Meetings were held in little rooms throughout the House. I have never seen so many redfaced people: they were not talking to each other. A compromise was reached; then came the time when the shadow Ministers were appointed. I thought they all got in before the cookie crumbled. On the front bench opposite we now have Dr. Eastick, a member of the L.C.L. or the Liberal and Country Party. It is difficult at times to tell which is his Party. Seated beside him is a former member of the Liberal Movement. Next in line is the member for Kavel, who is definitely L.C.L. or L.C.P. Next in line is the member for Bragg (L.M.), who barracks for the same football team as I do. Next in line is the member for Victoria (L.C.L.). Lastly, is the member for Hanson (L.M.). Immediately, we see another change of complexion, because the member for Glenelg was shot to the back bench. I do not understand why; perhaps it was because of his loss of popularity in the Glenelg District. The honourable member seemed to take a straight walk to the back benches.

Mr. Hopgood: Do you think he's the cookie that crumbled?

Mr. LANGLEY: I can assure the honourable member of that. Indeed, many members on this side went to his district and doorknocked for his opponent and it was marvellous the number of votes that changed in the last election, so most of us would be pleased to go down there next time. However, I have nothing against the member for Glenelg personally. The next development concerning members opposite involved the signing of the pledge, yet wherever possible members opposite are having a shot at Government members for their solidarity. Next they will have a rule book of their own. Indeed, if they did not have a copy of our rule book, members opposite would not be able to make speeches.

Dr. Tonkin: Haven't you got a copy of our rule book?

Mr. LANGLEY: No, but I would be happy to have a copy of it. I have found over the years that whatever the Labor Party has done to win seats in this State is copied by members opposite almost immediately. Further, I know

that a former prominent member of the L.C.L., the member for Mitcham, not only works hard in this House: I am sure he works hard in his district, as no doubt do the members for Goyder and Flinders.

Mr. Venning: Is the member for Mitcham known—

Mr. LANGLEY: He has a good name in his district. I was brought up in that area and I know this to be so. Indeed, I should not be surprised if the member for Mitcham holds his seat, no matter who stands against him; especially if he gets preferences from the Labor Party or the Australia Party, he will be a certainty at the next election. I cannot say the same about the member for Rocky River, because he will be relying on Labor again. He must know that he has little chance.

Mr. Hall: You can't send him back again.

Mr. LANGLEY: We will make a hard fight of it. People in South Australia are troubled by the position of the building industry in the community. Like many members I have tried on several occasions in this House to do my best concerning matters involving the industry. Ever since the introduction of subcontracting in this State the quality of workmanship in the building trade has fallen. Homes are now of substandard design and workmanship. Many of the workmen employed on these projects have never received tuition. Few workmen in the building industry can set out a job and get on with it properly.

Mr. Mathwin: That's ridiculous, and you know it. They have initiative.

Mr. LANGLEY: Land agents (they are not the only ones) and people with money who know nothing at all about the trade approach plumbers, electricians, carpenters and tilers and tell them the price they will pay for the work.

Mr. Mathwin: They don't.

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member has been a member of a union in the building trade and will have a chance to refute what I am saying, but I can say only what happened when I was in the building trade.

Mr. Mathwin: No-one forced you to take a job: if you didn't want it you didn't take it.

Mr. LANGLEY: People with money who know nothing about the building trade tell a tradesman that they will give him \$20 for certain work. True, if a man does not want a job he need not do it, but what happens then? These people get someone else.

Mr. Mathwin: What's wrong with that?

Mr. LANGLEY: The tradesman cuts his price, cuts his workmanship, and produces a shoddy home. Such workmen do not do a good job.

Mr. Gunn: Don't you believe in supply and demand?

Mr. LANGLEY: I believe in payment for services rendered.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the doctors?

Mr. LANGLEY: I may have something to say about them. I know something about the building trade, even if members opposite do not. Not one master can afford an apprentice to work for him.

Mr. Mathwin: I did when I was a subcontractor.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am telling you what happens in South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: He was working in South Australia.

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member can rebut what I am saying if he wants to.

Mr. Wells: What union did he belong to?

Mr. LANGLEY: We will never know. However, these people tell the tradesman what price they will pay and, unless the tradesman comes down to the price, he does not get the job. Who suffers? The people who make the

biggest investment of their lives are the ones who suffer. Indeed, the situation has developed to such an extent that most of the tradesmen are improvers and, if they were taken away from the job they have been doing for many years, they would be lost. The member for Torrens was apprenticed in the engineering trade. He is probably the only member of this House who has been an apprentice.

Mr. Coumbe: Were you a master?

Mr. LANGLEY: No. I had to teach myself.

Mr. Coumbe: You were an employer, though?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. I passed what I had to pass. Indeed, I have still got a licence and, if I do wrong, I shall lose it. I know the airing of this matter often hurts members opposite, but I am looking for an improvement in the construction of buildings. Many years ago only tradesmen were employed by builders and they saw the job right through, and the only people who were employed on a subcontract basis were plumbers and electricians. Now times have changed. What do these fellows who sublet do? They have no holidays, they work all hours of the week and deliver at any time, but they do not receive fair recompense for the work they do.

Mr. Harrison: Sometimes they don't get paid.

Mr. LANGLEY: The legislation for the licensing of builders, which was introduced by this Government, has improved the building trade in relation to what the member for Albert Park says. However, the building trade is in chaos at present, and the Minister of Labour and Industry is doing his best for it by introducing short courses. I am not a great believer in short courses, although they may improve the situation, but the building trade is really booming and could benefit from the training of more people. More foresight should have been shown by the previous Government, which did not do anything about subletting, and now we cannot get tradesmen. We have heard much about everything that is going on. It is marvellous that in this debate the Government of this State has not come in for much criticism, but the Commonwealth Government, which has not had much chance, having been in office for less than 12 months, has.

Mr. Gunn: It would be marvellous if it did not come in for criticism.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Commonwealth Government has not been in office for 12 months yet, and members opposite are condemning it. As I travel around my district, I am asked many questions. I saw and heard the member for Bragg the other evening discussing the ills, woes and wrongs of the proposed new national health scheme.

Mr. Gunn: Who wrote that for you?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am merely going to quote from what I have in my hand. I do not profess to be an expert in this field, but I am happy with this document because it is what the people of Australia want, not what members opposite want. Most Australians want a new health scheme, and what I am about to read will, I am sure, open the eyes of the Opposition and give a much clearer picture of the position. Nothing is ever 100 per cent right, but these are some of the questions and answers I have been able to get about the new health scheme. I hope I do not bore members with this. The first question is as follows:

Why does Australia need a new health scheme?

Mr. Mathwin: Because it is a bit sick at the moment.

Mr. LANGLEY: And the honourable member is sick in his area, too. The answer is as follows:

Australia is one of the few countries in the world without a universal system of health insurance. The new Australian Government is rapidly moving to overcome this serious deficiency in our social security system. Our

fundamental principle is that health care is a basic right to be provided according to need and not rationed according to wealth.

The next question is:

What will be the cost?

I am sure this will please the member for Bragg; there are no punch lines in this—it is all good stuff. The following is the answer:

Under our scheme four out of five people will pay less for health insurance coverage than they do now. Your share will be 1.35 per cent of your taxable income, which means what you are left with after tax deductions have been taken out from your family.

Mr. Gunn: No more taxes!

Mr. LANGLEY: No more taxes.

Mr. Coumbe: That is another impost.

Mr. LANGLEY: It is not; it is security for the people. The next question will hurt the member for Bragg. I do not mind paying for security. The question is:

Will there be a choice of doctors?

I know the member for Bragg does not believe this, but the answer is:

As a patient you will be guaranteed a free choice of doctors.

The Hon. L. J. King: The member for Bragg is never there.

Mr. LANGLEY: I think the member for Bragg has a fair clientele. The doctors say there is no freedom of choice; I am saying there is. The answer continues:

Your doctor will be paid for each service he performs and will continue as a private practitioner.

The next question is:

When will the new scheme come into operation?

Dr. Tonkin: Never, I trust.

Mr. LANGLEY: I think the honourable member will still be going strong, just the same. The answer is:

From July 1, 1974—

and I hope it is so—

when we expect the new scheme will start, all Australians will be automatically covered by health insurance. Instead of having to join a private fund, undergo a waiting period for claims, and remember to pay the monthly dues rate, your contribution rate will now be automatically deducted from your pay packet and paid to one single Government insurance fund.

I am not perturbed about that.

Dr. Tonkin: Who told you to put all this in your speech? It must have been the Attorney-General.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not know who wrote the one for the honourable member, and I did not ask him. The next question is:

How does the new proposal compare with the present scheme?

The answer is as follows:

Health insurance cover will be cheaper for most people under our scheme than the Liberal-Country Party Government's scheme. Take a married man with two children earning \$100 a week—about average weekly earnings now. Under the old scheme he would have paid \$80.76 for health insurance a year. Now under our scheme he will only have to pay \$52 a year—a considerable saving of nearly 75c a week.

Dr. Tonkin: How does he know? They are figures out of the air.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am quoting from this document, and this is correct. The next question is:

Will the new scheme help lower income earners?

This may not affect the Opposition but it affects me. The answer is:

Under the present scheme you have to pay a flat amount whatever you earn. This is most unfair as it means that those earning more pay less for their health care after

claiming tax concessions. We will also automatically cover unemployed people, certain pensioners and large families on low income.

I assure honourable members that I have many of these people in my district.

Mr. Mathwin: You have only one family, I think.

Mr. LANGLEY: I suppose the member for Glenelg is correct on this occasion. The next question is:

Will hospital care be free?

The answer is:

Your hospital care will be free in a public ward of the hospital. If you are poor you will no longer have to queue for hours waiting for medical treatment in the hospital outpatient wards.

Dr. Tonkin: The author of that document is guilty of blatant misrepresentation.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not sure that he is. The honourable member has had his say, and I am having mine now. The next question is:

Will private hospital treatment continue?

The answer is:

If you want to have private ward or private hospital treatment or wish to have your own doctor treat you in hospital, you can do so. Part of the cost for this extra service will be paid by the Commonwealth, as at present, and you can insure privately (as now) to recover the difference. These contributions will be tax deductible.

The next question is:

What will private ward insurance cost?

The answer is:

The total cost of the 1.35 per cent levy and private insurance cover will be about \$2.16 a week, after tax concessions, for an average income earner when the scheme starts. This will still be cheaper than the equivalent cover under the existing scheme, which will cost an estimated \$2.30 a week next year.

The document continues:

How will pensioners be affected?

I think the Government of this State has been of great help to pensioners, who really deserve help. The answer is:

Pensioners will be much better off under our new scheme than they are at present. Instead of being treated like second-class citizens and restricted in their choice of health care, they will now receive the same sort of treatment as everyone else. Doctors will be paid the full amount for treating them instead of the cut rate they now receive for pensioner medical treatment—

I notice nothing is said about that—

and pensioners will be able to receive specialist treatment in the doctors' own rooms instead of having to receive it in the outpatients department of hospitals.

This is an important factor, and I am sure the member for Bragg will be pleased about it. The next question is:

How will doctors be paid?

The answer is:

In return for your contribution, you will continue to see the doctor of your choice. And if your doctor co-operates by sending all his bills direct to the health fund for payment, you won't have to pay anything for your medical care. If your doctor does this he will receive 85 per cent of the agreed fees.

Dr. Tonkin: It's like children playing with matches.

Mr. LANGLEY: It sounds to me to be quite a fair scheme. The document continues:

Will doctors receive payment for service?

The reply to that question is as follows:

Bulk billing the fund will save doctors time and money, and will guarantee them payment for their services, even to their poorest patients. However, if they wish they can still bill you for each service. You will then take your bill to the fund and get it to pay the doctor 85 per cent of the bill, and you the rest, or you can pay the whole amount and get the 85 per cent refund yourself.

I think the following question and reply hit the nail on the head, namely:

Q. Should doctors fear the new scheme?

A. There is no reason at all for doctors to fear the new scheme.

Mr. Mathwin: There's reason for the patients to fear it.

The Hon. L. J. King: It's not the patients who are kicking up the fuss at the moment.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sure patients will be more pleased with this than with anything else. The reply continues:

It offers them financial security, an increase in payment for pensioner and repatriation payments, and the chance to concentrate on patient care rather than having to worry about collecting bills. The scheme proposes that fund benefits should be related to an agreed common fee. This is reasonable considering the Government pays every second dollar a doctor gets. In any case, no health insurance system can work unless there is some predictability of fees built into the system.

The following summary covers most of the points raised and, indeed, coincides with my thoughts on the matter:

The Australian Government has a firm responsibility to ensure that this money is spent wisely, and this includes checking the fees charged by the doctors. But we are not nationalizing doctors. Even if we wanted to, we cannot under the Constitution. Doctors will continue as private practitioners charging a fee for each service. We believe health care is a right, not a luxury. Our scheme will automatically protect all Australians against the cost of illness. We believe in freedom of choice for all Australians—doctors and patients. This will be preserved and improved with our plans. All Australians will have the right to choose their own doctor and the right of free public hospital treatment.

I am sure that this is in line with the thinking of most people in this State, who, happily, will realize that when this scheme is introduced it will not be nearly as bad as the picture Opposition members are painting at present. This matter is similar to many other matters considered by the Commonwealth Government, which, although it has not yet been in power for 12 months, has done some excellent things that have been ignored by the Opposition.

Speaking to this debate, the member for Davenport made a statement that I think would be unwise to circulate in his district: he said he was representing the intelligent citizens in Davenport. I am sure that if some people in Davenport heard this remark there would be a nice how-do-you-do. As a Labor member of Parliament, I represent everyone in my district; it does not matter who it is. Even though I know that some people did not vote for me, it does not alter the fact that, if they come along to see me, I do my best for them.

Mr. Jennings: Those that didn't vote for you should be certified.

Mr. LANGLEY: That may often be the case.

Dr. Tonkin: They'd be scared to come and see you now.

Mr. LANGLEY: No, they would not. I refer now to a matter that concerns me considerably, and it no doubt concerns many people, especially in the inner-suburban areas. I refer to people who buy established houses. Many young couples nowadays are trying to buy established houses in inner-suburban areas at prohibitive prices, and we hope that the activities resulting in these high costs will be curtailed soon. Near where I am living, three or four houses have been bought at a comparatively low price. Many of these houses are bought at a reasonable price by smart land agents and people in the land business. Virtually the next day after such a house is purchased, the painter moves in, followed by the plumber, electrician, and so on, and there is a rush job to cover up what should not be seen.

After the "one-coat wonder" and certain other jobs, these houses can look very nice, and one finds that they are then being sold at a price that includes at least one-third more than the cost of the ordinary repairs carried out. I think that at some stage the Government should seriously consider this matter and that, in the case of buying an established house, a report should be available concerning its condition, so that, although it may be difficult to control these prices, at least the buyer will be aware of the condition of the house before the work that I have described was carried out. I bought a house in the Unley District which had not been touched at all; it was not a new house, and I bought it through a fellow who I thought was very fair. The firm was R. W. Swan and Company, and the land agent said that it was far better for a purchaser to see the actual condition of a house. However, that is not the case generally in my district and, as I say, I hope that this matter will be considered in future, so that these people, who make the biggest outlay in their lives when they buy a house, will know its real condition.

Mr. Jennings: It will give them protection.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and they will know whether or not a house is worth buying. Finally, may I say how pleased I am to be on this side of the House, and I assure members opposite that we look like being here for many years to come.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): There are various items on the Notice Paper covering a wide range of private members' discussion that will take place on subsequent Wednesday afternoons, and I take it that that discussion will include subjects involving Government administration and its legislative programme. Therefore, I turn my attention to matters other than merely the running of affairs concerning my district or subjects that will be pursued in the House in the following weeks or months.

Many people in the community sense the presence of a strange political atmosphere across the country, and that is because there has been a change in the role of the political Parties in Australia. On the Commonwealth scene and in South Australia the role has changed from long-term non-Labor Governments to Labor Governments that are fully entrenched in office. This has meant a tremendous difference of approach to the public and a new interest in politics, because some people have been disappointed and some have won their point of view in electoral victory. This has meant that the Parties have had to face new roles in the community and in the Parliament.

One thing is quite apparent to all of Australia: the Liberal and Country Party coalition in Canberra is quite unprepared at the moment for its role in Opposition. This is having a severe effect on Liberalism throughout Australia. In this State it is quite apparent that the L.C.L. is totally unprepared for its role in Opposition, which it is not fulfilling in this House, as anyone can see from its day-to-day operations. So there is this strange factor overlying Australian and South Australian politics, and it is causing much distress in non-Labor circles.

The change of role has been made with the evidence that Labor has been prepared to govern after long years in the wilderness and the Liberal Parties and the Country Parties are ill prepared to adopt their role of Opposition. This has serious repercussions for Australia and for this State, in that Government legislation and administration is not being tested as it ought to be; democracy will not work in this country under a British style of government unless there is a strong Opposition as well as a strong Government. I deplore a situation where a Government,

as it has done in this State, can do almost anything at will in a political vacuum as far as the major part of the Opposition is concerned, an Opposition which still is unable to present a clear picture to the community and to this Parliament of the matters for which it is supposed to stand.

The result has been a search for identity, or perhaps I should say at least a realization by some people that there needs to be a search for identity among the non-Labor forces in this State. It is a search which has led so far to failure. It has led to the setting up of various committees. We read almost day by day of the Liberal Party of Australia or the L.C.L. in South Australia setting up committees, or committees having to report. There has been hardly at any time a clear definition of policy. I have read in today's *News* that the member for Davenport, who is attending the Commonwealth Liberal Party conference, has said that the Liberal Party in the past has practically ignored the voters under 40 years of age, who need to be told what are the Liberal principles. I should like to know what they are, because all of Australia is waiting to hear.

There is no leadership to Liberalism anywhere in Australia, outside of one or two State Governments, but there certainly is not on the Commonwealth scene. As the contest goes on about who is going to amalgamate with whom in that peculiar political dance in Canberra, we see confusion added to confusion, and any who study the political scene know there is no possibility of amalgamation between the Country Party and the Liberal Party in Canberra. It is simply not on, yet the statements are emanating from that political Party here in South Australia, a Party descending to mediocrity in relation to its leadership. Its Leader has just put to the Federal Council of the Liberal Party a proposition that there be voluntary voting, and he has been soundly defeated by the vote of the Liberal Party in Canberra on that proposal.

There is still, therefore, a search among local L.C.L. people for identity which their Federal members or their State colleagues apparently will not approve. So it is a rather tedious business. We come to the fact that the Liberal and L.C.L. Governments have lost by default as much as by the strength of their opponents. We saw in South Australia before 1965 a Government which had lost its grip on the public and failed to serve the public in anything but economic and physical planning measures, forgetting its social needs. That Party still pays the penalty for its lapse. On the Commonwealth scene, we had a Liberal and Country Party coalition Government until December of last year. It became the plaything of the Democratic Labor Party in its last few years in office. Two things stand out clearly to demonstrate that point of view. The first was the failure of the Commonwealth L.C.P. coalition to move on the China question long after the United States had taken a certain view. The other was its failure to move on the domestic scene in removing tax on contraceptives. Here were two issues, one foreign and one domestic, and in both the L.C.P. coalition sat inactive and inert.

In this House recently the member for Bragg referred to the Commonwealth Government's intention to nationalize the health services of Australia. He and I are in firm agreement in our opinion on this matter, and he spoke only a few days after I had written an article on this issue for the *News*. However, I disagree with him when he says this:

Pensioners and other low-income earners should be subsidized into the voluntary health insurance system on a

graduated needs basis and, again, I believe that a Commonwealth Liberal Government would introduce such a scheme.

There was a very good interjection by a member opposite, who said:

Why didn't they do it when they were there?

The reason was that they were too frightened or too conservative to alter the present scheme. It is a fact of life (and the member for Bragg would know this) that his own association, the Australian Medical Association, wrote to the Commonwealth Liberal Government 18 months before it fell asking for remedial action to be taken regarding some aspects of the national health scheme. The Commonwealth Government would not reply to its literature. That is the type of Government we had in the last few years of the decline and decadence of the last L.C.P. Administration in the eyes of the public.

There is no easy and quick way back for a Government that has fallen in this fashion, and there is no easy way for an L.C.L. that is so misguided as to produce the type of reference that was produced in this House by several members. There is no recognition of role. The member for Gouger, who has taken my place in an excellent seat in this House, made a statement that stunned all the members in this place who could recognize its implications when, in this debate, he said:

Having been elected as an L.C.L. member, I am most happy to be a member of this Party. More and more it is evident that the philosophy of political Parties comes down to a purely black and white division, one the philosophy of Socialism and the other of *laissez faire*, or free enterprise.

I shudder to think that I could be identified with a person who personifies the last century, a person who has taken over the seat I have just left.

Mr. Gunn: A seat that you ran away from.

Mr. HALL: I shall mention the member for Eyre in just a moment. I have looked for a definition of the words "*laissez faire*" and I have found several definitions, some more fulsome than others. However, the following definition is as good as any:

The doctrine that the government should refrain from interfering in economic affairs. *Laissez faire* may be considered from three points of view:

1. Production: The theory underlying *laissez faire* stressed that it would result in the maximum benefit from the employment of productive resources.
2. Distribution: Capital and labour would each obtain a share of the common product equivalent to the share it created.
3. Exchange: Prices would be stabilized, leading to the satisfaction of all those involved in market transactions.

Under the system of *laissez faire*, the forces of demand and supply were to determine the level of economic activity. The doctrine was popular in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, though it was never applied to the extent its adherents would have liked.

I dare not go back to the eighteenth century, but the honourable member has simply said that the political philosophies in this State in which he is involved are black and white, and he goes back to *laissez faire* to express his view. Does he want another great depression such as we had in 1929, which was the product of that system? Hardly any other member I know would go so far as to say that all economic enterprise should be unfettered and without control, supervision or regulation. Yet we see the influence of the Legislative Council intruding in this House in this fashion. Is it any wonder that it has taken so long to democratize the Upper House when that viewpoint is held there?

Therefore, we find the tedious situation in which members continue to represent the parochial issues of their districts. They have nothing to offer the public in the way of comparing themselves with the Government Party, except on parochial issues. As each member now has a district secretary, I wonder who will win that battle. I can imagine the efficiency of all members, who now have a secretary at their disposal to reply quickly to every inquiry, to write to all the people referred to on the back page of the *Advertiser* each morning, as so many do, and to write to each new elector on the rolls, as so many also do. Who will win this battle of parochial representation? My guess is that the Government will win it, for it has members who can be as effective as anyone else in this sphere, and sometimes more effective. The Liberal Party has nothing else to offer but competition at that parochial level. There can be no victory from that practice, because there can be no leadership from it.

This is the crisis point for non-Labor Parties in this State. There is a lack of understanding of any fundamental issues. Worse than that, I believe there is a deliberate attempt to undermine in the public mind the basis of our democratic existence. I will refer to two statements in this regard, the first of which was made in the Upper House on August 1 by Sir Arthur Rymill. I invite members to listen to the following description by Sir Arthur of democracy (or the Jack of it):

I refer now to what the Victorian Premier is reported as having said. Apparently he urged that the convention in Victoria should resolve that the death penalty should be abolished, and the resolution resulted in a vote in favour of abolition of 207 to 202. The Victorian Premier claimed, if I remember rightly, that the vote was a triumph for democracy. What sort of triumph is that? I would have called it a Pyrrhic victory. If three people out of the 409 had voted the opposite way the resolution would have been lost and no doubt everyone would have been called decadent and reactionary. What is this democracy? Is it some one ruling given on the spur of the moment by five votes on such a major matter? Is there a permanent will of the people?

Therefore, we find that the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House has an ally in what I believe is a deliberate attempt to discredit the only practical democratic way of electing people to Parliament, and that is the single district system, which operates at least in this House, where Governments are made and broken. In a recent publication of the Liberal and Country League early this year appears an article, headed "One Vote One Value is Emotional and Senseless", by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris (this was before his turnaround). He states:

Dunstan's catch-cry—"One man, one vote, one value." Emotional—and senseless. In the policy speech of the Australian Labor Party, this policy is to apply to both the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly. Let's look at the House of Assembly. In this House, the electoral system is based on single member electorates. Let us suppose that in a district of 10,000 electors, A receives 5,001 votes and B receives 4,999 votes—what Mr. Dunstan, is the value of the 4,999 votes? The answer—no value at all!

So two rather eminent members of the Upper House believe that the majority decision under a single district system is an unjust and undemocratic way of electing a Party. As this subject was revived as recently as last week by Sir Arthur, this would appear to be a deliberate attempt to undermine in the people's understanding of the issue the only basis of election which has been tried throughout the world and which has succeeded.

This illustrates what I believe (and the member for Heysen pointed this out) is the interference of members of the Upper House in the functions of this House, which so

far has been the only democratic example of a House of Parliament that the State has had; we have had no example from the Upper House. Therefore, those with no proper base with regard to democratic principles are criticizing a method of election for a House that is based on democratic principles. I rather fear what will be said in future if supposedly responsible members, such as the members to whom I have referred, continue to try to undermine the very basis of democracy as we know it.

I said that I would refer to the member for Eyre. In his speech, I suppose that from his point of view he was being loyal in saying how he supported his Party; that is his good fortune, or ill fortune, as events may prove in the end. He said:

The very point I make is supported by the elections in Victoria. The result in Victoria shows support for a strong united Party, and in that State the Liberal Party represents both country and city interests, just as the L.C.L. in South Australia represents both country and city people.

To be charitable to the honourable member, I believe that in making that statement he was being rather naive in his assessment of the comparative situation. If he cares to take out the figures on this situation (and I urge him to do so, or he can borrow mine if he does not want to do the necessary work), he will find that the representation in Victoria overwhelmingly favours the Liberal Party, which is based on the city. The figures show that in Victoria, the Liberal Party holds 66 per cent of the metropolitan seats. I ask the member for Eyre what percentage of seats the South Australian L.C.L. has representing the metropolitan area; the answer is 21 per cent. The honourable member says that the Victorian Party and the South Australian Party are comparable in their base, being able to represent both city and country. Let me examine that proposition, presenting further evidence that will show that there is no likelihood of establishing a comparison. The position I have put is further substantiated by the fact that, of the total representation of the Liberal Party in the Victorian Parliament, 54 per cent of its members are from the metropolitan area. In this State, the six L.C.L. members from the metropolitan area represent 33 per cent of its membership. Therefore, there is no comparison between the two Parties. It will do little for his comfort if the member for Eyre studies the situation in some detail. As he knows, the L.C.L. is unable to win the city support that it so badly needs if it is to become a credible Party in the sense that it can represent both points of view.

While I am still dealing with the problems of non-Labor Parties, referring to their inability to grasp the fundamental aspects of the policies that are necessary today and the requirements of the community, I want to refer to what occurred yesterday when I raised the subject of the misuse of taxpayers' funds by members of the Legislative Council in providing for part of their election campaign at Government expense. When I asked a question about this, before I could even finish the member for Eyre said, "It's a lie," and rushed out of this House, obviously to see his friends in the Upper House. Since then the subject has developed a little further. Last evening, I went to a meeting at Willunga, where I was given three letters that were further evidence of this campaign's being conducted to some extent at the expense of the taxpayers. I was handed two letters printed on Government-supplied stationery, posted in Government-supplied envelopes, and signed by the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House. I was given a third letter printed on Senate stationery and signed by Senator Jessop. Those three letters were identical with the first one that was given to me—even to the last full stop. So,

obviously someone in the L.C.L. has devised a model letter, which I know from the letters in my possession was signed by at least three members of Parliament, two of them in this Parliament and one in the Commonwealth Parliament; those letters were on Government-supplied stationery.

Mr. Gunn: Like the proof of the Liberal Movement's book.

Mr. HALL: I have been told by a person who observed a bundle of these envelopes that there were at least 1,000 in that bundle and that they were being carried around this House by secretaries who were paid by the Government. The concluding sentence of the rather lurid report in this morning's newspaper is as follows:

The Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council (Mr. DeGaris) said as far as he was concerned all members paid for electoral expenses.

Yet this afternoon the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has admitted that members of his Party have used Government-supplied stationery for electoral purposes. Last night he believed that they had all paid for it, and last night I was given two letters signed by him which simply asked the electors of the Southern District to vote for the Liberal and Country League candidate but, of course, the letters were not addressed to the electors of the Southern District: they were addressed "Dear Member"—and that means "Dear L.C.L. Member". I have four letters in my possession, all addressed "Dear Member", three of them signed by Legislative Councillors and one signed by a Senator, on Government-supplied paper. As to the stamps, I know not. I shall not burden the House with the full text of the letter, but the following, which refers to the candidate, is one sentence from it:

He is a man who can be relied upon to uphold the ideals and principles of the Party to which we all belong.

Are they the ideals of the member for Gouger, who believes in *laissez faire* capitalism? Are they the ideals of the member for Eyre, who believes that his Party is similar to the Victorian Liberal Party? Are they the ideals of the member for Davenport, who says that his Party has forgotten young people up to the age of 40 years and who wants to tell his Party the principles it has got to work out? Are they the ideals of the Leader of the Party, who has just been defeated overwhelmingly in Canberra on his proposal for voluntary voting? Are they the ideals that are referred to in that letter? I suppose that the ideals referred to are the ideals of using Legislative Council stationery to send out letters at the taxpayers' expense, if the members concerned can get away with it!

Mr. Gunn: You conducted a campaign from the Leader of the Opposition's office.

Mr. HALL: I have a letter from a Senator; this raises an interesting point that some Senator may care to pursue later, to ascertain how much Commonwealth money was used in this way.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't think that they are worried about next Saturday's by-election, do you?

Mr. HALL: I want to be fair about this. I am not surprised that the Legislative Council has done this, because over a long period it has been the greatest political manipulator that this State has seen. The Legislative Council has been a House of perpetuation; the resources of that House, in connection with members' activity in electoral districts using the physical resources of that House, have been directed to the re-election of L.C.L. members. I know and the Hon. Mr. Cameron knows fully the pressure that was put on him to drop the full adult franchise policy that he had. He was told that, if he dropped it, he would be selected as the No. 2 candidate on the Senate

ticket. When he refused to drop the policy, he was told he would be the No. 3 candidate; he was told in simple terms that that was what would happen to him. These are the greatest manipulators, and the member for Gouger, who has just stepped down from them, would know that what I say is true. So, we have Legislative Councillors using taxpayers' money in this way. It seems to me that those Legislative Councillors are adding to the great agony of the L.C.L. and of all non-Labor forces in finding some credible course back to Government.

The Upper House has been one of the greatest stumbling blocks to the credibility of non-Labor forces that this State has had, and it is apparently continuing, at the last by-election under this system, to use its resources in the way I have described. I do not know how the L.C.L. members of the Legislative Council can ever justify its existence under this type of management. I know that today prominent members of it are in panic and are trying to work out a system whereby they can be seen to make reimbursement for the material they have used, but that is beside the point; this is a small issue, and I do not want to make too much of it except to show that this is the way in which the Legislative Council has worked.

Mr. Keneally: You could have fooled us.

Mr. HALL: I and members opposite and some members of the L.C.L. are not surprised about this matter, because it is the type of thing that one would expect from the Legislative Council members involved. What is the future, therefore, for non-Labor forces in connection with that type of presentation? The following is an extract, written by the member for Mitcham, from *The L.M. Story*:

Socialism tries to make all people equal, but Liberalism aims to give all people an equal opportunity.

It is the problem of the L.C.L. that in the past it has denied people an equal opportunity, and the legislative processes have been the apex of this denial. The forcing through the Upper House of full adult franchise has been a great victory in South Australia in connection with at least establishing equal opportunity at the most important level—where laws are made. So, we have a Liberal Party bereft of any leadership and ideology, and there is no Commonwealth Liberal Party member that I know of who has been vocal in his opposition to the Labor Party's intention to nationalize the health scheme. The only person who has protested is the member for Bragg, who followed my public statement on it. The Commonwealth Liberal Party members, who so avidly adopted the slogan "Your doctor is in danger" and used the blue stickers during the last Commonwealth election campaign, are all quiet and muted now. There is no presentation of Liberal ideology on that issue, and the Commonwealth Government is not being tested on it. That is the greatest factor of all: there is no test of the Government, and the reason is the lack of central commitment by most of the non-Labor forces in the community.

I believe that the dissension in the non-Labor ranks here will prove to be a remedial factor in the long run. The L.M. has an important ideological role to play and, in this vacuum, it is already establishing some new meaning to the basis of Liberal ideology. However, there needs to be a complete reorienting and re-education of the public's mind in connection with the value of Parliamentary institutions. The status of those institutions has been lowered in the public's estimation by the behaviour of the Upper House. I see a need for a deep re-examination of the role of the Upper House in this Parliamentary institution. In saying that, I stress that I am a firm supporter of the bicameral system and retention of the

Upper House. However, that does not mean that I believe that the Upper House should be allowed to go along as it is going today, as a self-perpetuating kingdom serving the selfish interests of the Parties or individuals that inhabit it. We must somehow agree to a deep re-examination of its role. I should like the Government to appoint a body to do this: perhaps it could be called a commission of some sort. On the national scene, we are examining the role of Commonwealth and State Parliaments and their interactions. It is important for the reputation of the South Australian institution that a commission be set up, with representatives from all political Parties, to study the role of the Upper House in the past, to ascertain what it can do in the future, and recommend to Parliament what changes may be necessary so that it can fulfil a clear, open, and responsible role in future.

I urge the Government to take this action, and am confident that, if it appointed a committee free of any immediate Party dominance and arranged so that it could continue deliberations for a useful period, it would be of benefit to the reputation of the South Australian Parliament. As I move in the community, I find that there is a need for the remedy of an open investigation. I believe that the latest small instance of its actions yesterday and early this week indicate what an unhappy condition the Upper House has reached. The Upper House is not sitting today or tomorrow, and everyone knows that this is to allow members to go electioneering.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot reflect on another place.

Mr. HALL: I was not reflecting so much as making a statement of fact, and I do not think anyone in this House would disagree with my statement.

Mr. Jennings: You couldn't make a statement of fact without reflecting on it.

Mr. HALL: I believe that these incidents emphasize the need to re-examine its role and to ensure that its responsibilities lie not to that by-election but to the community of South Australia. Such an investigation would do nothing but good, would rehabilitate a House that has fallen so low in repute and could give it a role that could be effective administratively and in recommendations to the Government and Parliament, rather than the long-term propaganda role that has been adopted by the L.C.L. in the past few years. I leave it at that.

The Notice Paper provides the widest opportunities to discuss all the various issues pertaining to Government administration and legislation this session, but I urge non-Labor forces in the community to take stock of the situation and to understand how ridiculous they appear in the eyes of the public. There seems to be no policy that the public recognizes as coming from the Liberal camp, and there is a need to develop not committees that can pore over other people's ideas and try to dredge out saving factors for a Party that is in trouble but a policy that can generate ideas based on Liberalism, as Mr. Hamer in Victoria is doing so successfully. I support the motion.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): In supporting the motion, I congratulate the member for Elizabeth on his magnificent address when moving it. I have taken some interest in this honourable member since he was 22 years or 23 years old, have seen him develop in the last five years or six years, and have no doubt that he will acquit himself extremely well in this place. I know that he has forsaken a big career in law to become a member of Parliament at great financial cost, because he was making much more money from his law practice than he can hope to make in

this place under the present wage system. Also, I congratulate the member for Semaphore, who seconded the motion. I know that he, too, will acquit himself well in this place. I have known him for about 15 years. He first became an official of the Postal Workers Union at the same time as I became an official of the Australian Workers Union. He acquitted himself well in that organization and is well respected in the trade union and Labor movements.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the magnificent job they have done in this debate. The previous member for Semaphore, the Hon. Mr. Reg. Hurst, was a personal friend of mine, and I place on record the fact that no-one assisted me more when I first became a member than he did. I am very sad at his passing, and extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and children. I know that all members will join with me in doing so. Reg Hurst was a fine man who would help anyone in trouble, and tolerance was his greatest virtue in helping people with their problems. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment. You must have been very proud to know that you were unopposed by your Party, and by the Parliament, too. Already your authority has been exercised in this House and you have taken complete charge of it. You have set new standards, and everyone is complying with them. I think the House is much better because of that, and business is proceeding on an even keel. When you speak the House quietsens, and the debate is allowed to continue in a normal way. Before the end of this session you will have established yourself as one of the greatest Speakers the South Australian Parliament has produced.

I congratulate your Deputy on his elevation. I know that your training will assist him, although he has already had some training for the position, and I am sure he will be most successful in his position. Yesterday, my friend and colleague, the member for Ross Smith, said in this debate that Question Time in the House was a waste of time. I have been saying that for about 12 months: I believe that Question Time is far too long. It is taken up with the most piddling questions I have ever heard. I congratulate the member for Goyder on his speech today, because I agreed with at least 80 per cent of it. It is amazing how circumstances change, because, when I first became a member, I found it extremely difficult to agree with anything said by the honourable member. Latterly, I seem to agree with him on many things. He said today that the Opposition facing this Government was one of the weakest in the Commonwealth, and there is no doubt about that, because of the ridiculous questions asked by the Opposition about matters that could be dealt with by a telephone call or letter to the Minister.

However, Opposition members prefer to drag Question Time out for two long hours and thus waste Government time and restrict Government business. I hope that this situation can be rectified soon. Also, I consider that the present debate, which has continued for two weeks or three weeks, is a waste of time. I did not intend to speak, because of my firm belief that it is a waste of time and achieves nothing. A few people blow off hot air, speak about absolutely nothing, and waste taxpayers' time. However, having been provoked a few times, I have entered the debate. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be taking up much of the Chamber's time.

I deal now with the question raised yesterday by the member for Bragg, who referred to the privacy of patients in Government hospitals and the placing of doctors' fees under price control. One could only regard the question

as the complete bottom of the barrel: it was one of the lowest questions that could have been asked in the House. It was deliberately designed by the member for Bragg, who represents the doctors in this struggle. He is one of the oppositionists in the House who has frequently staled that workers ought to abide by arbitration and accept the decisions of various tribunals. However, in this case he supports a body of people who want to determine their own rates of pay. They are not willing to have the matter arbitrated or be guided by a proper investigation. No-one can deny that the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs is well respected. His decisions are always acted on: they are certainly acted on by the Government, because I have sat in Caucus now for about 21 years and have found that the Commissioner's orders, having the seal of approval of Cabinet, have always been adopted by the Caucus of my Party.

I imagine that the same situation applied when the Opposition was in Government, when it was faced with inevitable price increases. I do not like price increases, but I go along with them once they have been made. The same applies to the working class; if their wages have been examined thoroughly by a tribunal, the Opposition's cry has always been, "You must accept the tribunal's decision". However, the doctors are not willing in any circumstances to accept arbitration or the findings of the Commissioner. I will quote from an article concerning doctors' fees written by Dr. Reece Jennings and published in the August 1 edition of *West-Side*. It is necessary for me to read the article, because it would lose some of its merit if I tried to explain it.

Mr. Mathwin: Two pages!

Mr. WRIGHT: No, it is not. Dr. Jennings has just placed himself publicly at the will of the people in the West Torrens council area, and he was elected by a good majority. He is not only a doctor but has some tremendous community ideas that he intends to put forward soon. The article states:

I do not intend to enter into an altercation with the babbling anonymous Canutes of the medical world . . . We all know who King Canute was and what he thought of his powers. He was so enamoured of himself that he tried to stop the waves from coming in to the shore. The article continues:

. . . who are vainly attempting to sweep back the tides of change with a broom of windy verbiage, he explained. He said no Government with the interests of its citizens at heart could put off the need to make hospitals like Ashford public, and staff them with salaried doctors who were continuously present to look after patients.

That is a magnificent statement by a doctor. The article continues:

The person with a large family receives the dirty end of the medical stick. Those vested interests determined to make a living out of the sick at all costs are howling against the introduction of changes which will eliminate the present inequalities and give a more equitable distribution of medical resources.

Dr. Jennings said hospitals like Ashford should have abdicated their community role long ago. The fatuous arguments of those practitioners supporting the present use of hospitals like Ashford for the benefit of a favoured few were never better seen in all their hollow insincerity than in your correspondent's crocodile tears.

It is ridiculous to say local residents can be assured of a bed in Ashford. An inspection of the admission book will show how many non-ratepayers are admitted there to the exclusion of local residents. He said local medical association meetings were continually punctured by complaints about the shortage of hospital beds for acute illnesses.

It is a wicked waste of hospital space that residents from totally unrelated districts can occupy beds in Ashford to



have their breasts enlarged and faces lifted. This excludes ratepayers in West Torrens and other contributing councils whose need of a bed is far more urgent and important, and pensioners and non-insured ratepayers can't even be considered for admission there.

Dr. Jennings said arbitrary limits were applied to the number of babies local doctors could deliver in Ashford. The anonymous worried doctor should also get his facts straight about the position of family doctors who want to deliver ratepayers' babies at Ashford. If any local resident thinks she can go there and have her baby as simply as that, she's got another think coming.

A ridiculous situation exists where a local G.P. might be allowed to deliver one baby a month there—from an annual total of, say, 60 deliveries. The other 50-odd local patients who support the hospital through rates payments have to go elsewhere. Yet some specialists can book in more or less who they like regardless of where they live.

Again, specialist treatment for the specialist. The article continues:

There are gross and unfair discrepancies in the delivery of health care in the community at present.

I am pleased that the member for Bragg has returned to the Chamber so that he can hear what the eminent doctor had to say.

Dr. Tonkin: You haven't been keeping your eyes open. I came back a long time ago.

Mr. WRIGHT: The article continues:

The old, the chronically ill, the handicapped, the low-income earner, and the person with a large family receive the dirty end of the medical stick. A national health scheme follows this premise as inevitably as night follows day.

I hope that the member for Bragg is listening. The article continues:

It's not for nothing that prominent members of the medical profession and M.P.'s insist on going to the Royal Adelaide Hospital when they get sick. Highly-specialized care is always available. Some doctors seem reluctant to accept the day of the versatile, medical hillbilly has ended forever. No family doctor in this day and age can do a Caesarean section, followed by a gall bladder operation, in the morning and then consider this a day's work and go and play golf. With surgery and gynaecology done by proper salaried specialists, family doctors will have more time to spend with their patients, and this seems to be just what they are afraid of, he berated.

Dr. Jennings said the public should be prepared for an increasing amount of propaganda as the battle between the medical profession and the Government heated up. People will be inundated with an increasing amount of puerile and ridiculous propaganda. Most of it will be irrelevant and fatuous; the rest will be hypocrisy flavoured with self-righteousness. The disgraceful attempts to frighten and intimidate patients—many of them old and ill—reached an hysterical peak with the recent distribution of a scurrilous letter.

The honourable member cannot deny that the letter was put out. Indeed, if he does, I will bring the letter to the House and table it. The report continues:

Apparently sponsored by the General Practitioners' Society, it virtually told pensioners to join a medical benefit fund, as their doctor was going to withdraw from the Pensioner Medical Service. The effect on many old folk was shameful.

I can imagine the situation after the pensioner was told this. What is this doing to the image of the great medical profession? The report continues:

It's despicable they should be subjected to that sort of malignant blackmail. He said many changes were coming in the medical field, and the family doctor should have a say in them. As long as he can they will all be for the good, because no-one is in a better position to know what the community needs in health services than the general practitioner. Residents from other districts can occupy beds to have their breasts enlarged and faces lifted. Community needs cannot be gauged by distant academics, lawyers or Commonwealth medical officers. Nor are the

clumsy consultative councils sprouting up likely to be of much use, he added.

I am not *au fait* with all that happens in the medical profession; indeed, I have never made a study of it, but it is because of the attitude expressed by the member for Bragg in this House, and following his dastardly question of yesterday, that I felt it was incumbent on me to bring this information to the House for the benefit of members. I point out that it was not I or another member of the A.L.P. who said this: it was a member of the great medical profession who was berating doctors in the strongest words that could be printed in any newspaper. The article speaks for itself in placing doctors in an invidious position. It destroys whatever image they may have had left, and that was little.

I wish now to deal with the matter that first prompted me to buy into this debate, and I refer to what was said by the member for Alexandra who, unfortunately, is not in the House at the moment. I was not in the House when he was delivering his Address in Reply speech and, in any case, I could not have dealt with him then, because it was his maiden speech.

Mr. Payne: He's here now.

Mr. WRIGHT: I refer to page 162 of *Hansard*, August 1. In concluding his speech the honourable member referred to Kangaroo Island and compulsory unionism. He had one thing to say in this House, but another thing appears in *Hansard*. I do not know whether he corrected what the *Hansard* reporter reproduced or whether *Hansard* did not pick it up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot reflect on *Hansard*.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was going to pay *Hansard* a compliment, and say that it never missed anything. It therefore appears that the member for Alexandra either made a statement and had it withdrawn or did something to interfere with its appearing in *Hansard*, because it does not appear there.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Adelaide has misquoted me in the reference he has made to me in his speech.

The SPEAKER: I cannot sustain that point of order.

Mr. WRIGHT: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for not sustaining the point of order: indeed, I would have been bewildered if you had sustained it, because I have not said what I was going to say.

Mr. Gunn: You only reflected on *Hansard*!

Mr. WRIGHT: I will deal with the member for Eyre in a minute. In his speech on August 1, according to *Hansard*, the member for Alexandra said:

I have proved over a period of 20 years of employing men in one of the toughest industries in the country—I agree with that statement: it is certainly a very tough industry—

that unionists and non-unionists can work satisfactorily side by side, as the member for Adelaide well knows.

Of course I know that: everyone in Australia knows that there are unionists in some factories and there are also non-unionists in those factories. There are unionists on some properties and non-unionists on some properties—one does not have to be an Einstein to know that. I am not concerned about that part of the statement but what I am concerned about is that during his address to this House the honourable member said I had condoned it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never condoned unionists working with non-unionists where I was able to do anything about it. Certainly, there are circumstances that will arise where

we cannot get everyone into a union, but that is not condoning the situation.

I do not know whether the member for Alexandra can cast his mind back to almost the first official visit carried out by myself to Kangaroo Island to organize his own employees, when I would say that about 8 per cent of them were members of the Australian Workers Union. I will not criticize the member for Alexandra because of his attitude to me on that occasion: in fact, it was very good. I asked him whether he would arrange for all his troops to come to the main depot from their scattered positions, because otherwise it would take two or three days to organize them, and he said he would. So he was condoning unionism, because he had his men brought on to the property so that I could speak to them that night. He knows full well that I did not leave that property until every man there had joined the A.W.U.

Mr. Chapman: That's not correct.

Mr. WRIGHT: The honourable member knows very well that it is correct: not one man who was left on his property and who was entitled to be a member did not join, except the driver of the truck, who may have been a member of the Transport Workers Union. The next situation over which we had some difficulty on Kangaroo Island with the member for Alexandra was his refusal to honour the Commonwealth Pastoral Award by refusing to sign the provided agreements. The member for Alexandra knows full well that I forced him to sign agreements, and he flew to Adelaide at his own expense to sort out the matter with the Secretary of the union and me. He knows that full well, and from then on things went a little better than they had previously; but during that first visit the member for Alexandra admitted to me that his employees had for many years broken all sorts of rules on Kangaroo Island. I may say that this admission was from a man who had been a member of the Australian Workers Union previously because, when the member for Alexandra was a shearer in the industry, he was a member of the union and knew full well what that union's rules were, what they should be, and how they should be observed. But he admitted to me that he condoned, and in fact encouraged, Saturday shearing, Sunday shearing and all sorts of other things that were breaking the Commonwealth Pastoral Award.

Mr. Chapman: When it was convenient.

Mr. WRIGHT: Not when it was convenient—when the honourable member could get away with it. That was the key to the position on the island before 1965 or 1966, but thank goodness the situation has changed since then, because most workers now are at last in the union. I make no apology to anyone in this House, only to my own Party because so far I have not been able to convince my Party that it should recognize compulsory unionism.

Mr. Gunn: The democrat from Adelaide!

Mr. WRIGHT: I will prove why it should recognize compulsory unionism. How long is it since we have seen a dispute on the waterfront over non-unionism? It is not since 1954, in the Hersey case. Every eligible person now joins the union on the waterfront and there is no dispute over it. How long has it been since there was a dispute involving the Seamen's Union or Chryslers or Holdens or any other place where it is compulsory unionism over non-unionism? It just does not happen. Members opposite should wake up to themselves, particularly the nomad from Eyre, who could not spell the word "unionism" if he tried. The sooner there is compulsory unionism, the better off this country will be.

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That statement is a reflection on me. I ask for a complete withdrawal.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crimes): That is not a point of order. The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. COUMBE: Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, the member for Eyre has taken exception to certain words used by the member for Adelaide. He has said that they reflect upon him and has asked for a withdrawal. I draw your attention to Standing Order 153, which provides:

No member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House.

The member for Eyre has said that he takes exception and says that the words are a reflection upon him. I ask that his point of order be upheld.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that the member for Adelaide called the honourable member a "nomad" which, on my understanding, means a person who moves around the country. I cannot see that that is offensive, because practically every member of this House can be described as a nomad. There is no point of order. The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. WRIGHT: I thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, for your protection. Probably, only members on this side knew what I was referring to. I want to develop this argument a little further and take the minds of members opposite back to two incidents that occurred, one last year and one the year before, in South Australia which, to my mind, should never have occurred at all. I refer first to the Kangaroo Island dispute, which was over non-unionism. No-one won that dispute; it went on and on merely because people were refusing to pay for what they were receiving and to pay for what they were entitled to pay for. I see the member for Bragg is grinning, because he knows he must pay to the Australian Medical Association his association fees, and so should everyone else who wants to work in an industry covered by an award. There should be no doubt about that. I bet the member for Alexandra belongs to the contractors association or some employer association, and I do not blame him for that. He should belong to such an association because it gives him protection, but I extend that same theme to any industry. The Kangaroo Island dispute, as big and bad as it was, should never have occurred, and it would never have occurred if compulsory unionism had operated in this State. How could it have?

Mr. Gunn: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. WRIGHT: That shows how much the honourable member knows, when he says I do not know what I am talking about. On reflection, I do not think I used a strong enough word when I said "nomad": I should have looked in the dictionary and found a stronger word.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Adelaide to address the Chair and not members opposite.

Mr. Wells: The point is that unionism produces industrial harmony.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is my point. The member for Alexandra started all this, because he said we must have good industrial relations. I agree entirely, and, of course, everyone must join the appropriate organization. That is the first thing.

Mr. Chapman: Or else!

Mr. WRIGHT: How could there be any relationship otherwise? Honourable members know that is right. Let me deal now with another dispute where we saw one of the

things that shames me, namely, the gaoling of a trade union official, Les Robinson. This is something I have never been happy about. Would that have occurred if the people concerned had joined the union? Of course not. If there had been compulsory unionism, properly working, those people who refused to join the union would not have been there and there would have been no dispute.

Mr. Gunn: Do you believe in freedom of choice?

Mr. WRIGHT: I shall answer that in a moment.

Mr. Gunn: Yes or no!

Mr. WRIGHT: I believe in people paying their way.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Adelaide not to address the Opposition, but to show respect for the Chair and to address the Chair. He will please not engage in altercations with interjectors. The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was saying, when I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Eyre—

Dr. Tonkin: On a point of order, I regard that as a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. WRIGHT: I said "by the member for Eyre".

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am enjoying this. I said I was interrupted by the member for Eyre. I am getting into trouble with the Acting Deputy Speaker because of the bad manners of the member for Eyre, who is interfering with my speech all the time.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Adelaide has reflected on me by accusing me of having bad manners. I take strong exception and ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no reflection on the honourable member, and there is no point of order. The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. WRIGHT: If the member for Eyre will let me continue, I shall soon conclude my remarks, because I have not much more to say. I merely want to make the point, as the member for Alexandra did, that if one wants to support good industrial relations in this State it will be necessary at the same time to have compulsory unionism, because they work hand in glove. Otherwise it is an impossible situation. The member for Eyre today asked a question in this House, and, as he has done four or five times previously, he berated me, trying to belittle me because I am a supporter of compulsory unionism.

I wanted the honourable member to make that statement, because I have never denied it. I have spoken on this subject at every possible conference, and I shall continue to do so until my Party sees it my way. That may never happen, but I will continue. Members may have read recently of a man in Victoria who introduced 24 times into the House a Bill to abolish capital punishment. He kept trying, and eventually he was successful. I shall keep trying to follow my beliefs. The question today was directed to the Minister, who discussed it with me. I said, "It may be that you are not in a position to introduce compulsory unionism because it is not the policy of the Party as a general thing," but I am wondering whether the Minister would introduce it at least to apply to the District of Eyre.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Before expressing my support for the motion, I must make one or two points in this debate. First, I express my sympathy to the families of those members who have passed away, particularly those who have been members of this House or of the other place during my term as a Parliamentarian. The former Speaker, Mr. Reg Hurst, was a friend to me; as Whip, I found him very easy to work with, even though at times there may

have been rulings that caused anxiety among some of my colleagues. I believe he always treated me fairly and took a fair approach to all matters. I had great respect for the Hon. H. K. Kemp, a member of my own Party in another place. I did not work closely with him as a Parliamentarian, even though, of the Southern Legislative Councillors, his home was closest to my own.

To the members who have left Parliament since the last session, by way of either defeat or retirement, I express my thanks for the help given me and for the honest approach they adopted to politics here, according to their dictates and their philosophies. I do not wish to mention each and every one by name, except Mr. Ferguson, who was in the same room as I when I first entered politics and who had, to some degree at least, a quietening effect on me as an ambitious young person thinking he could change the world overnight. He soon convinced me that that was not the case, and others have since continued to convince me of that. I appreciated Mr. Ferguson's help, and it was an asset to me, as a young man coming here, to have an elder statesman beside me.

This is one of the saddest occasions on which I have spoken in the Address in Reply debate, because I have heard three members speak in a way I would never have believed they would speak. One was a new member and the others were previously members of the Parly to which I belong. When one sits here as a politician and hears the man who has been his former Leader stoop to the depths to which he has stooped in the past couple of days, it becomes embarrassing for one to sit in this House and remember having gone all over the State, wherever one was asked to speak, to support the man and promote his cause in the belief that he was a man of principle. I believe that the majority of us who have been here for some time have at times had difficulty in deciding where we should begin and end regarding the use of Parliamentary facilities. As Whip to the present Leader, and particularly to the former Leader, I listened to the comments made and the attack on people in another place, knowing in my mind what had taken place in the past.

Mr. Nankivell: The hypocrisy of the man was what embarrassed you, wasn't it?

Mr. EVANS: It was that, yes, but I must place myself in a position of having at one time tried to promote, and in fact helped to promote, the interests of that individual. I do not wish to say where I believe there have been abuses in the past that would be even greater than those referred to yesterday because, as Whip, I believe I should maintain some honour in that position, even though it was in a previous Parliament that the incidents took place. I hope for the sake of Parliamentarians generally that the sort of denigration the member for Goyder has entered into will cease.

How the honourable member ever expects to promote an effective Opposition (whether it be his own Party, the L.C.L., or the Country Party) while he makes these snide attacks, I just do not know. I believe that the people of South Australia want an effective Opposition: the L.C.L. can be that Opposition. However, we cannot achieve this aim if the ex-Leader of the Party sets out to snipe at and denigrate individuals, starting with the President of the Party, then moving on to the Leader in another place, and coming right down to the stage of denigrating members of this place, members who supported him in every part of the State and helped to create for him an image that he is now using against our Party. I say again that this is a sad occasion indeed; I do not know what has affected the man to this degree.

The member for Mitcham has made some suggestion that he did not know the Opposition was warned by the Premier that if we continued to ask many Questions on Notice our time for Questions without Notice would be reduced. I say sincerely and honestly that during the last Parliament the Premier approached this Party and me, through his Whip (and I spoke to the Premier directly), emphasizing his concern at how many Questions on Notice were being asked. That matter was discussed by the Party; if it was not discussed in the Party room, at least all members knew about it. The member for Mitcham counselled us not to allow an intrusion into our time for Questions without Notice. Although he had full knowledge of the warning issued by the Premier during the last Parliament, I heard the honourable member say recently (Standing Orders preclude my referring to the actual reference) that he had no knowledge of this warning and that he actually supported the move to deal with Questions on Notice during the time normally allocated to Questions without Notice. Yet the original thoughts of the honourable member were that we should fight not to give up any of the time normally allocated to Questions without Notice.

I wish to refer briefly to another matter to show the depths to which people are sinking. As reported at page 88 of *Hansard*, the member for Mitcham, referring to the fact that he was surprised to be the fourth Opposition speaker in this debate, said:

I am mildly surprised because I am speaking as early as this, but when I come to think of it I should not be surprised, because, notoriously, members of the L.C.L. are never ready to debate the Address in Reply motion.

I tried to be as fair as possible in this matter. When I approached the members for Mitcham and Goyder before the commencement of the debate, I said, "Do you want fourth and fifth positions?" I think it was the member for Mitcham who said, "Isn't the L.C.L. ready?" I said, "If you want to go last or anywhere else down the list you can do so. We are ready. Just say that you do not want to speak now, and our members will speak." I offered the member for Flinders a place on the list that he accepted without saying anything about wanting to alter the position. I understand that the time at which he spoke turned out to be suitable in relation to printing times of newspapers in his district. I am making the point that this sort of snide remark by the member for Mitcham will do nothing towards our achieving an effective Opposition. As reported at page 89 of *Hansard*, the member for Mitcham said:

It is not easy to avoid the temptation to recriminate. We must not do that, nor must we show ill-will towards any individual.

I am pleased that the honourable member has made that decision, because one day in this House, when the Leader of the Opposition rose to speak and it was not his turn, the honourable member said, "Sit down you fat slob." No-one took him up on that; we let him go, because it was not worth an argument. I hope he has now decided not to attack individuals. I admire the way in which my colleagues have accepted, without indulging in personality attacks, the abuse they have received.

At the Southern by-election next Saturday we will have the spectacle of strange bed-fellows in the member for Mitcham and the member for Flinders, whose Parties are working together. The member for Flinders has said all along that the L.C.L. sold country people down the drain; so it could not be said to represent that section of the community. However, his bed-fellow for next Saturday, the member for Mitcham, has said that the L.C.L. has sold city people down the drain so that it could give preference

to country people. The member for Mitcham argued that a coalition was better than a single Party. He pointed to the success of Sir Robert Menzies. There is no doubt about the 23 years of successful Government by the Liberal and Country Parties coalition. However, during that period there were not bitter attacks of the type made by the Country Party member for Flinders in his speech in this debate; in those years there was co-operation. To answer the member for Mitcham, we can point to the successful Government for more than 30 years of a single Party, the Liberal and Country League.

However, let us be honest; these sorts of comparison cannot be legitimately drawn. Personnel change; circumstances differ; the world may be suffering from depression or war. More than anything else we all know that no Party can expect to govern forever, nor should it wish to do so if democracy is to work. I do not wish to belong to a Party that would want to govern forever. I believe that a Party should fight to govern but not with the idea of denying others the opportunity to govern. The member for Mitcham spoke about making honourable decisions. I do not think that anything is much more dishonest than saying, "Let us split up and form two Parties so that we can come back and govern as one Party." Although that approach is completely dishonest, that is the sort of suggestion made by the members for Flinders and Mitcham. They say, "We will split up and then agree amongst ourselves; we will come together and try to do a bit of horse trading." I say that the only fair and proper way for a responsible group to achieve government is for it to meet in one Party room and settle the issues there. From then on, the public knows where a Party stands.

Another matter with which this trio (the members for Goyder, Mitcham, and Flinders) is connected is the motion moved by the member for Goyder with regard, to the French nuclear test, which I do not support. The Premier was willing to let the motion pass through the House if there was no debate. I accept the Premier's proposition as being fair if everyone was willing not to debate the motion, but I say definitely that I intended to speak if that motion was moved, unless people gagged me. I do not believe that a motion like that was the correct kind of motion. There are countries other than France with nuclear devices.

Australia lived under the protection of the umbrella of two countries that had nuclear devices. If war had broken out in previous years, we would have welcomed the opportunity of saying that we were under the nuclear umbrella of America and England. We have been hypocritical in saying to France that it should not develop a nuclear umbrella for itself. Really, we should have said that to the countries that already have nuclear devices—China, Russia, America and England. We should have told those countries to make nuclear material available to every other country that wanted it; that is the only way in which we can guarantee that there will never be another major war. During the Second World War poisonous gas and germ warfare were available to every nation and, consequently, those means of warfare were never used.

We should be worried not only about atmospheric tests but also about underground tests. I give the Prime Minister credit for attacking those connected with underground nuclear experiments, although I do not believe that the Commonwealth Government deserves much credit in connection with the nuclear controversy. The Commonwealth Government has reports from knowledgeable people on the likely effects of the French tests but it will not make those

reports available. Yet it says that it believes in open Government. There is certainly no open Government in that respect.

The member for Spence mentioned a newspaper article in which I referred to bludgers and parasites. I believe that at present we encourage such people. In the article I said that Australia was becoming a bludger's paradise, but I was not saying that everyone was a bludger or a parasite: I said that, for those who wished to bludge, Australia was becoming a bludger's paradise. The member for Murray referred to this situation. I can take people to homes in the Hills where up to eight persons live happily in a house while collecting unemployment relief payments. I believe that the unemployment relief payments are possibly not high enough for a person who genuinely finds it impossible to get work, but the problem we face relates to people who choose not to work. Such people are living not only on the tall poppies, to whom members opposite refer: they are living on the genuine workers in society. The Commonwealth Department of Social Security does not put a strict work test on them at all.

The point made in this debate was that I should not expect a man to work at a salary lower than that which he had received in the past. If everyone in the community had a university degree, it would be impossible to find for everyone a job appropriate to his degree, because there would simply be not enough work around in the field. If a person cannot get a job in the field to which he is accustomed, he should take a job elsewhere. The average man is willing to do that, but we have larger and larger sections of the community that are parasites.

The Commonwealth Government reduced the tariff protection by 25 per cent. I do not object to a gradual reduction in such protection, but I believe that a 25 per cent reduction in one hit was too severe. If the reduction had been gradual, the problem could have been solved without creating serious unemployment. Some workers, who have committed themselves to loan repayments, still need over-award payments and overtime as well as their normal salary, in order to meet their commitments. We all know that over-award payments will gradually be reduced, because the firms paying them will not be able to justify them before the Tariff Board; the same will apply to overtime payments. Not so many goods will be produced in this country because a greater quantity of imported products will be sold; consequently, not so much overtime will be worked in Australia. People will choose the products with the best price and the best performance. Australian products have not yet reached the stage of surpassing imported products in respect of quality and performance.

In connection with the increased spending in the public sector, I can see a large reduction in income tax collections by the Commonwealth Government in the manufacturing field not only from employees but also from companies. As a result, there will be less money for the Commonwealth Government to spend. At the same time, there is to be an increase in Government spending. The personnel of the Public Service of this State is increasing numerically at the rate of 7.8 per cent a year.

I believe that the Commonwealth Government is heading for real financial trouble because of its detrimental action in taking away income tax concessions under sections 77C and 77D of the Commonwealth Income Tax Assessment Act regarding the mining industry. As a result, people will not invest as much money in the mining industry as they have in the past. In Australia \$350,000,000 was spent from 1965 to 1971 directly on the

search for new mineral deposits. That expenditure turned up 52 new deposits of potential economic value, of which 29 can be considered to be viable. In other words, the average cost for each new operation was \$12,000,000. The sum of \$843,000,000 has been spent in the petroleum exploration industry, resulting in the discovery of six fields—an average of \$140,000,000 for each economic discovery. The Government's interference will stop much work and money being spent by oversea and Australian-owned companies, and I believe that, in the long term, this will be detrimental to Australia. One can refer to the Prime Minister's suggestion when he was in Mexico that he wanted plans to fix all prices and the rate of sale for every country in the world that produced ore. A report in the *Australian* of July 27 states:

Australia is seeking to negotiate international control of all mining contracts. It wants the major mineral-exporting countries to join together against the rest of the world in rationing ore sales at fixed prices.

That ambitious plan was suggested on July 27, 1973, but on the following day another report in the *Australian*, under the heading "Prime Minister backtracks on ore controls proposal", states:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) tonight acted to defuse his own proposal of 24 hours earlier calling for international control of the world's mining market.

The report continues:

The statement attempted to explain away the proposal as no more than Australia's support "wherever practicable" for measures already being adopted by other mineral-exporting countries. It suggests he is either concerned at the reaction of the Australian and Japanese mining industry or did not realize the impact of his remarks.

This is typical of the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Government: statements are being made that frighten people, because the Government has not completed research or given much thought to its proposals. Turning to another subject, I have no family interest in private schools. All my children have been, or are being, educated in State schools, but it amazes me that a Government that suggests it is concerned with people, places an across-the-board blanket over some schools because it believes that they have some assets. The member for Stuart suggested that the schools should sell their assets and use the money to supply facilities for the school, such as teaching aids and other assistance. Run down your assets and when you are broke we may help you: that is the attitude that has been suggested by the Commonwealth Labor Party, and the member for Stuart is the only member in either the Commonwealth or State Governments who has the courage to say it.

A person who wishes to send his child to a public or private school is entitled to at least some taxation concession in order to educate the child. In many average families the wife works, and they save and forgo luxuries in order to send the child to the school of their choice, but now no subsidy will be received through the school to help the child's education. In other words, the financial burden is to be placed on those who can least afford it. Concern has been expressed in my district about the lack of suitable transport facilities for children to attend schools. The terrain is rugged and climatic conditions are extreme, and a regulation concerning transport that may be satisfactory for a district with a mild climate may not necessarily be satisfactory in areas of the Adelaide Hills with a cold, wet winter.

Three miles is a long way to walk or ride a bike in wet conditions in a district with an annual average rainfall of 48in. (1 220mm). I should like the Minister of Education to reconsider the relevant regulation and bend it a little.

Some areas in the Adelaide Hills have no public transport and mothers take turns to transport their children to school. However, with mothers working, in some cases no-one can transport the children. I refer to the lack of school buildings in my district, and I hope that the Minister will increase the number of transportable units available until more permanent structures can be completed. A promise has been given by the Commonwealth Government to help pre-school children through grants for buildings. I hope this assistance will be substantial, because other members like me in developing areas realize that there is an extreme shortage of kindergartens.

It is important that these kindergartens be made available in outer-city areas and not be built in one or two areas only, so that other districts are not catered for. I commend those who work hard for kindergartens, often in communities without much affluence, as I believe committees in those areas deserve much credit for the work they do. The Minister of Education replied to a question by the member for Kavel (who is now overseas on Parliamentary business) about superannuation for teachers and the opportunity for a teacher to nominate retiring earlier than age 65 years. In his reply the Minister said that it did not matter about those few affected who had nominated to retire at 60 years but found that the Act denied the chance to retire at 60 years and that they must continue until the end of that year. I quote comments made to me by such a person who has been affected, who states:

It seems to me that the whole of the answer demonstrates:

1. An unwillingness to meet the terms of a contract, a contract that exists whatever the Minister may imply to the contrary;
2. A firm determination that no consideration whatever shall be given to the small number of teachers disadvantaged by the amendment of the Education Act;
3. A callous disregard for the moral principles involved in the honouring of existing contracts.

This latter I find particularly disturbing in view of the Government's stand on a variety of moral issues (so-called), and the general lowering of moral standards in the community, which trend, by his present attitude, the Minister followed.

This teacher has been in the profession for many years and entered into a contract with the Minister's department, but another Act of Parliament has denied him the benefits of that contract. I hope that the Minister will examine this matter and see what can be done to alter it so as to provide the original benefit when this teacher decides to retire.

Another area of concern in developing communities is that of sewerage, although there are many other areas of concern. Lack of sewerage facilities is a major problem, and it would be wrong if I did not refer to this problem in my area. The reason why some of the areas in the Hills urgently need sewerage facilities is that the poor soil is not able to absorb the effluent that passes through the septic systems. As a result, there are health and environmental problems, and the Government must find a solution to them soon. One of the problems we face is the inability of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to make up the leeway. The Government will either have to increase the number of departmental gangs or make existing plant work 16 or 24 hours, that is, three shifts, during summer, or let out some of the work to private contractors. If the work is let out to private contractors, the department must consider giving continuity of work to them, because of the expense involved in acquiring the timber used for shoring up the trenches.

A contractor might buy the timber for one contract and not secure another contract for some time, thereby making the venture uneconomic. The problem is mainly caused by the department's inability to make up the existing leeway. The Minister of Works, through his department, is establishing a small treatment works right in the middle of a residential section of the Stirling District Council area, and the lovely "crystal clear" effluent will flow down the Aldgate creek into the Mount Bold reservoir, the Minister asserting that this will not involve a health risk. Yet the effluent from the Bolivar treatment works cannot be used for growing vegetables, because departmental officers, through the Minister, have said that its use might cause health problems and might result in a virus epidemic. It is difficult to reconcile how a treatment plant at Stirling will put crystal clear water into a water supply for human consumption, whereas the Bolivar effluent is unfit to irrigate vegetables.

Dr. Tonkin: It's time they got things straightened out.

Mr. EVANS: The main reason for the establishment of the small temporary plant at Stirling is that, as a result of the Postmaster-General's Department and the Police Department erecting new buildings in the area, a hole has been drilled in the ground and the effluent was to be put there by means of a bore. However, the local people said that this might harm the bore water used for drinking purposes. Nearby houses will no doubt depreciate in value, and even though there may be smell and noise, the Minister has not guaranteed that the way of life of people in the area will not be interfered with. That is not fair.

Last financial year, \$400,000 was allocated for sewerage works in the Mitcham hills area. I am disappointed at this allocation, which I hope will be greater this financial year. The member for Mawson appears to have been promised that the work in several areas of his district will finish by 1975. I only wish that the people in my area could be given a similar assurance when the Loan Estimates and the Budget are introduced.

The lack of cottage homes for the aged in my area also concerns me. I fear that the application now being made by the Stirling community to have cottage homes for the aged built at Crafers will be rejected by the State Planning Authority. I find it difficult to believe that, in an area such as the Stirling council area, there appears to be no opportunity to build cottage homes for the aged unless they are made individual units on individual allotments. Some aged people who have lived in the area all their lives would no doubt prefer to stay in the same climate and with their same friends, not living in a large house that could be used by a younger family. We must provide cottage homes or flats for these people.

Regarding the Government's attempts to try to control land prices, I do not believe that there is any effective way of controlling the price of building allotments, except by creating many more of them. At present, there are applications to create about 11,000 allotments. However, it takes between 24 and 27 months from the time an application is made until the individual titles are allotted for each allotment. In other words, we have the ability to process between 5,000 and 7,500 allotments a year, yet we are building on about 9,000 allotments, and it will be increasing to 10,000 allotments within the next 1½ years. The method of processing applications is just not expeditious enough to keep up with present-day demands, let alone make up the leeway. As much as it may sound absurd, I believe that, if we are to limit the area of Adelaide and suburbs to what the Government has proposed,

it will be impossible to buy an allotment of land in the Adelaide metropolitan area in 1980.

If one looks at the number of allotments needed and at the number of homes being built, young couples will only have the choice of living in flats in Adelaide or at Monarto, or they may buy an old house that has been tised up, as the member for Unley said today, and such houses will become even more expensive. Regarding young couples of the future, we have made errors in our attitudes in the last five or six years. We have come to regard "subdivision" as a dirty word, but we have forgotten that people will need a block of land on which to build a house. Every time someone has mentioned subdivision, the answer has been, "No, don't do it. You must not subdivide, because it interferes with the environment." We must have well-planned towns and suburbs, and with them will come allotments. We must promote the idea that subdivisions are important in keeping down the price of allotments.

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

Mr. EVANS: I wish now to refer to the large increases in land valuations made by the Valuer-General to allotments in my district. I shall give some examples, and it must be remembered that the Premier is advocating an increase of no more than 7 per cent annually in the price of these allotments, yet the Valuer-General is placing a value on allotments that is far greater than this figure. The land valuation on one unimproved allotment at July 1, 1970, was \$15,000, and on April 24, 1973, the Valuer-General valued that property at \$22,400, an increase of about 50 per cent in three years. The unimproved value placed on another allotment at July 1, 1970, was \$3,100, yet on April 24, 1973, the unimproved value was \$5,000. This increase is far in excess of the increase stated by the Premier as being acceptable to his Government. In another instance, I have received a letter from a constituent who receives only a small income and who states:

In view of the fact that I have heard some vague statements about Mr. Dunstan's (talk only) attempts to stabilize land prices, I would like to ask about my case. I have just received my land tax assessment with a jump of \$2,200 in unimproved value in two years. So much for his Government's talk.

He then said in what a difficult position this increase placed him and his family in meeting their commitments, because of the current high cost of living. When one talks about controlling the unimproved value of allotments in this State, one must ask the Valuer-General to take the same matters into consideration in making his valuation.

Many people who have entered politics and many people in the community have at different times referred to censorship. In recent years there has been a tendency to say that censorship is not necessary. In this regard I refer to an article in the Melbourne *Herald* of July 26, 1973, in which it was reported that Judge Arthur Adams had stated the following:

I have the unpleasant task of trying to equate this crime in a community which allows crime to be portrayed as something pleasurable and entertaining.

The headline of that report was "We let films poison young, says judge", and the report states:

A community prepared to let pictures depicting violence and rape poison the minds of its young, could not expect judges to disregard its free thinking, Judge Arthur Adams said in the County Court today. A youth pleaded guilty to a charge of having raped a 16-year-old girl at East Kew on March 23 this year, with mitigating circumstances. Judge Adams said the girl was drunk and unconscious at the time.

The report continues:

Judge Adams said, "This is a shocking case and the reference to *A Clockwork Orange* does not help the matter

much. This community is prepared to let pictures depicting violence, rape, sex and all the rest of it poison the minds of the young, and then expects judges to forget that the community is so free-thinking and restless of censorship. I have the unpleasant task of trying to equate this crime in a community which allows crime to be portrayed as something pleasurable and entertaining. This picture has been described by judges all over the English-speaking world as a cause triggering young men to violence, but the community accepts it. It is the younger generation, not the older generation, who should be protected from it and from the whole gamut of encouraging drinking by allowing them to be seduced by advertisements," Judge Adams said.

An English judge was also referred to in that article, and he took a similar approach. There is no doubt that, if we are to start banning the advertising of cigarettes, Parliamentarians must accept the responsibility of taking action regarding the advertising of alcoholic beverages. I believe that alcohol is just as great a health hazard to the community in the long term as is smoking.

Other speakers have referred to the Commonwealth Government's proposed health scheme, and I support the sentiments that have been expressed by members on this side, that this is just another move to take away in the long term the individual's freedom of choice. No doubt this is also true of the policy of this Government, which believes that we should have a society completely controlled by bureaucracy, and that we should be told who to consult for medical advice and which hospital a patient should attend. My district is fortunate in having two community hospitals (one at Blackwood and one at Stirling), and I believe that the community works hard to keep them. Members of the community appreciate the service that is given, and much hostility would be shown toward any Government, whatever its colour, if it set out to take over the control of either or both of those hospitals. The Hills community appreciates this service, and I am sure that it wishes to retain it. The doctors within our community are respected, give good service, and, if a person cannot afford to pay for treatment, they treat such a person accordingly. Indeed, that has been the approach that general practitioners have made for as long as I can remember. The family doctor has become part of the home. People have learnt to have confidence in their doctor as well as in the services provided by the community hospitals.

Recently the member for Mawson directed a question to the Minister of Environment and Conservation asking for a ranger to be made available to protect and control the Hallett Cove area. I now ask the same thing of the Minister regarding the Sturt Gorge. I hope that a ranger can be allocated to that area to protect that environment and, as I know this area also encroaches on the district of the member for Mawson, I hope he will support my request.

Finally, I refer to the fact that members of the Hills community have in the past suffered from the effects of the encroachment of major roads. Indeed, the concern of members of the community has been such that a public meeting on this matter was held and over 300 people attended. A committee was appointed to make certain recommendations to the Government of the day and also to investigate any new proposals. One proposal deals with a road to connect the Hackham and Morphett Vale area to the new Monarto site. We have invited two people from the progress association in the member for Mawson's district to join our Hills road committee. I should now like to describe briefly the route that we believe the road could follow, leaving a spot between Hackham and Morphett Vale, heading due east over the range

to the Onkaparinga River and using the wall of the proposed Baker Gully reservoir as the cross-over point for the main road. From there it could go to the fringes of Kangarilla, so that it does not interfere with the township, to Meadows, again skirting around the town, in towards Strathalbyn and out towards Woodchester and Monarto. By this method there would be no interference by the traffic to road construction. We would take the road to the lower part of the range where there would not be so much fog and it would be safer to travel; there would be not so much wet weather and the gradients would not be so steep. It would give an access road to the southern area of metropolitan Adelaide and at the same time give a connecting link through Wellington to what the Premier describes as our "green triangle"—Mount Gambier, Millicent and Naracoorte. In the long term, this would be the best route for a main arterial road to take, without interfering with the densely populated area of the Hills or the foothills. I commend the committee for the work it has done on that project and wish it success.

The Hills happen to be a wonderful place in which to live. It is not only nature's creation: much of the beauty has been created by man, and the thanks for that beauty that has been created must go to the older residents of the Hills and the pioneers, who in some cases who have passed on. To the older people of the Hills we must say, "Thanks for what you have done." At the same time I pay a tribute to all the voluntary organizations working in the smaller and bigger Hills communities in respect of fire protection, raising funds for worthy community activities and sporting organizations, and to all the voluntary helpers who have worked in that field, whether participating in competitive sport, bushwalking or any other club activity. Voluntary help is what makes our society what it is. I hope more people will be prepared to make their time available as leaders of groups.

Last but not least, I should like at this late stage to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment as Speaker. I know we shall find you fair and co-operative at all times.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. EVANS: I also congratulate our new Clerk on his appointment after our previous Clerk's promotion to Ombudsman, which gives me some satisfaction because I know that our Ombudsman will be able to help with some problems that I cannot solve myself. I support the motion.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I have pleasure in supporting the motion. I also have great pleasure in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your high office. Like other members, I regret the circumstances that brought about your election—the untimely death of the former Speaker, the Hon. Reg Hurst. However, I share what I believe is universal respect for the impartiality and efficiency you have made so manifest since occupying this office.

In my maiden speech in a similar debate three years ago, I mentioned that the supporters of my Party, who had worked so long and loyally to overcome the gerrymander, would take pleasure from the long list of progressive measures set out in His Excellency's Speech at that time. I can now say that they would not have been disappointed. The Fortieth Parliament was the hardest working, most productive and most progressive that this State has ever had. No wonder the Government was swept back into office this year with the cry "South Australia is doing well with Labor". And that was the reason for the Government's victory. There was no need to dwell on the schisms that developed in a Liberal Party that was unable

to stand unsupported by a dishonest, undemocratic electoral system, unable to show the unity of purpose necessary to fight back, and unable to overcome the conflicting sectional and personal interests inherent in its organization.

If the Fortieth Parliament was good for South Australia, the Forty-first will be even better. Already, if I may borrow a quotation, the tattered white flag of the Liberal and Country League has been hauled down in utter capitulation over the basic issue of democracy for the Upper House. His Excellency's Speech adumbrated legislation further to protect the environment, to develop comprehensive welfare schemes and services on a decentralized basis, to improve the Workmen's Compensation Act and to widen consumer protection—all areas in which this State already leads the nation. Further massive expenditure on hospitals, schools, highway construction, power generation, and housing is promised. Obviously, in the next three years South Australia will do even better with Labor.

Three years ago I drew attention to the crisis that existed in education, and I listed the many areas in which our education system was woefully inadequate. Although there are still grave deficiencies, this State has had its most capable, energetic and enlightened Minister of Education ever. His recognition that there was a crisis, plus the continuous generous support of a sympathetic Cabinet, have done much to ease the crisis. His Excellency in his Speech pointed out that in the last year alone the school building programme rose to a record new level of \$29,770,000. In the last year of the previous L.C.L. Government, it was \$15,500,000, so this expenditure increased by 92 per cent in three years. Current expenditure on all education in the same time rose from \$82,160,000 to an estimated \$137,800,000 in the last financial year (I do not know the full figure at this stage), or by more than two-thirds. But it is not only in expenditure that education has seen major advances. A new Education Act and Acts relating to the University of Adelaide, the Institute of Technology and colleges of advanced education have brought major improvements in the structure of our education system. A Further Education Bill is to give full legal status to this most important and expanding area of education, which has already enjoyed massive support from this Government. So also has the kindergarten movement, and I am happy to see that, with Australian Labor Party Commonwealth Government aid, considerable emphasis is to be placed on the provision of kindergartens in less affluent areas. Three years ago I drew attention to the grave lack of these facilities in the poorer localities, and I hope there will be a marked improvement in parts of my electoral district in this forthcoming Parliament.

I also spoke of the deleterious effects of the subsidy system, and I congratulate the Minister on the abolition of this scheme, which favoured schools in wealthier districts, so widening the gap in education opportunities, which is so deplorable a feature of our society. I welcome all the moves being made to ensure that standards of education are raised to an acceptable level for all parts of the community rather than giving additional aid to people who already enjoy considerable educational and social advantages.

In 1970 I drew attention to the lack of adequate provision to meet the special needs of migrant children. That is a very real problem in my district, where there are large Greek and Italian minority groups. Again, with Commonwealth Government assistance and a sympathetic Minister, much has been done to improve this situation in the last three years. All in all, there have been great advances in



education during the term of the present Minister. Nevertheless, I am sure he would be the first to agree that much remains to be done. With the help of an Australian Government with a sensible set of priorities, I am sure he will continue to overcome these deficiencies.

I should like now to comment on one of the areas of greatest concern to supporters of democracy, and particularly of Parliamentary democracy. I refer to the continued growth, power and influence of bureaucracy. The ever-increasing complexity of Government in a technological age inevitably leads to greater reliance by Ministers on the experts or administrators largely beyond the reach of the people. As a democrat, I therefore applaud any action to curb and control the power of the bureaucracy. In South Australia we are well served by our Public Service, but nevertheless it is inherent in the nature of bureaucracy, particularly where it is not subject to any public control, that abuse, waste and inefficiency will develop.

In theory, in the Westminster system a Minister is responsible for all that happens in his department. Mr. C. J. Hurford, M.P., then Vice-Chairman and now Chairman of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Joint Committee of Public Accounts, in a paper to the Royal Institute of Public Administration in April, 1972, said, in dealing with the question of Ministerial responsibility:

The doctrine of Ministerial responsibility has variously been labelled by different commentators "a hoary old myth", "antiquated", "impracticable", "obsolete", "disregarded", and "irrelevant". G. Caiden, for instance, in his paper entitled *The political role of Commonwealth bureaucracy in public administration* maintains that the "doctrine of Ministerial responsibility does not recognize any distinction between policy and administration. It holds the Minister responsible for all departmental actions whether or not he knows personally about them".

This responsibility is obviously unrealistic, and Ministers can do little more in connection with administration other than take whatever steps are possible to ensure efficiency and honesty and welcome the existence of outside checks, such as the Auditor-General, the Public Service Board, the Treasury and the Public Accounts Committee, which act as independent watchdogs on the activities of their departments.

Two most important steps have been taken in South Australia in the past two years to help Ministers control the vast bureaucratic machines for which they are responsible. I refer, first, to the Public Accounts Committee, set up at the beginning of this Parliament. Its existence is a tribute to the Parliamentary zeal and persistence of the member for Mallee. On two previous occasions he had attempted to get the approval of Parliament for the idea of a public accounts committee, first by a motion and then by a private member's Bill. I understand that both moves to maintain Parliamentary control were frustrated by those self-professed guardians of democracy in another place. However, the honourable member's persistence eventually paid off, and the Bill became law. The fact that it did so is also a tribute to the Australian Labor Party Government, which supported it unreservedly and which kept the pressure on another place to make it more responsive to public democratic influences.

I believe that the Ministers whose departmental operations may be investigated by the committee are to be congratulated on their willingness to allow their departments to be subjected to this scrutiny as well as on their realistic acceptance of the assistance they will receive from the committee. I go on record as saying that I believe the committee will be moved by a desire not to conduct witch-hunts but to assist in providing efficient and economic administration, which it will do fearlessly in the public interest.

The public accounts committees now operating in many Parliaments within the British Commonwealth all owe their origin to a committee that has existed in Britain since 1861, five years before even the Comptroller and Auditor-General was first appointed in that country. They represent, therefore, a long-standing attempt by Parliament to keep some control over public expenditure. Probably the most effective public accounts committee in Australia is that established in 1895 by the then Colony of Victoria. A joint Commonwealth committee was established in 1913 but, strange to relate, it was suspended as an economy measure in 1932, which one might think would be just the appropriate time to step up its activities. However, the committee was revived in September, 1952, and it has operated with great success since then. I had the pleasure of observing it in action last week under the chairmanship of Mr. Hurford. In the session I attended the committee dealt with the loss of public moneys paid as rent for premises in Adelaide leased by the Commonwealth and not promptly occupied. The loss of rent was about \$100,000 because of delays in taking occupation of those premises.

A paper issued by the Training Section of the Commonwealth Public Service Board gives a good indication of the role of the Commonwealth committee, and I shall quote from that paper to illustrate how the committee complements the work of other authorities. Under the heading "Constitutional framework", the paper states:

To make a proper appraisal of the functions and work of the committee it should be examined in the context of the other controlling agencies, that is, the Treasury, the Audit Office and the Public Service Board, operating within the constitutional framework of the Commonwealth. That is so, partly because the committee is one of the more recent agencies to appear on the scene, but mainly because the functions it has been given assume the existence and proper functioning of these other controlling agencies.

The functions and consequent relations between the four agencies concerned were outlined by Emeritus Professor F. A. Bland at the first public hearing of the reconstituted Public Accounts Committee, in February, 1953. He said:

There are three main instrumentalities concerned with the administration of public finance. First, there is the Treasury which has to safeguard the volume of expenditure to which the departments wish to commit the Government. Then there is the Auditor-General who is concerned with the honest expenditure of public funds and, particularly in recent years, with ensuring that funds are used for the purpose for which they are voted and for no other purpose . . .

The third instrumentality is the Public Service Board which is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the various Government departments shall be so efficiently organized that the funds voted by the Parliament may be economically expended and full value obtained in return. These are the three existing agencies.

In the South Australian context, I look forward to the existence of a fourth agency, the Ombudsman, to whom I shall refer later. Last week, for example, in the Commonwealth inquiry one area investigated was the late payment of accounts, which was a source of considerable irritation and loss to outside private contractors, who were waiting an unconscionable time for money from Government departments. I noticed in Melbourne on Monday last, on my way home, that the Victorian Public Accounts Committee had also had to undertake a similar investigation. Obviously, this is an area where the Ombudsman may be called on to remedy an injustice on application by individuals. However, if the Public Accounts Committee can make a general investigation of the matter and bring in proper procedures to ensure that these delays do not occur, it will be doing much work that the Ombudsman might otherwise have to do. Professor Bland's comments, as quoted in this paper, continue:

The Public Accounts Committee comes in now as a fourth agency and its establishment should be regarded as an indication by the Parliament that it is not altogether satisfied that, even with the three existing agencies, sufficient care is taken to ensure that Parliament shall have a real control of the purse. We have decided to adapt our procedure to that followed by the House of Commons and, in consequence, we shall have, as the British Public Accounts Committee has, the assistance of the Auditor-General or his representative. On occasions we shall, of necessity, rely very heavily on the Public Service Board.

Professor Bland had much to do with the setting up and successful inauguration of the Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee in 1953.

Mr. Coumbe: He was a member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, I believe he was actually the first Chairman of the committee. The paper continues:

Because it is created directly by the Parliament, the Public Accounts Committee is analogous to the Auditor-General and the Public Service Board, and falls into a different category from the Treasury. Basically, however, the committee is unlike those three bodies, for it is a committee of the Parliament itself and exercises the powers of the Parliament.

What does the fact that it is a committee of the Parliament mean for the way in which the Public Accounts Committee functions? To answer that, it is necessary to be clear as to the nature of the control exercised by the Parliament. Parliamentary control is of an order quite different from the control exercised by the Executive. Parliament controls by criticism, not by directive. Criticism is the very basis of democracy. Said John Stewart Mill:

The proper office of Parliament is to watch and control the Government, to throw the light of publicity on its acts, to compel a full exposition and justification of all of them, which anyone considers questionable, to censure them if found to merit condemnation.

What Parliament has felt is that its control of the Cabinet (which, from one point of view, can be regarded as a very special kind of Parliamentary committee) is not sufficiently direct for it to be sure that it retains an appropriate hold of the purse-strings. There are two ways in which the Parliament exercises financial control over public expenditure. One way is through criticism of the Government at the time when annual departmental estimates are before it. The other way in which the Parliament exercises control is by its scrutiny of the moneys expended by departments from funds voted to them.

This is one of the functions of the Public Accounts Committee. The paper concludes as follows:

In recent years there has been a substantial growth in the complexity of Government and its administration generally. In these circumstances, the Parliament requires techniques for questioning the use of Executive power, so as to avoid the dangers of Government behind closed doors and to seek more and better occasions for ensuring that the Executive justifies its policies, decisions and actions. It appears that Parliamentary committees have much to offer in promoting the role of the Parliament if we accept that, in essence, Parliamentary control means influence, not direct power; advice, not command; criticism, not obstruction; scrutiny, not initiative; and publicity, not secrecy.

Within the Australian Commonwealth sphere, the growth in the complexity of Government in recent years has been accompanied by a considerable expansion of the Commonwealth Public Service and statutory authorities under Commonwealth control. In these circumstances, the scope for administrative complacency, inertia, and mismanagement is greatly increased. The existence of the Public Accounts Committee, since 1952, has brought the Commonwealth Public Service into a position of effective Parliamentary scrutiny and has also provided a healthy forum for the direct exchange of views and ideas between the Parliament and the Public Service.

I believe that those comments can be applied just as appropriately to the Public Service in South Australia. I hope that the committee, which is about to commence its existence, will carry out these functions here as well as the Commonwealth committee has carried out its functions.

I wish to express my appreciation of the fact that this Legislature has given to the Public Accounts Committee the same status as that held by the old-established and prestigious Public Works Committee. The remuneration of members is the same, the committee having the same wide-ranging powers. I believe this is appropriate, for the Public Accounts Committee has in many ways even greater responsibility than has the Public Works Committee. The Public Works Committee operates as a result of references from the Minister on certain projects, such as schools or hospitals, that serve an obvious social need. On the other hand, the Public Accounts Committee has, under section 13 (d) of the Act, the responsibility, *inter alia*, "to inquire into and report to the House of Assembly on any question in connection with the public accounts of the State (1) on its own initiative". That is a very wide-ranging power. Moreover, it must operate in a delicate area where there is already an implied failure or weakness in administration, and where a clear distinction must be made by the committee between policy, which is the prerogative of the Cabinet, and administration. The Public Service Board has indirectly recognized the equal importance of the committee by fixing salary ranges for its officers that are the same as those of the Public Works Committee officers.

In the Commonwealth and Victorian Parliaments the same situation applies. Indeed, until recently in Canberra the Public Accounts Committee officers were more highly paid than were the Public Works Committee officers. In Western Australia a Public Accounts Committee was set up last year, and I am assured that it is working to the complete satisfaction of the Parliament. At this stage Western Australia does not have a Public Works Committee. It will probably cost \$30,000 a year for the committee to function; the salaries of the two officers will amount to \$16,000 a year. I earnestly hope that the \$30,000 will be repaid many times over to the public purse through the savings that the committee will produce. I shall be only too delighted if at the end of this session the number of cases that have to be brought to the attention of the Public Accounts Committee by the Auditor-General has diminished to a stage where the committee is left with nothing to do. I believe that an inevitable result of setting up the committee will be an improvement in the efficiency of the Public Service.

The second development which has taken place within the last two years and which I personally welcome is the passing of the Ombudsman Act. This legislation followed the passing of a motion moved by the member for Fisher, as a private member. He is to be congratulated on taking the initiative in this regard. I am in an unusual position, since so far I have complimented two Opposition members, the member who spoke before me and the member who will speak after me. However, I believe in giving credit where credit is due. When the motion regarding the desirability of having an Ombudsman was put to the House, 12 members (some L.C.L., some L.C.L. reconditioned and one L.M.) opposed it. On the other hand, all Government members supported the motion and the subsequent legislation that the Government was pleased to introduce. I believe they are to be congratulated on providing this further check on the operations of the bureaucracy. The terms of this legislation give the

Ombudsman extremely wide powers. In addition to all Government departments, a long list of public authorities, ranging from the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Advisory Board to the Wheat Delivery Quota Contingency Reserve Committee, come within the ambit of the Ombudsman.

A surprising omission, which I understand is due to a legal technicality, is the University of Adelaide, although the Flinders University, the Institute of Technology and all the colleges of advanced education are covered by the terms of the Act. A further most desirable provision in our Act that does not appear in Acts in other places is that councils may be brought within the purview of the Ombudsman. Provision has thus been made for a person who believes that he has been unjustly treated by any one of a wide range of administrative bodies to take his complaint to an independent arbitrator with the assurance that it will be adequately investigated. At this stage, I place on record, my belief that the Government made an admirable choice in appointing as Ombudsman Mr. Gordon Combe, who served this House with distinction and impartiality for so many years.

I turn now to another area in which the Government has made a substantial contribution toward upgrading the status of Parliament as an institution. In my first speech after entering this House in 1970 I commented on the shockingly inadequate facilities provided for members. At that time office accommodation was disgracefully scarce and in most cases inferior. For a time seven members had to share one room. There were only two interviewing rooms for 47 members; we have not improved much on that situation since then. There were only four typistes to give secretarial help to more than 50 back-benchers. Under those conditions it was impossible for members to provide the best type of service to constituents and to carry out their Parliamentary duties at a satisfactory standard. The fact that there were four secretaries and as many billiard tables in 1970 was a fair indication of the status assigned to members of Parliament during the long years of one-man rule in this State.

In the intervening period the Government has made a major improvement in this respect. Secretarial help was progressively increased, and in April of this year Cabinet decided to provide offices for members within their districts, together with appropriate secretarial help, so that they could be more accessible to their constituents and at the same time be given the necessary assistance to enable them to discharge their Parliamentary duties adequately. I believe that this service is greatly appreciated by the people in the district. There has been some improvement in the facilities provided within the House and some promise that the services will be upgraded to a reasonable minimum standard, which will still fall below that normally accepted nowadays in the Public Service and commerce. However, as I say, there has been a major improvement in the facilities available to members, and this can only have the effect of improving their performance as Parliamentary representatives of the people.

I should like to comment on many items in His Excellency's Speech but, as the list of Bills of which notice has been given today indicates that this session will be very productive, there will be plenty of opportunity during the session to deal with that legislation. I conclude by expressing my pleasure at the terms of His Excellency's Speech. I support the motion.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): One of my colleagues asked me a moment ago for how long was I going to speak roughly, and I said, "Probably for most of the time." I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the

motion, but at the same time I should like to warn the member for Whyalla, because it seems to me that the member for Elizabeth is hand in glove with many of the

women in the Whyalla District; that is a critical situation in which to find oneself. More seriously, I congratulate the

seconder, the member for Semaphore, a quiet man, as was his predecessor, who concentrated on matters relating to his district.

I join with other members in expressing my sympathy to the widow and the family of the late Reg Hurst, a kindly and considerate man who was held in high respect by all members. We mourn his passing, as we mourn the passing of other members from our ranks. The late Harry Kemp from another House was also a very good friend of mine. He was a family man, an expert horticulturist, a dedicated Party man, and a very loyal friend. I extend my sympathy to his widow and family in their bereavement.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on having attained your high office, which I hold in very high respect in any Parliament. I consider that the functioning of the House depends on the authority that is exercised from the Chair, and I commend you for the actions you have already taken and for the policies you have enunciated from the Chair. I believe that under your leadership and guidance this House will function effectively and properly in accordance with our Standing Orders. I should like to comment on the speech of the member for Adelaide with respect to one aspect, Question Time. As an executive member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I have attended sittings of many Parliaments in the world, and I am certain that very few members realize the privilege extended to members of the South Australian

Parliament. No other Parliament that I know of allows the same latitude and the same length of time for members

to ask questions without notice as does this Parliament.

Mr. Jennings: That is a good reason why Question Time should not be abused, as it is now.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The honourable member has anticipated me, as usual; I agree with him. It is a good reason why we should not abuse it but should respect it. If we do not respect the privilege I have referred to, we will have no-one to blame but ourselves if the Standing Orders Committee changes the form and function of Question Time in this House. I am very critical of the member for Mitcham for the action he took this week in placing 20

Questions on Notice. I believe that this is abusing the privilege of Question Time, and it is most regrettable that such action was taken.

In passing, I refer to the member for Goyder. I have been a member in this House with him for 15 years, but I begin to wonder how such a little man achieved such

heights. I think the honourable member was summed up precisely by Shakespeare when, in *Julius Caesar*, he penned these words to be spoken by Caesar:

Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look; He thinks too much: such men are dangerous . . .

I say no more. I thank the member for Peake for the kindly references he made about the interest I have shown in establishing the Public Accounts Committee. I hope, and share with him the wish, that the committee will be established and will function as he hopes it will: as a means of streamlining the function of bureaucracy and placing a curb on the action of bureaucracy through a committee under the control of this House, a committee that has had tremendous powers vested in it by this House. Its purpose is to act in the best interests of this House in ensuring that people employed in the Public Service of this State

work as effectively and as efficiently as we consider they should.

About 15 years ago, when I became a member of this House, one of the topics I spoke about was one that is still of current interest—the Coorong. At that time I drew attention to the fact that, although this was a unique area, we in South Australia were ignoring what could be, and what will be I hope, one of the best nature areas available, perhaps not in the world, but certainly in Australia and a region that I believe will provide not only a source of interest but also an area for recreation for coming generations, provided that we act before it is too late to preserve some of its unique features. When one looks back in history, one realizes that many mistakes have been made and, unfortunately, many of them are perpetrated in good faith. However, far too many are continued without question, and one of the errors of judgment that has been perpetuated until recently has been the design and plan of the drainage of the South-East of South Australia.

The original concept of drainage in the South-East was to take water off the land as quickly as possible in order for it to be made arable for agriculture. I say “agriculture”, because the original concept was considered in 1910-11, when the plans were conceived. At that stage no-one in his fondest imagination could foresee that the South-East of South Australia could be such a fertile area with permanent pasture carrying as much stock as it carries today and able to keep on carrying even greater numbers. Because of its water resources, we believed it capable of carrying a large population, possibly in another decentralized city that might be constructed in the future.

However, one of the tragedies of the drainage system was that it interfered with the natural balance of the Coorong. Whereas the northern end near the mouth has not changed greatly in nature over time, the southern end of the Coorong has changed dramatically as a result of fresh waters that originally ran into it being cut off by a system of man-made drains. I do not wish to say any more on that aspect, because much has already been said. Work has been done by Dr. Noye and Professor Radok working at the Horace Lamb Oceanographic Research Unit of Flinders University. Subsequently, I believe as a result of the matter being referred to me by some of my friends on the Coorong Preservation Committee, Dr. Noye now wishes to continue his studies on the tidal movements at the northern end of the Coorong. I draw the Minister's attention to this statement in the hope that, if money is required for the project (and it is considered a reasonable request) in order to gain additional knowledge about the area, it will be provided to establish metering points and check points on the movement of water at the northern end.

Concerning the southern end, when I was Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, one of its last exercises was to inquire into Bool Lagoon, which is now a most interesting area. It is a game reserve and waters in it are controlled. I believe there have been some problems relating to water regulating and management, but one of the important things about which I became aware immediately was that, once the Bool Lagoon outlet (Drain M) was constructed, water no longer flowed northward. That drain from Bool Lagoon to Beachport intersects Baker Range drain, the original natural drain running from south to north and emptying into the Coorong at Salt Creek. Once Drain M intercepted the flow of waters from the catchment area of Mount Burr that flowed north along Baker Range drain, and also immediately diverted to the sea the waters of Mosquito Creek, which has one of the largest flows of water into South Australia, the movement

of water northward no longer continued, except for private drains that have been constructed to extend Naracoorte Creek drainage into Baker Range drain at a far more northerly point in the area of the hundred of Marcollat.

If it were not for the Naracoorte Creek waler, there would be little, if any, water running northward into the swamp country at the back of the Coorong east of Cantara and Salt Creek.

Mr. Arnold: It hasn't helped the wildlife.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I agree with my colleague that this has been a disaster for wildlife conservation, because, immediately this natural drainage was cut off, the areas that had been subject to flooding and had been natural areas for bird life and conservation dried up sufficiently for landholders to develop them. However, not only are we confronted with the position of having cut off the flow of water to the Coorong (and in so doing having destroyed the natural drainage into that area) but, by not having acted sooner, we find ourselves in the position where we now have to deal with landholders who have developed and are stocking land that was previously undeveloped drainage areas.

I say advisedly that it is not too late, but the \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 suggested as being the sum necessary to redirect the South-East drainage waters into the Coorong would be for an engineer's exercise and possibly related to intercepting already constructed drains in the Western Division. Most of the water is in the Eastern Division and that division is still an area with considerable run-off and catchment. Because the major drain in the Eastern Division is the Baker Range drain (which could still be developed), I believe that if action was taken to install control gates on the outlet from Baker Range drain into Drain M, to divert water northward from the Mount Burr area, to collect water from Mosquito Creek and from Naracoorte Creek, and to direct these waters northward on the old natural drainage water course, it would still be possible to put considerable water into the Coorong and in some measure balance the natural situation that we interrupted when we constructed drainage in the South-East in order to make land arable for closer settlement by soldier settlers. These things were done at a time when the paramount interest was, first, to get rid of the water, and, secondly in 1947, to get rid of as much water as possible so that blocks for soldier settlement could be made small and compact. These were possibly good motives at the time, but we must consider this matter in a much broader sense now. It is still not too late to do something to make use of the natural drainage waters in the Eastern Division to help restore the balance in the Coorong.

I now turn to another matter which has been of considerable interest to the House and which also came before the Land Settlement Committee when I was a member of it, namely, the question of the Crown lands area in County Chandos, the tiger country south of the Pinnaroo line and east of the main line between Tailam Bend and Bordertown. I recall the considerable pressure on me, as member for the district, and on the Government of the day to have this land opened up for closer settlement. The Government went so far as to undertake a land utilization survey of the total area of the Crown lands, and the results of that survey are available. In addition, the Lands Department moved on the eastern fringe of this area to create the hundreds of Quirke and Fisk and to carry out subdivision in the hundred of Fisk. I believe that some of this subdivided land has still not been developed, basically because the Lands Department's requirements were that the developer must satisfy the

department that he had the necessary finance to undertake the economic development of this country, which is not easy to develop. For three years or more the whole matter went into what we could call limbo.

No-one worried about it. In fact, some people said to me, "I think it is a good thing that development was not proceeded with, because there may have been many people who, out of their enthusiasm to obtain land and develop it, would have found themselves in financial difficulties because of the agricultural recession". The reason I raise this matter is that I noticed in the *Pinnaroo Border Times* of August 2 the heading "Lameroo wants Crown lands scheme revived". I point out that this matter will be raised again and that the Government must decide on the future of that area as to whether there will be any further development or whether a substantial area of it will be proclaimed as some form of reserve or wilderness area. Some of this land is capable of economic development, but much of it is marginal land, except during periods such as we are now enjoying, when there is a high return per acre (.405 ha) from agriculture, provided that people have surplus moneys to invest. However, during the period we have just gone through, had some of this land been developed the results could have been catastrophic. The Government must make a decision in view of the change in the economic climate in rural areas, because pressure will again be brought on me, while I am a member, and on the Government to have this area reviewed for subdivision, and, if it is thought fit, to have areas of it opened up for further development and settlement.

In this context, I point out that a road was constructed south of Lameroo as part of the original development project. The road goes to within about seven miles (11 km) of the southern boundary of the Lameroo council area. I think that the road is about 17 miles (27 km) short of completing a through road from Lameroo to the bitumen road that runs east from Keith to join with the Pinnaroo-Bordertown road. In other words, the road is about 30 miles (48 km) in length, but it goes nowhere and serves no purpose. The road, which cost \$80,000 or more to construct, is not used for two reasons: first, as the development was not proceeded with, it would have been an access road; and, secondly, because it does not interlink with any other road. I believe that a decision must be made on the future of this road.

Mr. Coumbe: Does the road go from A to B?

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, from L (Lameroo) to K (Keith). The road would cut off a considerable travelling distance for people moving from, say, Lameroo and wanting to go to the South-East. I am concerned at the high rate of turnover of Highways Department engineers. During the 15 years I have been member for the district there have been six highway engineers representing what is now the department's Eastern Division. It seems to me that every one of those engineers had different views on road construction. Acting with what appeared to be autonomous authority, one engineer would promote one idea, whereas another engineer would later promote a different idea, so we found some most unfortunate happenings.

First, we have the Meningie-Narrung road. I remember attending a public meeting at Narrung in 1968 at which the people present had to decide whether the people from Narrung wanted a sealed road back to Meningie or a sealed road through Poltulloch station to join Princes Highway between Meningie and Tailem Bend. The meeting decided that most people would support the construction and completion of the road from Narrung to Meningie.

A five-year plan was drawn up for the sealing and completion of the road. Although that five years is up, there is still about 14 miles (22 km) of unsealed road. The grant of money allocated this year was \$30,000, which I understand will complete an additional two miles (3.22 km) of the road. On this basis, it will be another seven years before the road is completed. This is one of those changes in policy that is most disturbing to local people: they decided; they were given an assurance; that assurance no longer exists; and the position now is not much better than it was before they started making representations in 1968.

I should now like to refer to the Lameroo-Karoonda road (Main Road 245) on which reconstruction work has been in progress for as long as I can remember. At one stage the council undertook what it considered to be the reasonable programme of stage construction, intending to complete up to three miles (4.828 km) of the road annually, but doing the work properly. However, this road is in difficult country, with clay, there being no limestone, so the road can be most sticky and dangerous. Wet weather makes such roads very slippery.

Progress on this project was proceeding well until a new engineer was appointed to the area. He believed that this project should be done on a piece-meal basis and that about 20 miles (32 km) of sub-base construction was required in one hit. The council was obliged to follow this instruction and formed a road to sub-base standard from the clay base which, because of the crown formation, left a road especially dangerous in wet weather. One serious accident occurred on the road and action was taken against the council. Unfortunately for the family, but fortunately for the council, the person concerned died before her claim could be laid against the council.

I have heard of many other minor accidents in which cars had rolled over on that road, and now work is being undertaken to upgrade the sub-base and seal it. Had the work proceeded six years ago under the direction of the engineer who directed that the sub-base be constructed for 20 miles, the construction of the road would now be complete. Soon after the road had been brought up to the sub-base standard, that engineer was moved on and replaced by another engineer, a man with completely different ideas. People in the area therefore go along in this unhappy situation of having people with autonomous authority, but differing ideas giving different instructions, the end result being chaos.

I now refer to the northern part of my district, which is an area incorporating a wide range of interests. Although my district is the third largest electoral district in South Australia, notwithstanding the fact that there are others larger it is probably the most complex to represent because of its diversity of interests. I refer to the *Murray Pioneer* of August 2 and the report under the heading "Citrus Industry Opposition to Tariff Cuts". Mr. D. Andary, (Chairman of Berri Fruit Juices) is reported as making the following comment on the tariff cuts:

The tariff reduction of 25 per cent on citrus juices would reduce the import duty by about six cents per single strength gallon. This in itself is not significant, but it has been drawn to the attention of industrial users of juice that the imported products could be of interest. Imported juices can now be landed up to 23c a gallon cheaper than the comparative local products, which is equivalent to \$23 a ton of fruit.

That is the important part: imported juices can be landed in Australia at the equivalent of \$23 a ton cheaper than the local product. This is serious, as those of us who have been concerned with the citrus industry well know. This Parliament has been concerned with the industry and

has passed legislation to try to regulate the marketing of citrus in this State. Unfortunately, that failed, but we have nevertheless been concerned with the problems of the citrus grower in South Australia.

Fortunately, as a result of the activities of private enterprise and groups such as Mr. Juicy, the Moore brothers of Loxton and others, a big market has been built up for fruit juice. In having transferred the market from fruit to fruit juice, we have been able progressively to absorb more and more of the product, and we are getting close to the ideal situation that exists in America, where about 60 per cent of the production goes to juice. When we reach that situation the industry becomes stabilized, and we are fast reaching that level of stability. However, we now find ourselves confronted with a new situation.

I draw the Government's attention to this new situation, because the citrus industry is so important to this State. It is vital that nothing serious happens to interfere with the development of the orderly marketing of citrus juice. I hope that this point is noted and that, if necessary, representations will be made regarding the recent tariff cuts. The grape industry is not affected by these cuts, because there is an excise on imported brandies, wines and other products. However, I am referring to the citrus industry. Citrus, which is important, has lost its protection. We have a responsibility to ensure that the interests of the people concerned in this industry are protected.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the producers?

Mr. NANKIVELL: True, our concern is not only for the industry but also for the producers, because the livelihood of so many people depends on their making a profitable living from the production of citrus. In this regard, I congratulate the Moore brothers of Loxton on their enterprise in setting up a dehydration plant to handle the pulp and skins from the two major juicing plants, their own at Loxton and that at Berri (Berri Fruit Juices). That has been a family enterprise, the engineering having been done mainly by the brothers themselves, and the product they hope to produce being one that will turn what was a waste end product (once causing pollution and contamination because it had to be dumped) into a highly productive protein pellet for livestock feeding.

I believe that Mr. John Moore, who has just returned from America after looking at similar products and their marketing has already obtained forward contract sales for this product in Hawaii and in Japan. This enterprise should be encouraged. I draw the attention of members to this project and point out that, while we talk about decentralization of industry and believe in assisting private enterprise, all the pulp and skins from Berri Fruit Juices must be transported to the Loxton dehydration plant. Although it may be proper to charge road maintenance tax on normal haulage, such tax still applies to the transportation of what is a waste product, in this instance, over a distance of about 16 miles (25 km) to a factory for processing. The bulk of the skins and pulp are in Berri. The factory happens to be at Loxton. John Moore said: "We would probably have done better if we had shifted from Loxton to Berri. What we would have saved on road tax and cartage costs would have been considerable." Will the Government look into this matter to see whether assistance can be given to an infant industry that is making effective use of an end product of the juicing industry and making a product which is saleable and will be valuable ultimately in the fattening of livestock for market?

I should like to do what is not often done from this side of the House—congratulate the Minister of Education on the introduction of library services. I know the mem-

ber for Ross Smith thinks I am trying to do a crawl by that comment, but that is not so. It is an excellent idea. We have had problems in the country for many years in the maintenance of institute libraries, as I know only too well because for about 10 years I was secretary of a local institute. The basic function of the institute was to operate a library for the use of local people. We had great difficulty in getting people who were prepared to give their time to look after the library as librarians on a voluntary, but not always very efficient, basis. However, now that we have the facilities in our area schools, we are having finance provided from Commonwealth funds for the development of our libraries and resource centres.

It is a good move that we can incorporate those resources into one centre so that people can have access not only to the sorts of book available in the fiction library but also to various reference books. I wholeheartedly concur, too, with the Minister that the bus services going out from these schools can be used as a medium for distribution, and the fact that the Government intends to train some teachers as librarians to help in this work all adds up to an excellent proposal that will be of great advantage in my district. I have no hesitation in congratulating the Minister on that proposal. I should like now to mention teaching facilities in the form of housing and accommodation. Today, we are building schools costing between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000. They are substantial investments.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Even up to \$1,750,000.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, but I am thinking of many of the schools in my district, and they would not cost as much as \$1,750,000. I am thinking of the school at Lameroo, which I am supposed to have delayed because of my interference in trying to get the best school possible. That is what was said in Lameroo. Costing \$800,000, it will be a magnificent building when completed. However, that is by the way.

Having made a substantial investment, what we tend to lose sight of or, if we do not lose sight of we do not make provision for, is housing for the staff that have to make these places work. It is wrong and has been wrong (I do not know how much the pattern is changing) that we have to depend on indentured teachers to teach in country schools. Of course, as a consequence, we sometimes get some of the best teachers in the State. I think of some people in the present education hierarchy who were teachers in my district about 10 years ago—John Steinle, for instance. But, although we have the schools and the resources at the moment we are not providing adequate accommodation for married teachers, the permanent teachers in these country schools; nor are we providing what I consider to be reasonable accommodation for the single teachers, particularly those who have to live separately and perhaps are away from home for the first time in their lives.

I know suggestions were made and approval was given for the construction of teacher hostels. I understand that one was to have been built at Geranium but, to my knowledge, it has not yet been constructed. We must give more consideration to this aspect. Having established the school, the important thing then is to be able to maintain adequate permanent staff there, and this in most rural areas requires housing of a standard not always readily available. I should like the Minister to consider this matter, if he has not already considered it.

Finally, I refer to the very good speech made by my colleague from Frome, in which he referred to railway freights. What worries me is that two conflicting things are happening today, and they are both under the control

of the Minister of Transport. One is a proposed change to the load capacity of a truck from axle weight and an accepted load capacity to a more restricted weight governed by gross vehicular weight. Many farm trucks at present are called 5-ton (5.1 t) trucks. They are loaded to the axle loading of 8 tons (8.16 t) and function in that way when they carry out the limited operation of transporting grain from the property to the railway siding.

It is intended that something be done to restrict the load capacity of those vehicles and, where perhaps one load is being carried now, it may mean that the trailer will in future have to be taken off if the total weight is exceeded, which may mean 2½ loadings to carry the same quantity of grain. That farmer will say, "I will not register my truck; I will tip my grain on the ground and will employ a carrier such as Harry Philbey to cart it direct to Port Adelaide." That of course is the sort of exercise going on with the big road transporters, who do not give a darn for the railways.

If rail freights are increased and people are dissuaded from registering their farm vehicles and carting to the nearest suitable railway terminal, they will employ the big cartage hauliers to cart their grain directly to Port Adelaide. They will do it more cheaply that way and get around the problem of vehicle registration. If the Government is not careful, instead of improving the position of the railways and increasing railway revenue, it will succeed in achieving exactly the reverse effect.

Mr. Coumbe: And it will put an even greater strain on the roads.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes; in the process it will put an even greater strain on the roads and cause more damage to them. I was concerned to read the recommendations in the Lees report on railway closures. We must look at those recommendations in the context of the fuel crisis we may experience in the next 10 to 15 years. Once a railway line is pulled up it is finished. Where we have lines such as the Karoonda-Peebinga line and the Karoonda-Waikerie line, which have been recently upgraded at considerable

expense, they should be retained for as long as possible. The Waikerie line runs almost parallel to the Murray River, and consideration should be given to freights being worked out on a radial and not on a rail mileage basis. The people from Karoonda north to Waikerie are 80 miles (129 km) or 90 miles (145 km) by road from the terminal at Port Adelaide, and 130 miles (209 km) by rail. They will not use the railways if they have to pay according to rail mileage. It is not a competitive exercise and I ask the Minister to consider, where such a situation exists, providing perhaps a differential rating to make the railways more competitive.

I have spoken in this debate for the first time in many years. I appreciate the opportunity, because it gives us, as members of this House, one of the open forums available to us. I hope nothing is done to restrict too much the debate in other areas. Once we get into the Budget debate I realize that a time factor arises for the Government, but there are certain things in the procedure of this House that we must not take for granted, certain things that are a privilege this House enjoys above any other Parliament I know. I hope that our freedoms are not curtailed; I plead with members not to abuse them. I support the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I thank members for their contributions to this debate. As it is a general forum, the contributions have been many and varied, and it would not be appropriate at this stage for me to try to reply to any of them. I assure members that the specific contributions relating to the administration of the Government (and there have been contributions of that nature) will be examined and consideration given to the suggestions made. I also thank the Opposition for the co-operation shown in expediting the conclusion of this debate.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 9, at 2 p.m.