

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

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

PETITION: HOTEL TRADING HOURS

Mr. Evans, for Mr. DEAN BROWN, presented a petition signed by 27 members and attenders of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), expressing strong objections to the proposals to permit hotels to trade seven days a week, and suggesting that the tremendous increase in the consumption of liquor of all kinds was detrimental to public health, road safety, and family harmony. The petitioners prayed that the Government should not further liberalize the liquor laws in this State.

Petition received.

PETITION: WATER RATES

Mr. Evans, for Mr. DEAN BROWN, presented a petition signed by 214 residents of the city of Burnside who expressed concern at the present inequitable system of estimating and charging water and sewerage rates, particularly in the present period of high inflation. This practice had resulted in water and sewerage rates being increased, in many instances, by more than 100 per cent, which was an unfair, discriminatory and grossly excessive impost on them, and which would cause hardship to many residents on fixed incomes. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would take action to correct the present inequitable and discriminatory situation.

Petition received.

HAHNDORF SEWERAGE SCHEME

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the Hahndorf Sewerage Scheme.

Ordered that report be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S STATEMENT

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. J. KING: In his personal explanation yesterday, the member for Mitcham repeated the allegation that he had made in this House on March 6, 1974, that I had misled the House in relation to the proceedings of the Select Committee on the Bill of Rights. The allegation is untrue, as I indicated to the House on March 6. The facts are as follows. At the meeting of the Select Committee on the Bill of Rights on November 21, 1973, there were present, in addition to myself, as Chairman, and the Secretary, the member for Mitcham, the member for Mitchell, and the member for Gouger. A discussion took place as to the future course of the committee's proceedings. I indicated that there was a considerable volume of evidence to be considered, and I also indicated my view that the committee could not satisfactorily conclude its deliberations until the fate of the Commonwealth Government's Human Rights Bill was known. As no member of the committee dissented from this view, I took it to be the view of the committee. The committee resolved on the motion of the member for Mitcham that I, as Chairman, be authorized to fix the time and date of the next meeting.

On November 29, 1973, I moved that the time for bringing up the report be extended until March 6. I had been authorized to do this by resolution of the committee passed at its meeting on November 14, 1973. I contented myself with the explanation to the House that, as the committee was still engaged on its deliberations, it had not been able to bring up its report on the appointed day. I did not think it necessary for the purpose of moving the postponement to refer in particular to the matters occupying the committee's attention, namely, the study of the evidence and the fate of the Commonwealth Human Rights Bill. There was no occasion to do so. I added, "We hope and expect to be able to bring up the report on March 6." In his statement yesterday, the member for Mitcham affected to see some inconsistency between the last statement and what I told the House on March 6. I am quite unable to follow his point.

In the event, the Commonwealth Human Rights Bill was still undisposed of in the Commonwealth Parliament on March 6. For that reason, I did not call the committee together, and no member of it requested me to do so. At some time before March 6, I was informed by the Secretary that the member for Mitcham had inquired of him whether I intended to fix a date for a meeting. The Secretary informed the honourable member that I did not intend to do so and that if the honourable member wished me to do so he should make a request to me. The honourable member made no such request to me.

On March 6, I moved that the time for bringing up the report be extended until April 24, 1974. Of the two matters which had led the committee to postpone its deliberations, the first matter (namely, time to study the evidence) had presumably ceased to be relevant, as adequate time for that purpose had elapsed. The remaining relevant consideration was that the Commonwealth Human Rights Bill was undisposed of and that it seemed certain that it would not be disposed of during the current session of the State Parliament. I therefore gave that reason to the House as the reason for the proposed postponement.

The member for Mitcham thereupon made the baseless allegation that I had misled the House and that I had not said one word in the committee about waiting to see whether the Human Rights Bill passed through the Commonwealth Parliament. The member for Mitchell immediately rose in his place and supported my account of the matter. Immediately the House rose, the member for Mitcham and I both approached the member for Gouger and asked for his recollection. In my presence, the member for Gouger addressed the member for Mitcham as follows: "Robin, you were not present at all the meetings and I cannot be certain whether you were present when Mr. King spoke about it; but there is no doubt that he said that there would be no point in proceeding until the Human Rights Bill had been disposed of."

There is no foundation for the allegation of the member for Mitcham. It was wrong of him to have made it in the first place, and it is even more wrong of him to have repeated it after being corrected not only by me but also by the member for Mitchell and the member for Gouger.

DEATH OF MR. E. C. A. EDWARDS

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received from Mrs. Mary Edwards an acknowledgment expressing appreciation to the House for the sympathy expressed recently on the death of her husband, Mr. E. C. A. Edwards.

QUESTIONS

TRANSPORT DISPUTE

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier endorse my suggestion and seek support from the Transport Workers Union to allow service clubs to move into the city of Adelaide and clear away the mounting piles of garbage that are starting to spill on to footpaths and into gutters? The garbage accumulation in the city streets is apparent to everyone who traverses those streets. I understand that the situation at the conference this morning was that the workers would not consider a return until at least Wednesday next week.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's not quite true.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not quite true, but it is somewhere around the point. As a result of this extension of time, garbage will build up and, with the splitting of bags, it will spill across footpaths and into the gutters. Rats and other vermin will have access to the material and it will become a serious health hazard. Although the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union is reported to have stated, "I do not think our workers would agree to that," that certainly does not close the door. On that basis, I ask the Premier whether he will help me obtain the aid of Apex, Lions, Rotary, Jaycees, Kiwanis, or any other service club that shows a civic responsibility in this pressing requirement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid that I cannot form a consortium with the Leader on this matter. If he has a proposal to put to the Transport Workers Union, I am sure that he is perfectly capable of doing that without my being involved in the matter.

Dr. Eastick: You're not interested or concerned?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am concerned about the matter but I am also concerned not to appear to be involved in any strike-breaking activity.

Mr. Millhouse: Whatever the cost to the community?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants to engage in strike breaking, at least he will be following a considerable precedent from his side of politics.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not a reply.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was asked whether I would second the Leader's approach to the Transport Workers Union. The reply is "No". I am certain that the Leader is quite capable of handling that himself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader thinks that he has a sensible approach, I really think that he ought to be able to stand on his own two feet and make it.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't reply to the question, can you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what progress, if any, has been made in negotiations that may have taken place in the case of the pursuit of just wage claims by the Transport Workers Union?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I can tell the honourable member that, after the meeting of transport workers this morning, I had discussions with the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union (Mr. Nyland), reaching agreement with him in respect of drivers covered by State awards. As members know, most of these drivers, including those who work for the Adelaide City Council, come under Commonwealth awards. Agreement having

been reached with the Secretary of the T.W.U., urgent arrangements are now being made to have these matters placed in the hands of the Industrial Court for an early hearing.

BANKSIA PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on whether the transaction, pursuant to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, has been finalized between Suburbs Proprietary Limited and the Education Department regarding land required to extend the Banksia Park High School site? The Minister will recall that I asked a Question on Notice on March 12 this year, to which I received a reply that the current position then was that the notice of claim served on the Minister as the acquiring authority was considered excessive and would be disputed. The school council is interested in having the matter finalized.

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

ROADS

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Local Government indicate what is the position regarding the new agreement between the States and the Commonwealth to replace the old Commonwealth Aid Roads Act agreement? Has a decision been made since the recent conference of Ministers of Local Government held in Darwin and, if it has, when will details of council allocations be announced? These are matters that are causing some concern at present and, in view of the statement contained in His Excellency's Speech that there would be a reduction in the allocation of funds available to the Highways Department and, presumably, to councils this year, will the Minister indicate the likely reductions and explain why funds for South Australian metropolitan roadworks are to be reduced under the proposed agreement? Will the Minister also say whether funds are to be made available to local government by the Urban and Regional Development Department?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope I can remember at least half the questions the honourable member has asked. However, I will try to answer as many as I can remember, and if I miss one or two it is just that the questions have escaped me. The first question related to there being no agreement, as such, operating between the States. The Commonwealth Aid Roads Act expired on June 30, 1974, and currently before the Commonwealth Parliament are three Bills, each designed to deal with a specific area, to replace the provisions that applied under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. The principal Bill, to which the honourable member referred, will provide money by allocation under various categories laid down in the Bill. The Bill contains eight categories, whereas previously the Act contained only four. One of the original four categories (planning and research) has been transferred to a separate Bill. The new programme will be renewed after three years: it will not be a five-year programme as it was previously. The reason for the reduced period is that the Australian Government believes that both the old Commonwealth Aid Roads Act and the present provisions do not adequately cater for the financial needs of Australia at present. The Commonwealth Government was forced to introduce immediate legislation to enable grants to continue to be allocated to each State. In about 18 months the South Australian Government expects to discuss this matter again with the Australian Government about legislation that will follow the expiration of the allocation for 1974-75.

Dr. Eastick: That will be the new Government!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It will be the Whitlam Labor Government with which we hold discussions. I do not see any sound reason why any sensible person would believe that that situation would alter. Concerning the sum granted to South Australia in the current financial year, \$31 000 000 will be made available. That sum is identical to the sum allocated under the old Commonwealth Aid Roads Act for 1973-74. In other words, under the proposed legislation we have been allocated the same sum for this financial year.

Mr. Coumbe: No increase for inflation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, nor has any allowance been made for the normal increases caused by expansion of activities. The position, as explained to us, is that at present the Australian Government holds the view that for far too long Australian money had been pumped into the road system, with nothing being pumped into the public transport system. The Australian Government is now trying to arrest that one-sided approach and is attempting to get a more rational distribution. The honourable member would know that South Australia received last year and this year considerable sums for urban public transport.

When finality has been reached with the Australian Government as to the sums concerned (and until the legislation is passed, finality will not have been reached), the State Government will make a final decision on the review that has been undertaken into the distribution of available funds. We believe that it may be necessary to raise additional funds, but the decisions have not yet been taken. Until all these decisions have been taken, obviously decisions cannot be taken on distribution. However, we have said to local government, wherever the opportunity has been provided, that it should not automatically expect to receive continuing financial support at the level we have previously been able to give. That is as far as we can go at this stage but I hope that, within a couple of weeks, we will be more specific regarding local government.

Mr. Coumbe: I asked whether we were getting funds from the Urban and Regional Development Department.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the honourable member is referring to money for local government bodies that made requests to the Australian Government as a result of its saying that it would support local government projects on a regional basis. Those requests have been made; the case has been stated; officially, no reply has been given.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister say whether, from the \$31 000 000 that he says will be made available to South Australia this year for roadworks, he expects councils to receive the same share as they have received in the past? The Minister's replies on this matter from Thursday until today have been evasive on the question whether in fact councils will receive as much as they have obtained in the past or whether they will be cut back. I do not think I need emphasize the importance of this matter to councils, because the whole question of employment in country areas is involved. I consider that the Minister has been deliberately vague about the matter. Frankly, councils are up in the air about it. All that the Minister has said to the House and councils is that councils are warned not to expect the same grants in future. This leaves councils with an insecure base from which to operate. Moreover, I point out that no allowance for expansion is made in this sum. Councils face an increase in rates of from 25 per cent to 30 per cent to cover inflation. Even

if grants they have secured in the past are maintained, they will still have to face that increase. As I have said, councils and the communities they serve are vitally concerned about the matter. Can the Minister be less vague and say whether he expects that councils will receive the same level of support as they have received in the past, so that they can realistically get on with their budgeting? To my knowledge, councils have not had to face this situation in the past. I certainly hope that the Minister can be more precise now than he has been so far.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: True, this is the first time that this position has occurred, and there is a good reason for it, namely, that the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1969-1974, expired on June 30 this year and that, because of factors beyond the Australian Government's control, that Government could not pilot through Parliament the legislation to replace it.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Government was playing politics instead.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No; members of the Government were out on the hustings defending themselves against the scurrilous attacks made by members of the Senate when they prevented the passage of Supply. That prevented the legislation from being introduced in the Parliament: so, if anyone opposite wants to attach blame, I suggest that he look at the South Australian Liberal Senators who voted to deny Supply to the properly elected Australian Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Now answer the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member wanted to know why there was a delay, and I have given him the reason. If he does not like that, it is just too bad. At this stage we cannot say how much money will be available for grants for roadworks or debit order works by country councils from the 1974-75 road funds. We cannot make a statement at this stage.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Western Australia has it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member checks what I have said in reply to the member for Torrens, he will find that I have said that I hope we can clarify this position within a few weeks. At this stage we are anxious to give councils as much financial support as is humanly possible, but our first loyalty is to those persons who are employed in the Highways Department.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Now we're getting the message clearly!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Kavel can put whatever interpretation he likes on it but, until we know the extent of the finance available, it will not be possible to make an allocation. At this stage we have merely told councils that they should not expect an allocation of more than (or even as much as) they received in 1973-74. They know that and, equally, they have been told wherever the occasion has required it that, if as a result of the present situation there is difficulty about continuity of employment and if they tell the Highways Department, action will be taken forthwith to rectify that position.

Dr. Eastick: It's discrimination, one against the other.

The SPEAKER: Order! A member asks a question and a Minister replies, but the Minister will not reply to continual interjections. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the question has been answered adequately, Mr. Speaker.

GAS

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Development and Mines say whether the reserves of the Cooper Basin are adequate to meet South Australia's short and medium-term needs, including the Redcliff petro-chemical plant? In the House of Representatives yesterday, Mr. Connor (Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy) in reply to a question claimed that there was 3.5 trillion cubic feet of recoverable reserves at Gidgealpa and that the South Australian and Australian Gas Light Company's requirements were 4.4 trillion cubic feet. Mr. Connor said that the extra gas required could be found other than at Gidgealpa, and referred to his plan to connect Gidgealpa to the Palm Valley field in the Northern Territory. Can the Minister say whether South Australia is dependent on the construction of that pipeline?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course, that depends on two things: first, the quantity of gas yet to be discovered in the Cooper Basin; and secondly, the time scale to which Mr. Connor was addressing himself. Mr. Connor, I understand from the newspaper clipping I have, referred to 3.5 trillion cubic feet of recoverable reserves in Gidgealpa. I assume that he meant the whole of the Cooper Basin, not simply the Gidgealpa field, because figures I have from the Mines Department indicate that there are presently deliverable reserves in the total Cooper Basin of 4.4 trillion cubic feet (that is, American trillions).

Mr. Millhouse: What is an English trillion?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is 10^{18} , whereas an American trillion is 10^{12} . Since it is difficult to know the time scale to which Mr. Connor was addressing himself and therefore difficult to evaluate the 4.4 trillion figure, I give the House the following figures: Under schedule B of the A.G.L. contract, 2.0 trillion cubic feet is dedicated to the Sydney market and the quantity needed for the Adelaide demands, plus the Redcliff project, to 1987 is 1.4 trillion cubic feet, and these figures together match the recoverable reserves. The Government has just negotiated a new exploration agreement with the producing companies under which they will spend \$15 000 000 on exploration in the field over the next five years with a minimum of \$2 000 000 to be spent in a 12-month period. We expect reasonably that this will yield good results. We are reasonably confident that there is at least as much undiscovered gas in the field as the quantity that has already been proved. In addition, there are the as yet unexplored basins of Pedirka and Officer, north and west of the Cooper Basin. The South Australian Government would welcome any initiative from Mr. Connor to build a pipeline from Palm Valley to the Cooper Basin field for necessary back up, and I imagine that the producers would welcome it as well, because it would enlarge the scope of their reserves. In the terms of the discoveries of gas we have made, there are no problems concerning the existing contracts.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Education, as Acting Minister of Works, say whether the Government intends to restrict further expenditure on Parliament House renovations in the current financial year? I understand that \$1 013 845 was spent in the 1973-74 financial year on renovations to Parliament House and that the estimated total cost is \$2 800 000. In view of the current financial situation in this State, has consideration been given to re-establishing priorities for more urgent public works in preference to lavish expenditure on Parliament House?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I believe that the vast majority of members thinks the upgrading is necessary, and now that the work is half completed I am sure that all members, other than the member for Hanson, would agree that the sooner it is completed the better, so that those working within this building can do so under reasonable conditions. I hope that members appreciate the conditions under which some members of the staff of Parliament House are working, particularly in the dining room and kitchen where renovations are in progress. I all members, other than the member for Hanson, would the work of upgrading Parliament House arising from the transfer of some members of the construction team to other projects would involve substantial additional costs in respect of this project and might not do very much towards helping complete the other projects to which these men were transferred. Without checking with the department, my initial reaction would be that the increase in efficiency that would arise from the suggestion made by the honourable member is something that would not be tolerable.

Mr. Becker: Some of the—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member may express an opinion if he wishes. I will ask the Director of the Public Buildings Department to see how much is to be spent this financial year but I am sure that most of the people who work in this place are appalled by the prospect of the project not being completed for at least another year.

SALARY INCREASES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of the Premier, but I see he has gone again.

Mr. Langley: He hasn't gone again: this is the first time he has gone out.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the Premier is not here, I suppose I will have to address my question to his Acting Deputy. However, with due respect to the Minister of Education, I hope that the Premier will see fit to come back into the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What's the question?

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the honourable member's question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What communication, if any, has the Government had from the Prime Minister asking that pay rises made to judges and senior public servants since last December be taken away, and what reply, if any, has been given? Last Friday, it was reported that, following the defeat of the attempt by members of the Australian Labor Party and the Commonwealth Government to increase Parliamentary salaries, the Prime Minister had gone to the opposite tack, communicating with all State Premiers and telling them to cancel pay rises that had operated since December, 1973. It was also reported that the Premier had (rightly in my view) rebuffed the Prime Minister. I am sure the Government and the Minister of Education will agree that the Prime Minister acted in a fit of pique and petulance such as would throw doubt on the soundness of his judgment on any matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: How can members get away from that? If the Prime Minister does such a silly thing on a matter such as this, what will he do in other cases? I ask the Minister what precisely was the communication from the Prime Minister and what precisely was the reply given to him by this Government.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To my knowledge, the reports to which the honourable member refers are correct. There is no substantial variation from what took place—

Mr. Millhouse: I always speak accurately.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is outstanding only in one respect: his ability to beat his own breast. Be that as it may, the position is substantially as has been reported in the press. If the honourable member wants to see the precise communications that took place between—

Mr. Millhouse: I do.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —the Prime Minister and the Premier, I shall discuss the matter with the Premier and see whether he is willing to make the correspondence available. If he is willing to make it available, it will be made available to all members, including the member for Mitcham; if the Premier is not willing to make it available, it will not be made available.

TOURISM

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Tourism give comparisons to show that there has been an upsurge in tourism, and can he say in what categories (monetary, numerical, or added tourist attractions available) 1973 was a record year? Yesterday's *News* contains an article under the name of the Minister, headed "Tourism leaps ahead at a record pace". The article states that tourism in South Australia is surging ahead and last year reached a record level. However, nowhere in the article does it state by how much tourism has increased. Was the increase on a monetary basis and, if it was, was the inflationary trend taken into account? Was more money spent in the State in terms of actual purchasing power? Did more people enter the State as tourists, or was the Minister merely referring to increased tourist facilities available (this would not necessarily mean that more tourists had come to South Australia and spent more money)? I ask the Minister to clarify the position.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We have certainly provided increased facilities for visitors; no doubt, this is one reason why we have been able to show that there has been a considerable increase in the number of people visiting South Australia. Naturally, as a result of this, there has been increased patronage of tourist accommodation and other facilities. I will obtain for the honourable member as soon as possible figures supplied to the Tourist Bureau by operators in the field that show where the percentage increases have occurred.

YORKETOWN SCHOOL

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Education say when tenders will be called for the construction of the new Yorketown Area School? I notice that the Public Works Committee report on members' files recommends that this undertaking be proceeded with. As this matter has already been deferred because of a change from an application for a high school to a request for an area school, considerable delay has occurred in relation to the project. The Yorketown school council would now appreciate an early start to this work.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although I will obtain precise information for the honourable member my recollection is that the school will now be rebuilt in Samcon Mark 3, in which case it is not a matter of calling tenders but merely a matter of shifting the Samcon team to the Yorketown site when it has finished work at another

site. I will check the precise details for the honourable member and bring down a reply as soon as possible. I assure him that our concern also is to get the Yorketown project under way as soon as practicable.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Premier tell the House of any findings he made while overseas regarding the potential pollution hazards of a petro-chemical complex and will he also explain his findings regarding the most up-to-date way to prevent potential disaster? Any information that the Premier can give will be appreciated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was able to see a prototype of the major part of the petro-chemical works at Wilton, in England, and to discuss the possible pollution hazards with the operators in the works and with the directors. Apparently, it will be possible to ensure that there is no pollution danger from effluent or from fumes from the works, so that there is no air or water pollution potential from the works. The major interference with the area, apart from the existence of the works, is in the provision of marked additional light and noise. When the lights are flaring (and that is inevitable in a petro-chemical works), there is a substantial amount of noise and a considerable increase in the amount of light. For this reason, it is not intended to have any living quarters near the works at Red Cliff Point. The works will be sufficiently far from domestic occupants to involve no problems about noise or light.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you confident of that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had an opportunity to test the kinds of thing that happen when flaring is occurring, and it is obvious that at Wilton the houses have been built too close to the works. However, the plans for the Redcliff project will provide for the nearest residence to be some kilometres away, so it is unlikely that there will be any adverse effect on residents from noise or light. I have seen in the newspapers a suggestion that bird life, foliage, and similar matters in the area will be affected adversely, but I can only say that at Wilton Castle, which is only about four kilometres from the works, the birds—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Were attractive?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The birds of all kinds were attractive and they sang sweetly.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: All kinds?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had the opportunity (not the opportunity that the Minister is speaking of) to get up early one morning and look clearly at the woodland gardens and pastures in the area, and I must say that anyone in the best parts of the Adelaide Hills in South Australia could have been proud of the state that they were in.

Mr. Mathwin: That was quite a holiday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member likes to talk about holidays. I must say that, if the honourable member kept to the schedule to which I kept on that trip, it would be a miracle.

WATER AND SEWERAGE RATES

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Education, as Acting Minister of Works, say whether, in threatening to restrict water supply to properties in respect of which water and sewerage rates have not been paid in full, he intends to adopt the same procedure and time schedule as has been adopted previously? If he does not intend to do that, will he say why? I have documentary evidence to suggest what procedure was previously adopted. If a

person fails to pay his account first he receives several notices indicating that his account has not been paid. An interview is then carried out with the person concerned, he then receives further notices, and after a further 12 to 18 months he eventually has the water supply to his property restricted. If after three years he has still not paid the account, the Engineering and Water Supply Department can ask the Minister of Lands to take action under the Crown Rates and Taxes Recovery Act, 1945. Under the provisions of that Act his property can then be sold by the Minister to retrieve the unpaid charges. I therefore ask the Minister whether he intends to victimize the people of Burnside.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No question of victimization is involved. Certainly, it is the intention of the department and of the Government to apply the law and to see to it that the flouting of the law that is being carried on in certain quarters and being encouraged by certain people, including the honourable member, is not pursued.

Mr. Chapman: Don't Parliamentarians get preferential treatment?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Such action is not encouraged—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I asked that the Minister retract a similar statement he made last week; I now ask him to do the same today.

The SPEAKER: What are the words the honourable member is asking the Minister to withdraw?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I may be wrong, but I thought I heard the Minister say that I was encouraging people to break the law—to flout the law.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the words to which the honourable member has objected.

Mr. Mathwin: I did.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the words the honourable member considers to be objectionable; therefore, I ask the honourable Minister whether the words objected to were used by him.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I said that the honourable member was encouraging people to flout the law, and I said it deliberately. Those are the words to which the honourable member has objected. May I point out that last week—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have asked what objectionable words were used, and I sought that information from the honourable Minister. The words used last time were withdrawn by the honourable Minister, and I ask that, as objection has been raised to these words, they be withdrawn if they are objectionable.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is doing exactly as he has done in public statements and on television: he has taken actions that amount quite clearly to encouraging people to flout the law. I believe that action is wrong.

Mr. COUMBE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are already dealing with a point of order.

Mr. COUMBE: Whose point of order?

The SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the honourable member for Davenport, about which I admitted that I had not heard the objectionable words that were supposed to have been said. To verify the honourable member's statement I asked the Minister whether he used

the words that the honourable member for Davenport accused him of using. There cannot be more than one point of order at a time. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: What I have stated is the truth and I do not believe I can be asked to withdraw what has been demonstrated on several occasions since last week to be the truth.

Mr. Coumbe: You have been directed by the Speaker to withdraw.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am asking that the Speaker rule on the question.

Mr. Coumbe: He has.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He has not.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You just refused his direction.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Because what I have said is the truth are you, Sir, directing me to withdraw those words?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Davenport has asked me to ask the honourable Minister whether he will withdraw the words to which the member has objected.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am prepared to obey a direction from the Chair but, unless it is a direction, I am not prepared to withdraw the words.

The SPEAKER: I can only request that the honourable Minister withdraw the words objected to by the member for Davenport.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to that request is "No", but I will obey any direction given by the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Then I direct that the honourable Minister withdraw the words.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I point out that these words are the truth, but I withdraw the words.

Dr. Tonkin: To say in these circumstances that he withdraws—

The SPEAKER: Order! I always understood that if an honourable member was to speak he must be called by the Chair. The honourable Minister, at my direction, was instructed to withdraw the words objected to by the honourable member for Davenport. As I understand the situation the honourable Minister, at my direction, withdrew the objectionable words.

Dr. Tonkin: That is not so.

The SPEAKER: At my direction, as I understand it, the Minister withdrew the objectionable words.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Under Standing Order 169 the member must withdraw the remarks and apologize for their use. I therefore ask that the Minister withdraw the words and apologize for using them.

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders provide that if an honourable member objects to some words used they shall be withdrawn on the determination of the Speaker that they have been withdrawn. The honourable Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. With great respect I draw your attention to the exact words of Standing Order 169 at the bottom of page 53 and at the top of page 54 of the Standing Orders. There are two requirements: the first is to withdraw the words, and the second is to apologize for their use. The two matters are coupled in the Standing Order. As I understand it, the Minister of Education has withdrawn the words at your express direction, but he has not yet complied

with the other provision of the Standing Order that requires him to apologize for their use. I therefore respectfully suggest, Sir, that the member for Davenport is entitled to have the Minister comply fully with the Standing Order: he is entitled not only to have the words withdrawn but, in addition, he is entitled to an apology.

The SPEAKER: I will not uphold the point of order, because the honourable member's interpretation of Standing Order 169 is vastly different from the way I read it. The Standing Order provides for the case of the member who, having used objectionable words, refuses either to explain the same to the satisfaction of the Speaker or to withdraw them and apologize for their use. I have ruled that the words objected to by the honourable member for Davenport have been withdrawn in accordance with Standing Order 169.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I now take exception to the remarks of the Minister when he said that he would withdraw the truth. I ask him to withdraw those remarks, to simply withdraw the statement he made earlier, without any qualification at all.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold that point of order because the words objected to are not unparliamentary in the terms of past practice and procedure of this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that, whatever your reasons for doing so, you asked and then directed the Minister to withdraw the words. We do not go behind that direction. You have directed him to withdraw and I suggest he must withdraw the words in accordance with the Standing Order, particularly when the member affronted asked that the Minister should do so. That is the position we have here, and, if the rights of the member for Davenport are to be upheld, the Minister must not only withdraw the words but also apologize. Certainly, if he purported to withdraw in the terms suggested by the member for Davenport, that was not a withdrawal at all.

The SPEAKER: I rule in accordance with Standing Order 169, which states that the objectionable words shall be withdrawn to the satisfaction of the Speaker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In that case I move to disagree to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must put his reasons for disagreement in writing and bring them to the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will do that.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has moved to disagree to the Speaker's ruling, that the Minister of Education has withdrawn in accordance with Standing Order 169, on the ground that the Minister has not withdrawn and apologized. Is the motion seconded?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The point is a short one and was pretty well covered in my point of order before you refused to uphold it. Let me now read the relevant part of Standing Order 169, which provides:

If any member,—

perhaps I should leave out the next part because there is no question here of "persistently or wilfully" refusing to conform to any Standing Order, and it is the next part that is important—

If any member, having used objectionable words, refuse either to explain the same to the satisfaction of the Speaker, or to withdraw them and apologize for their use,

the Speaker shall name such member and report his offence to the House.

The words strictly relevant to this situation are as follows:

If any member,—

in this case the Minister of Education—

having used objectionable words,—

and I believe we can accept that the words were objectionable, because you, Mr. Speaker, eventually directed him, albeit unwillingly, to withdraw, and we can take it that you regarded the words as objectionable—

refuse to withdraw them and apologize for their use; the Speaker shall name such member and report his offence to the House.

That is the Standing Order, and that is the situation we now have. The Minister apparently withdrew the words, although I did not hear precisely what he said, but I doubt whether he actually withdrew them at all. If he said that he merely withdrew what was the truth, that is a cheeky way of getting around the position, because that is not a withdrawal. A withdrawal implies that what is withdrawn is objectionable and inaccurate. However, we may leave that point. The Standing Order is definite that there is not only to be a withdrawal in the circumstances: there also has to be an apology. I venture to say that if you, Mr. Speaker, had been dealing with a private member and not with the Minister of Education, there would have been no doubt as to how you would act.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must withdraw those remarks, because they are a reflection on the Chair. Will the honourable member withdraw?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will withdraw those words, but I say that in the circumstances the Minister of Education has not been dealt with by you in the same way as other members would have been dealt with. You did everything you could to avoid directing him to withdraw, and *Hansard* will show that tomorrow. Eventually, you were obliged to direct him to withdraw and he made the withdrawal, but he has refused to apologize. The member for Davenport has asked for an apology and, under Standing Orders, he is entitled to it. If you do not rule in that way, you are ruling contrary to the plain words and not according to the interpretation of Standing Orders, and that is completely wrong and unfair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I must support the motion, but do so with perhaps less vehemence than did the member for Mitcham, because this is one of the few times that I believe that you, Mr. Speaker, have made a mistake, and I say that genuinely. Since you have been in office you have done a remarkably good job but, I believe that you have made a genuine mistake. The situation has arisen because the Minister of Education saw fit to tack on to his withdrawal a statement to the effect that he was withdrawing the truth. I suggest that, if the Minister had not, in his typical arrogant and petulant fashion, added those words, this situation would not have arisen. The Standing Order is clear and has two parts to which you have referred. The first section refers to a satisfactory explanation being given by a member of whom a request has been made for an explanation. The Standing Order provides:

If any member, having used objectionable words, refuse either to explain the same to the satisfaction of the Speaker—

That reference is not applicable, because the Minister was not asked for an explanation but was specifically requested to withdraw. The second part of the Standing Order, which refers to the situation that has arisen, provides:

... or to withdraw them and apologize for their use;

One does not have to be a student of the English language to understand clearly the interpretation of that Standing Order. The first part, to which you unfortunately referred, Mr. Speaker, is the section alluding to the satisfaction of the Speaker and concerns an explanation being given by the Minister. No such explanation was given or had been called for. A withdrawal was called for, and the second part of the Standing Order therefore applies. If the Minister had not, with his usual arrogance, tacked on something that negated the withdrawal, this situation would not have arisen. Nevertheless, as he has tacked those words on so that they nullify his withdrawal, I am in the unfortunate situation of having to support (although very much against the grain) a motion to disagree to your ruling. Members have no option but to disagree to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In opposing the motion, I point out that what is being sought of the Minister of Education is a complete departure from the previous practice of this House.

Mr. Millhouse: Not the Standing Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point to what occurred a few moments ago when the member for Mitcham reflected on the Chair and then withdrew, but he did not apologize.

Mr. Millhouse: I was not asked to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course not, because the honourable member knows perfectly well that what he is now contending for has never been the practice in this House in relation to anything other than the use of words found on precedent to be unparliamentary language. The point is that, in terms of the Standing Order, there are two matters about which members take objection. The first is where words used offend a member in some measure, though these are not words which are on any precedent unparliamentary in language. In these circumstances, it has been the practice of the Speaker, simply in order to maintain order and good relations in the House, to request a member to withdraw. If the member withdraws, the Speaker has considered that to be an explanation of the matter to his satisfaction. There was never a ruling in this case, and there could not have been a ruling that the language used by the Minister was unparliamentary in the terms of the second part of the Standing Order. They were not unparliamentary terms. Good Heavens! If the honourable member were to object that it was unparliamentary to say that someone else was encouraging others to break the law, the number of objections to be taken to the speeches of members opposite would be myriad.

They would not be able to get through a speech half the time, not even through a paragraph. Just how absurd and petty are we getting with this kind of motion? The honourable member knows perfectly well that there is no substance whatever in the point he is taking. As it is not in accordance with the precedents of the House, it ought to be rejected.

Dr. TONKIN: I believe that you, Mr. Speaker, may have been inadvertently placed in this position because you did not hear clearly the actual terms of the Minister's withdrawal; that, I respectfully submit, is the problem that faces us now. The Premier says that this is an absurd and petty way of acting. The Minister's action in tacking on to his withdrawal the words "the truth", I submit, is also absurd and petty. I consider that the Minister's statement was in deliberate defiance of your ruling. I believe that you directed the Minister to withdraw certain allegations he made against the member for Davenport and

that, following your direction to withdraw, the Minister turned and said, "Very well, Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I withdraw the truth."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I added something else to that.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister has perpetuated the allegation and the reflection he made in the first instance. A member cannot withdraw a statement and make a similar objectionable statement in the same breath and in the same sentence. I believe that you, Mr. Speaker, did not hear the Minister's full statement. Your rulings have been fair and you have filled your position with dignity and great fairness, so I cannot believe that, if you had heard the Minister's full statement, you would have accepted that as a withdrawal. Indeed, I think that you might have ruled that that, in itself, was a reflection on the Chair and on you as Speaker.

Mr. GUNN: This House has been accustomed to the Minister's complete arrogance. He is one member who has deliberately set out to defy Standing Orders, and this afternoon has seen another example of his arrogance. His personal attack on the member for Davenport is what the House has become accustomed to. It is surpassed only by the Premier's complete vindictiveness in this debate. The Premier has put on record that he will support the Minister in contravention of Standing Orders. I believe that you, Mr. Speaker, did not correctly hear, when the Minister withdrew, the reservation that is totally unacceptable (and rightly so) to the member for Davenport. I hope that all fair-minded members will support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have heard only one speech in defence of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and that was from the Premier. I suggest that the fallacy and weakness in what he said in trying to defend the situation and the Minister is that you yourself, Sir, in your judgment had already directed that the words be withdrawn. What the Premier is saying, in trying to support your ruling, is that you were wrong in directing the Minister to withdraw. The Premier cannot have it both ways: he cannot say that the words were trifling and piffling, and did not need to be withdrawn, because they were not unparliamentary and, at the same time, support you, Mr. Speaker, who had directed that they be withdrawn.

What does he think of your judgment in that case? Why did you direct that they be withdrawn if they were not unparliamentary? That shows the weakness in the position of the Premier and of the Government and it shows that there is no merit in the opposition to my motion. That was the only point the Premier vouchsafed to make in defence of your ruling, Sir, and it is so demonstrably false that I say no more about it.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Venning. No—Mr. Burdon.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson is strictly not conforming to Standing Orders when conversing

with someone not actually in the Chamber during the course of a division.

The result of the division having been declared:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, under Standing Orders, may I complete my answer?

The SPEAKER: Standing Orders do not allow the Minister to continue.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 30. Page 135.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, the need for which arises from a recent judgment of the Full Court. The procedure applying for about 30 years has been challenged successfully in the court, although that has no real bearing on this matter. However, there has been a successful challenge as regards the inclusion in certain Acts and by-laws of wording which is open to an interpretation different from that which has been generally accepted for 30 years. It is not sufficient to say that the matter has been determined on a fine point: indeed, the Full Court's decision clearly indicates that that fine point favours persons charged with parking and certain traffic offences. Unless specific wording is used in legislation passed by this House, there will be a constant attempt by some members of the community to find errors and successfully challenge that legislation.

I remember attending a meeting at which a member of the legal profession arrived late, saying with some glee that he had been successful for the first time in challenging the law in relation to the apprehension by radar of motorists accused of speeding. In this case, the person accused of speeding did not actually deny that he had been travelling at a speed greater than the legal limit, but his lawyer was able to demonstrate in court that the driver had been called to the side of the road as a result of identifying the colour and make of his vehicle rather than as a result of identifying the specific registration number of that vehicle. That was a successful defence notwithstanding that no other vehicles of that make or colour were on the road or in the vicinity at that time. The fact that the vehicle was identified only by its make and colour was held not to be specific enough to warrant prosecution.

It is necessary to specify the wording of Acts and by-laws when providing for circumstances leading to the payment of an expiation fee. The Act requires a report to be submitted to the council before steps can be taken to invite the payment of an expiation fee. If one takes this through to its logical conclusion, it becomes apparent that the cost involved in requiring a person who has transgressed to pay a fine will be markedly greater because of delay and that, therefore, the fine would need to be markedly increased. However, the Act, as written, has not been complied with.

In a recent court case a Mr. Willing issued a complaint against a parking inspector for placing a so-called sticker on the windscreen of his car without the consent of the owner or driver of the car, and he claimed that that action was contrary to City of Adelaide by-law No. VI, section 3 (21). The stipendiary magistrate held in the first instance that the by-law did not cover the council or employees acting *bona fide* in the course of their duties and pursuant to standing instructions. The present matter involved a standing instruction of the council concerning the placing of paper on windscreens. The parking inspector

was acting in accordance with it; and the charge was not proved. Mr. Willing then appealed against this decision to the Supreme Court. Mr. Justice Hogarth said that in his opinion the by-law did not apply to the act in question, which was done in and as part of the performance of the respondent's duties. Mr. Willing then appealed to the Full Court, which dealt with the matter on June 3 and 4, 1974.

Justice Mitchell dismissed the argument that Mr. Willing did not have *locus standi* to bring suit. This right could be expressly withdrawn by amendment to the Local Government Act, as had been done in Victoria, where prosecution for breach of a by-law should be taken on behalf of the council only. The reference given in this respect was the case of *Steane v. Whitchell*, 1906 V.L.R. 704 at page 708. I wonder whether the South Australian Government will follow this course to stop Mr. Willing's legal excursions. She went on to say that the parking inspector had an honest belief on reasonable grounds that an offence had been committed, but the question of the legality of the action was not concerned with this factor but rather with the \$2 expiation offer on the notice.

She said further that section 64 of the Police Offences Act enabled regulations to be made specifying the sum to be paid in expiation of certain by-laws. A regulation had been made, but section 64 (4) of the Act required that, before an expiation notice was given, a report of the offence must first have been made to the council, which could then issue the expiation notice. She said that section 64 (6) provided that, after making the regulation with regard to expiation, it should be unlawful for any council to require or invite any expiation fee, except in terms provided by the section (that is, in respect of regulations covering the matter). She said that, as regulations required the matter to go to the council before an expiation notice was issued, in accordance with section 64 (6) the council had been in breach of this provision, concerning unlawful invitation to expiate, for 30 years. She said that the special requirement of consideration by the council before issue was obviously included for a special purpose.

Section 64 (4) did not create an offence, but a person giving notice not authorized by this provision could possibly bring himself within the ambit of section 163 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which deals with threatening to accuse someone with a view to extorting money. However, it is open to argument whether a person could be said to be obtaining money for the benefit of any person within the meaning of this section. Justice Mitchell went on to say that the act was forbidden by Statute and could not be said to be done as part of the performance of the respondent's duty. She also said that the defence in *Proudman v. Dayman* (1941) 67 C.L.R. 536, was not open to him (that is, that he had an honest belief on reasonable grounds in a state of affairs which, if true, justified his action). Even if the respondent had no knowledge of section 64, this would be no defence, and the council could not properly direct him to place paper on a car. Therefore the inspector's action was unjustified by law and was prohibited by by-law No. IX, section 3 (21). However, the action itself was of such a minor nature that the stipendiary magistrate's order dismissing Mr. Willing's complaint would not be interfered with. Again, I pinpoint the fact that this was said to be a trifling matter, but nonetheless it involved an error that required adjustment.

Mr. Justice Wells said that the words "shall not be lawful" in section 64 (6) of the Police Offences Act meant that an invitation purportedly given in contravention of

this section was ineffectual in law to constitute a valid invitation, and was therefore beyond the power of the council to give. He said that Mr. Willing had *locus standi* to prosecute under section 42 of the Acts Interpretation Act. He added that an inspector was a "person" within the meaning of by-law No. IX section 3 (21).

Mr. Justice Bright gave a dissenting judgment. He said that he agreed, first, that Mr. Willing had *locus standi*, but he interpreted section 64 of the Police Offences Act differently. He agreed that the paper contained an unlawful invitation, but he said that by-law No. IX section 3 (21) did not apply to restrict activities of employees of the council who were *bona fide* acting within the scope of their authority or specific instructions. The paper placed on the car was not fully unlawful, only the instruction relating to expiation. It is interesting to see this divergence of opinion. Mr. Justice Bright agreed that there was a breach of section 64 (which is the only matter at issue in this Bill. His disagreement concerned the characterization of the respondent inspector according to the interpretation of the council by-law. Therefore, I suggest that he would agree that the Bill is necessary to put the matter beyond further doubt.

The provisions in the Bill follow the judges' reasoning by spelling out all the necessary steps needed to legalize the present situation. I do not agree with retrospectivity. I understand that people who have been affected over the 30 years that the practice has been followed will find that the cost of taking action in respect of expiation fees paid will make such an exercise unprofitable. I believe that subclause (8) is necessary to prevent Mr. Willing and others who might follow his course from bombarding the courts with summonses. The past procedure was followed in what was believed to be the best interests of the community; it was thought to be the best means of bringing about the beneficial use of available parking spaces. As part of this procedure, the so-called stickers were placed on vehicles.

The present subsection (4) must be struck out as it relates to matters going to the council before an expiation offer is made, and new subsection (4) is being inserted, as far as I can determine and on the advice I have received, to cover all the matters required to make legal the procedures that have been taken over the years. By new subsection (4), the present situation is given legal sanction and all matters arising from the court judgment will be resolved satisfactorily.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the Bill. The Leader has given the House an interesting and worthwhile explanation of what we may term the history of the legal question that has led to the introduction of this measure. However, I should not like the occasion to pass without pointing out that, although the second reading explanation refers to *Willing v. Watson*, another gentleman whose name is well known to many people (Mr. Gordon Howie) is one of my constituents, and I consider it fair to say that he has been guided by public spiritedness and a feeling that, if laws, including by-laws and regulations, are made for society to abide by, every effort should be made to ensure that they are reasonable in intent, understandable in wording, and applied with moderation. I have had many conversations with Mr. Howie on matters such as we are considering today.

Mr. Evans: Do you think Mr. Willing is a similar sort of man with a similar sort of goal?

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, I am not detracting from the efforts of Mr. Willing. He has shown South Australians what he

thinks of the matter by paying much money to pursue it as far as the Full Court, and it costs more than a \$2 expiation fee to do that. Mr. Howie has told me many times previously that various technicalities have been mentioned in courts in South Australia. For example, councils and council employees have tried to effect the notification without interfering with vehicles, and that has led to various forms of adhesive being used, hence use of the term "sticker".

I have heard of these notifications being placed on ventilation slots on the front of vehicles, as well as under windscreen wipers. Consternation was expressed in Adelaide when some vehicles were found to have disappearing windscreen wipers, which made it difficult to find a place to put the sticker, but doubtless that difficulty was soon overcome.

I pay a tribute to people such as Mr. Willing and Mr. Howie. It may be argued that they have gone to much trouble and that now we must straighten out the law, but I commend the actions that Mr. Howie has taken when he feels as he does. He considered that the procedure was not being operated correctly and that action taken was not in accordance with the law.

Mr. Howie scans assiduously most of the literature, if one may call it that, that emanates from councils and he reads the *Government Gazette*, in which the many changes to laws and regulations are published. This information is available to citizens who search for it and advertisements are placed in newspapers, but it is not always convenient for some people to read everything that is issued in this way. However, I assure the House that Mr. Howie reads it all. He reads the reports of proceedings in this House and he reads as much as he can about local government generally.

He has been of great help to me, and I acknowledge that help. I, like other members, have received many queries about council by-laws and, when I have contacted Mr. Howie, he, with his considerable knowledge, has saved me much time and I have been able to tell people the correct position. The Leader has canvassed all the matters in the legislation that we, as members of Parliament, ought to consider, and the Minister explained the position fairly when he said that the Bill set out to provide legally for what had been occurring. I do not think any member would object to the expiation principle in this area.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill and, like the member for Mitchell, take the opportunity to give credit to persons who have found a deficiency in the wording on council parking stickers, as they are called. Such people have also taken action regarding the Municipal Tramways Trust, in relation to action taken by the Adelaide City Council on parking meters, and regarding action taken to allow what is really unlawful free parking by members of the Judiciary in front of the Supreme Court building in King William Street. I shall refer to these matters individually.

Mr. Willing, like Mr. Howie, is a man of good character and he has assisted me in a similar way to that in which Mr. Howie has assisted the member for Mitchell. Regarding the action taken by the Adelaide City Council on parking meters, it seems that the practice was for council officers to have a hood placed over certain meters outside the Town Hall, and councillors were able to park in those areas. Then, when the council meeting started, councillors would decide to give exemption for that day for those meters. Mr. Willing believed the practice was unfair and, for that reason, raised the matter with me. Usually it is not good practice for people to take such action on their own.

The other matter related to the parking space in King William Street made available to judges and other members of the legal profession who, by parking there, were really breaking the law, and parking stickers should have been placed on their vehicles. I am not sure, but I believe that practice still exists. I asked the Government at the time to negotiate with the Adelaide City Council to provide parking space for our busy judges and members of the legal profession.

Regarding the Victor Richardson Drive incident, the Municipal Tramways Trust parked buses in the middle of the road instead of parking them, as the law provided, as near as practicable to the left-hand side of the road. I raised that matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport (as he then was) on November 23, 1972, and said that Mr. Willing had recently won a case against the M.T.T. during which the magistrate who heard the case said that it was a trivial offence and, even though he found the case had been proved, took no action. I should just like to draw a comparison between the opinion of the Minister of Transport and that of the member for Mitchell on Mr. Willing. At page 3492 of *Hansard* the Minister said:

If the honourable member wants to associate himself with a certain character merely for the sake of getting a vote from him, the honourable member sinks as low as the person concerned.

Maybe I am being unfair to the Minister of Transport and maybe he has as high an opinion of Mr. Willing as has the member for Mitchell; however, those were the words he used. The Minister also stated that he would do nothing either in the House or outside the House, in his capacity as a member, to help regarding frivolous and unimportant matters such as the matter raised by the honourable member. Now the Minister has introduced two Bills as a result of action taken by Messrs. Howie and Willing. Both gentlemen knew that the law had been broken, although it was trivial and small penalties were imposed, but it was an offence that was committed thousands of times each year.

The Adelaide City Council has, now that it has been proved beyond doubt that the fixing of stickers to wind-screens and collecting a fee for the offence are illegal, seen fit to suggest these amendments. The Minister said that he would do nothing to deal with such trivial matters, but now action has been taken to introduce these Bills. I do not know whether the M.T.T. still parks its buses in the centre of Victor Richardson Drive, but that practice was proved by Mr. Willing to be illegal. To clear the record, Mr. Willing does not live in the Fisher District and has no hope in the world of voting for me unless I change my district or he moves into Fisher. Mr. Willing lives in another good district, represented by a fine member of this House, the member for Heysen. Mr. Willing came to me for the same reason Mr. Howie went to the member for Mitchell: Mr. Willing lives on the border of my district and I was closer to him than was the member for Heysen. He knew I would take as much interest in this matter as would the member for Heysen, who has discussed matters such as this with Mr. Willing.

Other illegal actions being committed by the Adelaide City Council and other councils may be brought to light in future. However, I support the Bill and support people such as Messrs. Howie and Willing for causing us, as legislators, and other people some trouble. If it were not for people like them it might be that John Citizen would be run over completely by such legislation.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 30. Page 135.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): We on this side support the Bill because it is consequential on the Bill just passed. The Minister's second reading explanation was short and to the point, but one wonders whether it is really necessary to have such a Bill before us unless the Minister can define an officer of a council. This Bill amends section 44 of the Road Traffic Act, subsection (1) of which provides:

A person shall not, on a road or elsewhere, drive, use or interfere with a motor vehicle without first obtaining the consent of the owner thereof.

Subsection (3) provides:

Subsection (1) and (2) of this section shall not apply to a member of the Police Force or any officer of a council in the execution of his duty under this Act or any other Act.

However, because this Bill has been introduced following litigation, I fail to see why a member of the community should have to spend large sums to test similar laws. Parliament passed the law, and if it were not correct it should never have been passed in the first place. Why should it be left to people in the community to prove that the law is wrong? Parliament should look more closely at Bills before passing them.

This Bill, the provisions of which are indeed broad, concerns any person acting in the exercise of the discharge of any duties conferred or imposed on him by this Act or any other Act. If this Bill is passed it will be legal for a police officer or a parking inspector to place a parking sticker under a windscreen wiper of a car. Such officers would not care what would happen to the windscreen if it were broken, and where would a person stand in law if it were broken? That is where this Bill fails for a start. It does not cover the old system, which has been covered for many years, of putting a chalk mark on a car tyre when that car is parked in a parking zone.

Perhaps we should also consider whether it is illegal for a person to mark a tyre with chalk, and then take a time reading in order to know how long the motor vehicle has been parked. How will a parking inspector fare under this legislation when he adopts that practice? No doubt that practice will also be the subject of a court case. It seems that legislation is rushed through with only a brief explanation being given, and I do not like that system. Councils must be assisted by legislation when abandoned vehicles have to be removed, and at present police officers have the power to stop and test a motor vehicle. However, the person driving the vehicle or any passenger in it may not be the owner of the vehicle, and it will be interesting to note what happens in such cases.

I know of a person who served a gaol sentence for not paying parking fines, and he must be consoled by the passing of this legislation. His car being parked outside his boarding house, he became ill and could not move it. He did not pay the several hundred dollars worth of fines because he believed that he should not have to, but he served a gaol sentence. No doubt a scheme will now be considered to tow away vehicles. I believe that several hundred bookings were made of vehicles illegally parked on clearways, and no doubt they caused a nuisance to other road users. In New South Wales a tow-away scheme operates under which vehicles can be impounded: this also happens in London and in many American cities. In Mexico City the licence plates are removed from an illegally

parked vehicle, and the owner has to pay an on-the-spot fine before the plates are returned to him.

Mr. Wells: I did not think a tow-away system operated in New South Wales.

Mr. BECKER: It does in some parts of Sydney. In Rio de Janeiro the tyres of illegally parked vehicles are deflated, and I understand that parking authorities do a large trade in hiring pumps to be used to inflate the tyres. At least in this country we have some protection, but it is to be regretted that this type of legislation is necessary.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Using motor vehicle without consent."

Mr. BECKER: The new provision deletes the reference to a member of the Police Force and a council officer and inserts:

Any person acting in the exercise or discharge of any power or duty conferred or imposed upon him under this Act or any other Act.

What do the words "any power" mean? Does this mean that a parking or traffic inspector is not an officer of the council?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): No. This provision was included because the Government considered it desirable to amend the previous provision because of the possible legal arguments that could have been involved. It seems that this is a better solution.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 30. Page 164.)

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): In supporting the motion, I endorse the remarks of previous speakers regarding condolences and regrets at the passing of two former members, neither of whom I had the good fortune to know, and on the death of the Duke of Gloucester. I did not know the Duke of Gloucester either, but, on one occasion during the war, I participated, as a member of the Royal Australian Navy, in a formation that His Royal Highness reviewed.

Some Opposition members who have so far spoken, in speaking of the people they represent, namely, the primary producers, went to some lengths to try to show that scant recognition has been paid in the Speech to primary producers. Yet, strangely enough, I thought they would observe that primary producers in this State were shown such importance by the Governor that they appear on the first page of a multi-page document. For that matter, they are the first to be mentioned of all people in the community. Surely that is at least evidence of recognition of their correct place in our society. I do not think that Opposition members would suggest that, if the Governor referred to conditions and the seasonal prospects in the offing for primary producers, that is not referring to them early in the Speech.

How could anyone suggest that no importance is placed on primary producers? I was somewhat surprised to hear one or two disparaging remarks to the effect that only seasonal prospects were given prominence in the Speech. During the four years I have been a member, we have often had arguments about the difficulties faced by this sector of our

economy and how prone it is to suffer severe loss and hardship because of the elements over which it has no control. It seems to me perfectly reasonable and sensible that now, at least, there is every hope that primary producers will have a good season with bumper crops. Then surely this is something of importance that should not be discounted. This, to some extent, has been the tenor of other remarks made by some Opposition speakers, in relation to education, for example.

A suggestion has been made that there is little about education in the Speech and that that is not very satisfactory, because, as the Speech contains no long list of programmes associated with education or any other activity, it is not good enough. I have almost gained the impression that the way in which Opposition members judge the quality of the Governor's Speech is according to its length; in other words, a four-page Speech is not very good, but a 24-page Speech would be excellent.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense! One of the best ever written was the 1970 Speech, and that contained only a couple of paragraphs.

Mr. PAYNE: I am pleased to hear that the member for Mitcham does not subscribe to a view apparently held by other Opposition members, namely, that a Speech, to have any real weight and tone, should be longer and more detailed than the one given by the Governor on this occasion.

Regarding education, one Opposition speaker said that, somehow or other (almost as though it was the Governor's fault), we would not progress much in the field of education. One might surmise that this was the impression Opposition members gained in perhaps listening to the Speech and being distracted by someone in the gallery upstairs. Paragraph 15 of the Speech contains important information and statements of fact about which there is no need for any member to argue. Paragraph 15 states:

In the area of education, the most significant development during the past year was the establishment of the Australian Schools Commission and the adoption by the Australian Government of the financial recommendations of the Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission.

Finance is what that is all about. Paragraph 15 continues:

This has resulted in substantial additional funds for South Australian education under seven separate programmes.

To suggest that the Speech, with regard to education, is deficient in any way as regards information or detail is a specious argument. Paragraph 15 continues:

The first funds—

in which we, as elected representatives, must be interested—under these programmes were paid from the beginning—not talked about or promised, but paid—of 1974 and have already had a significant impact in the schools.

That is where it counts. One should go to the schools and see evidence of the spending of Commonwealth funds. Visual aids have already been delivered to schools. I have seen them in schools in my own district. I assume that members who think that there is little about education in the Speech have been pleased to receive their share of these funds by way of various additional visual aids, such as television sets, which are appreciated by teachers and students.

Mr. Harrison: And parents.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes. It has been something of a hardship for some parents to help pay for some of these items

in the past. Another important area in which the Government has taken giant steps is in the provision of many additional ancillary staff. Every school in my district has ancillary staff, who have been paid for since the beginning of 1974 by means of these funds. I am sure that Opposition members would agree how satisfactory it has been to members of the teaching staff to know that some of their tasks (with which the member for Kavel would probably be far more familiar than I), which used to fall to the lot of the teachers, have been taken over by the ancillary staff.

Mr. Goldsworthy: As a result of Commonwealth funds.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes. This is a most important area, and I laud the action of the Minister of Education, who has been very strong on these matters, who has continually fought to try to provide this help in schools, and who has now succeeded as a result of the Commonwealth Government's help, as has been pointed out by the member for Kavel. Reference to pre-school education is also made in the Speech. Some Opposition members were worried, justifiably, about what might be happening in this area. The same degree of worry and concern was felt by Government members and I am pleased to say that in reply to a question yesterday the Minister of Education said that we are in a better position than was at first believed to be the case. The Minister said we could now hope for a Commonwealth grant of between \$3 000 000 and \$4 000 000. In the previous six months we had \$1 250 000 and it looked as if we might get \$2 500 000 for the year. Instead of that, the much maligned Australian Government has allowed us considerably more than that (up to \$3 000 000 or \$4 000 000) and the Minister can justifiably—

Mr. McAnaney: What about—

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member is wont to try to distract speakers on the Government side, especially when we are telling the truth. As he does not want to hear the truth or to have it recorded, he will use his long experience in this Chamber to do all he can to distract me. I assure him that he will not succeed, because I intend to go on and give the important facts relating to pre-school education. Mr. Hudson said that by the end of next year at least 50 per cent of South Australian four-year-old children could attend a pre-school and the opportunity should be available to all children by the end of the decade, whereas only a year or two ago all was black on the horizon for the parents of pre-school children. They were worried about how it could be financed.

Mr. Mathwin: How would you—

Mr. PAYNE: I am very glad to have that interjection from the member for Glenelg. I am pleased he is recovering rapidly from his bout of Patawalonga flu or whatever it was that laid him low for some days.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He had tigeritis.

Mr. PAYNE: I do not want to go into that matter, because I, too, support Glenelg, so, after last Saturday's disaster, I do not want to canvass that any further. Some of the expansion of advanced training of pre-school teachers will include new courses to be introduced at Murray Park next year, and there should consequently be enough teachers to staff additional pre-school centres. We have been told that legislative authority will be sought this year for the Interim Pre-school Education Committee to plan the overall development of South Australian pre-school education. Importantly for parents, kindergartens are to be free within six years. That is a sample of what the member for Torrens (the Deputy Leader) has referred to as a complete whitewash for the Government's actions or for

its inaction. What a peculiar statement to make. He wanted two bob each way: the Government is not doing enough, and it is doing too much, all in the one breath. I can only suggest that it was one of his poorer efforts when he came up with that mish-mash. It did not mean anything and it was useless in a debate.

Other things I have heard from members opposite range from the amazing to the absurd. An example of the amazing occurred during the speech of the member for Chaffey when he was speaking about problems of grape-growers and wine producers in his area. I am not questioning the right of the honourable member to represent the views of those of his constituents engaged in that area, but he said that the Australian Government had collared \$1 000 out of each tonne of grapes and that the poor grower got only \$69 a tonne. He said they could not exist on that amount and could not continue with such a small financial return. However, within two minutes he castigated the South Australian Government for not allowing the same growers more water to allow them to expand and, I assume, to make even greater losses than they are already making, if one accepts his statements at face value.

An absurd example came from where one would normally expect it to come from. The member for Eyre last evening, speaking in this debate, tried to get members on his side and also members on the Labor side to accept the absurd proposition that the *Advertiser* as a newspaper was anti-Liberal Party. I repeat that this could only be regarded as an absurdity: any member on this side could substantiate my opinion. That is an example of what we have come to expect from the member for Eyre. Any person reading the *Advertiser* can detect without doubt that, if there is any bias at all, it is certainly not against the Liberal Party in South Australia. I consider that type of contribution to such a debate as this at the commencement of a session is only to be deplored. I urge the member for Eyre to show responsibility in these matters.

I am interested in many things contained in the Governor's Speech on which I wish to make a few remarks. I hope what I say in relation to matters of health will be noted by the Minister of Health. I will not give intensive and close detail of the two cases on which I wish to comment, because there may be unfavourable reaction in relation to at least one of the patients concerned. I can deal with that by corresponding with the Minister. However, I believe this matter is important enough to be brought to the attention of members of this and of another place.

I have been told by a medical officer who does not reside in my district but with whom I have had some contact that nursing homes that care for patients of the geriatric type are becoming rather selective. Sometimes, the medical officer and the relatives of a person seeking entry to one of these hospitals have to parley with those in charge of the hospital; it is like a game of bridge, where neither side should disclose its intentions too early in the game. The medical officer to whom I have referred told me that she located a bed for a patient in a certain private hospital, but the position changed when she said that the patient was convalescing after a stroke. When the question of intensive nursing arose, an earlier offer of a spare bed suddenly evaporated. The matron, on looking at her records again, found that she no longer had a bed available. I feel strongly about this terrible state of affairs. I hope that the Minister of Health will look into the matter, because hospitals of this type receive

finance from both the Australian Government and, in many cases, the State Government. If hospitals that have intensive care facilities attempt to be selective, the matter should be examined and, if necessary, the granting of Commonwealth and other aid may need to be reviewed. In another case, I was involved in direct negotiation with a certain denominational institution, and again I apologize to honourable members for not naming it. This institution went to considerable lengths to find out from me specific details about the extent that the person I was trying to assist was handicapped and whether she would be a bother to look after. I understand this institution also receives funding of the type to which I have referred. This is a disgraceful business. I had some difficulty in containing myself, but I played it cool, as I did not wish to prejudice the chances of the person I was trying to assist. I am pleased to say that I succeeded in assisting this constituent. I hope that we can do something to prevent this type of situation from arising again.

Since the last Address-in Reply debate, several things have happened, including the Commonwealth election. I wish to refer to canvassing in the Commonwealth Boothby District by the former member for Goyder and by a present member of this House. At the time of the canvassing, the former member for Goyder had just become a former member, and I refer to Mr. Hall.

Mr. Millhouse: You mean Senator Hall.

Mr. PAYNE: I am speaking of the then Mr. Hall.

Mr. Millhouse: Now Senator.

Mr. PAYNE: If the member for Mitcham desires that small consolation, I shall let him have it: the now Senator Hall.

Mr. Millhouse: It's more than a small consolation.

Mr. PAYNE: Figures show that, had there not been a double dissolution, despite the early prognostications of Senator Hall, he would have remained Mr. Hall. The actual percentages at the election were such that he would have been an also-ran at a normal Senate election. I make clear to the member for Mitcham that I bring forward this matter only to provide information.

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't told us what you're talking about yet.

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member is not blessed with what is sometimes regarded as a cardinal virtue—patience. I should have thought that over the years he has been here he would learn to be patient, and I am optimistic enough to hope that he will still learn. In canvassing for Mr. Berman in Boothby, the member for Mitcham adopted one approach, and Mr. Hall another. We have all come to know and accept that the Liberal Movement is allegedly a trendy outfit; it does not have ordinary colours, as other Parties have, but has purple and white. Such devices are supposed to have some magical or charismatic effect on people that the L.M. hopes to woo. I do not object; this is a free country, and the L.M. is entitled to use such means. The former member for Goyder wrote to the electors of Boothby in purple on white paper: the standard L.M. approach. I do not have much quarrel with the early part of his letter, in which he wrote the sort of things that we have probably all lent our names to when canvassing. The letter states:

For the first time in many years you will have a chance to put a progressive Liberal candidate in the House of Representatives. Your vote gives you an opportunity to reject antiquated conservatism in favour of aggressive look-ahead leadership.

It is interesting to note that, despite many protestations by the L.M., this approach is not really directed to Labor voters, as the letter states:

If you have been a non-Labor voter in the past, I urge you to assess Peter Berman in this light. If, on the other hand—

only as a second choice—

you normally vote Labor, I urge you to vote for Peter Berman in this instance.

The point I want to bring before members is that the Leader adopted this sort of standard approach as the leader of the household with his team colours. However, the member for Mitcham shows a different approach. Again, I do not suggest that he should not be allowed to do this, but I bring it forward merely by way of information. The member for Mitcham chose to use an envelope stamped with the Parliament of South Australia crest and bearing the words, "A letter from Parliament House". At the top of the envelope the letters "O.H.M.S." appear and the colour of the printing is green.

I do not know whether that means that, now that Mr. Hall has become Senator Hall and has left here, we will get a new broom through the old outfit, but let me record that, to my subjective eye, the colour on the envelope is green and the letters "O.H.M.S." appear. I presume that those letters mean "On His Majesty's Service", and members can work out who His Majesty is: I do not need to elaborate to members on that and I leave it to their own interpretation.

Further, we have left out voters and now we have electors, because this letter is addressed "Dear Electors". I hope that I am choosing the correct words when I say that the letter appears to be on House of Assembly paper but suspect that it is not. The letter has the crest of our State House on the top and the sub-address is "House of Assembly, Adelaide, South Australia".

Mr. Keneally: That appears to be House of Assembly paper, all right.

Mr. PAYNE: The letter is signed "Robin Millhouse, M.P., Member for Mitcham". Perhaps it is curious that the envelope had on it "O.H.M.S." and the letter was signed by Robin Millhouse. The content of the letter is fairly standard for the field. I should do the member the compliment of saying that it seems to be well compiled and careful in the choice of words. There is no purple colour anywhere on the paper and one could surmise that the member who sent the letter thought that it might be a better each-way prospect to leave the identification colours off the letter.

Mr. Mathwin: Wouldn't purple be the colour of the bleeding heart?

Mr. PAYNE: This could have affected the honourable member's judgment in the matter but I, not having such an object, would not be able to give any advice to the member for Glenelg on that. There is in the letter one prognostication that, with hindsight, as I have pointed out, did not seem to be justified. That part states:

We believe that there is strong support for the Liberal Movement in South Australia . . .

As I have said, the support was not so strong that it would have got Mr. Hall to Senatorial status unless we had a double dissolution, so I suppose that one could argue that that statement in the letter was not entirely accurate. However, I have no quarrel about the member's right generally to prepare and send out such material, and I am intrigued by the use of "O.H.M.S." on top of the envelope.

Doubtless, the member who follows me in this debate may be able to tell me who His Majesty is, and we look

forward to hearing this information. Other Opposition members who have spoken have tried to attack about inflation, increasing prices, whose fault it is, and other matters like that. Opposition members have had no doubt that all the blame (in fact, almost all of the cause) lay with either the Government of which I am a member or the Australian Government.

Mr. Coumbe: You mean you're a member of the Government Party.

Mr. PAYNE: I am a member of the Government Party: I stand corrected by the member for Torrens.

Mr. Keneally: But it won't be long.

Mr. PAYNE: I assure the member for Torrens that that was a slip of the tongue. The Opposition record regarding the matters to which I have referred bears examination. Members opposite have said that our Government did not do this and did do that, and we have been asked why we are doing something else. However, let us consider the Liberal Party of Australia, South Australian Division (alias the Liberal and Country League). What have members of that Party said or done?

Only six months ago inflation was prime in the minds of the people and the people were given all sorts of advice about what to do after the Australian Government had asked them to go to the polls and vote on a referendum question. That question referred to an Act to alter the Commonwealth Constitution so as to enable the Australian Parliament to control prices. I cannot see in that question anything about an octopus or any other kind of deep sea denizen, or about Socialist philosophy or control, or anything else. The question refers to the Australian Parliament, not the Australian Government, and who other than the elected representatives of every person in this country should have control in these matters? The elected representatives in the Australian Parliament comprise all sides of politics and all shades of opinion. I venture to say that not one Opposition member in this Chamber has read that referendum question.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: I say that especially about the members who are interjecting. I do not know for certain, but I am advancing an opinion and I intend to stick to it. I have said that we ought to examine the Opposition's record in these matters because the Opposition must answer to the people of this State for that. I will keep the matter at State level, because that will please members opposite. They want to live within the narrow confines of one part of this country. The Leaders of the Opposition Party in the Commonwealth Parliament and locally told the people that they should vote "No" to that question and also to the second question, which was about incomes.

Mr. Coumbe: What did Mr. Hawke say?

Mr. PAYNE: Never mind about Mr. Hawke. He advocated a "No" vote on one question, and that is what we are talking about.

Mr. Coumbe: He wanted to have two bob each way.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: We are not here to talk about having two bob each way. The cry from the Opposition benches is: "What are you going to do about prices? Why isn't the Commonwealth Government doing something about prices?" That is the question we are considering. Mr. Hawke came down firmly in support of a "Yes" vote at the time of the referendum and the Opposition members came down firmly in support of a "No" vote to both

questions. They were "No-Noes", and stuck to that group for not too long.

Mr. Coumbe: What did the voters of Australia say?

Mr. McAnaney: The Labor Government caused this inflation—the Australian Government.

Mr. PAYNE: It would be fair at this stage to examine the type of company the Opposition was keeping in its "No-No" advocacy. Unfortunately, I do not have my facts in any order of merit or demerit, because most of the company the Opposition was keeping did not deserve any merit. The Opposition kept company with the League of Rights, which produced literature and paid for advertisements at that time advocating "No-No". Secondly, they were in company with, as we would expect, the Commonwealth Liberal Party and the Country Party, both of whom advocated "No-No".

Mr. Becker: What about the D.L.P.?

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, they were in company with the D.L.P. and the Liberal Movement. Finally, they were in company with that fly-by-night committee which emerged from the sludge, or something like that, at 41 Pirie Street, calling itself "The Vote 'No' Committee".

Mr. Goldsworthy: You were in league with the Communists.

Mr. PAYNE: That is what I am talking about. That is a nice sort of smear tactic.

Mr. Becker: Aren't you smearing?

Mr. PAYNE: I am not smearing: I am just listing the company you were keeping.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I understand that you were in company with the Communists. How did they vote?

Mr. PAYNE: I did not look very carefully at that, but—

Mr. Keneally: The Communists voted "No-Yes", so the member for Kavel is wrong again.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. PAYNE: I understand that the Communists advocated "No-Yes". Momentarily, I faltered under the savage attack of Opposition interjections, especially those from the member for Kavel; however, I have weathered the storm and will now proceed to give the facts of this matter. What a motley crew the Opposition was keeping company with. They were entitled to a view, and that is the view they produced.

Mr. Becker: They were entitled to a viewpoint.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, but how long did it last? Later the Opposition had much to say about this matter but early in December Mr. Corcoran (Acting Premier at that time) offered to give the Commonwealth power to control prices.

Mr. Becker: Yes, but after the judges (the people of Australia) had made their decision.

Mr. PAYNE: I will deal with that in a moment. The Deputy Premier made that offer, which was published in the *News*, on December 10, 1973. On December 5, 1973 Rex Jory wrote an article in the *News* about this matter telling the public of South Australia that State Cabinet would vote "Yes" on prices and incomes at the referendum. I heard suggestions earlier that at least one speech by the South Australian Government had supported this matter. It seems that that decision was got over clearly to Rex Jory that the Government advocated a "Yes" vote on both questions, so much so that he chose to write an article about it. Rex Jory went on to tell the public that Dr. Eastick has said:

All other members of the L.C.L. Parliamentary Party will be voting "No-No" because we do not believe in extending the Canberra octopus.

That was the Leader's view, and he was entitled to express it. He did not say that he would be voting "No-No" because of something that might happen if the Party voted "No-No": he did not say that he was going to advocate a "No" vote because rising prices did not matter. One can only deduce that, unless he was stupid, he might have considered the possibility that prices could rise as a result of a "No" vote. That is where the Opposition will have to reconsider its position.

Some months ago the Opposition advocated a "No" vote on this question, particularly regarding prices. Why did Opposition members do that? Was their motive sinister? Did they have in mind that they would vote "No" so that their mates in business could go on raising prices if enough people would follow them?

Mr. Becker: You're sick.

Mr. PAYNE: Why did they engage in a fear campaign? Advertisements at the time, presumably paid for by the State or Commonwealth Liberal Party because they were signed by Mr. Vial and such people, advocated a "No-No" vote on the basis of what the Government might do—

Dr. Eastick: How do you know that?

Mr. PAYNE —if it were given this horrible tentacled power! The question referred to the Australian Parliament, not to the Australian Government.

Dr. Eastick: But the Commonwealth Government—

Mr. PAYNE: The Leader cannot contend that that was not what was meant, because the tone of the advertising was that people could not afford to let the Commonwealth Government, especially a Labor Government, have this power because it was matey with octopi. What a load of bunkum!

Dr. Eastick: I'm talking about any Government.

Mr. PAYNE: Now we are getting a different slant: they have to swing it around because they are stuck with their decision. Every person in the street remembers the advice of the Opposition and wishes that he had not followed it. I can cite hundreds of examples in my own district of people who have approached me about prices and who, on being asked how they voted, have said that, because they were not sure at the time, they voted "No". It was the Opposition's advertising that got them to vote "No"—a straight-out fear campaign to distort the import of the question.

Mr. Becker: You've been using those tactics for the last 50 years.

Mr. PAYNE: I hope that members opposite will continue to make such wild accusations by way of interjection because it seems to me that they will have to do a remarkable about-face. Now they are advocating that we ought to do something to control prices. For seven months the Liberal Party advocated doing nothing about prices, but now that Party has suggested that something should be done. What happened to make its members change their minds? Leaders of the Labor Governments, both State and Commonwealth, clearly stated the reasons for wanting this power to reside in the Australian Parliament.

Mr. Jennings: Where does it reside now?

Mr. PAYNE: In the pockets of those who can extort from the community profits and income that take no account of the struggle of the ordinary person to live. The record

of Opposition members on this matter is absolutely clear. Can anyone suggest that the reason for changing their minds was the effect on the economy in seven months? That is a load of rubbish. It seems that this matter has now become important, and there are all the signs of political opportunism. Obviously, Opposition members were either stupid or made the wrong choice, and we could be charitable and suggest that they have considered that matter and have gained more wisdom and are now trying to do the right thing. The alternative is that they were not stupid but were playing politics all the time.

Mr. Keneally: Have you considered that they could be both stupid and opportunist?

Mr. PAYNE: I want to be charitable. However, their conduct has not been good in the eyes of the public, and they now realize that something must be done about prices.

Mr. McAnaney: Have you read Rex Jory's article in today's newspaper?

Mr. PAYNE: I think he still works for the *News*: he has spoken to me a couple of times, I have replied, and we have parted good friends. I did not try to upset him and I hope that I did not. I suppose that would be about par for the course. Opposition members cannot escape my argument. I look forward to hearing an explanation of their extraordinary conduct in this matter, particularly as it affected the person battling on \$70 a week who was told not to vote for price control. The second largest political Party in Australia advised people to vote "No" and they would then have no worries about prices. I am sure that the first 10 people I spoke to in the street today would not agree with that policy. The Liberal Party had a disgraceful attitude in a matter that affected the daily living problems of ordinary citizens, and I am glad that I had no part in it. My Party clearly advocated the support of price control. I think I have shown the reprehensible conduct of Opposition members, and I am sure that when this matter comes to the attention of electors again they will recall who gave them the correct advice and which Party gave them phoney advice. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): In supporting the motion, I refer first to the most important matters. Therefore, I congratulate my colleague from Goyder on his maiden speech and on his election to Parliament. I have never enjoyed listening to a speech more than I enjoyed listening to the speech of the new member for Goyder. At the end of last session few members in this place thought that I would have a colleague when Parliament resumed. However, I am sure that all members received a shock, and none greater than the shock received by members of the L.C.L. My only regret is that last week I was not invited by the Speaker to escort the new member for Goyder into the Chamber to take the Oath. I believe that the Speaker was wrong in refusing my request by letter made before the session began.

I did not have the chance to raise the matter when the House met last Tuesday week, but I believe that it would not have been contrary to Standing Orders for me to escort the honourable member, if for no other reason than that it was ludicrous to see the Leader of the Opposition, who had bitterly opposed the election of the member for Goyder, being one of the two members to bring him into the House. Members of the Labor Party now say that his election was due to their efforts, so the situation is a little different, but I shall say something about that matter later. The fact is that the L.M. won the seat of Goyder with a very good victory. That has firmly established us

as a political force in this State and, I believe, before long throughout the Commonwealth. I believe that the victory of the member for Goyder was even more significant than that victory which is so much lamented by members of the A.L.P. and the L.C.L. in this place: that of Senator Steele Hall in the Senate election. When the result was known on the evening of June 8, the Leader of the Opposition blamed it on what he termed an A.L.P.-L.M. axis. Why he could not admit that his Party had taken an absolute thrashing, I do not know.

What the L.C.L. has to explain (and I invite other members of that Party who have not yet spoken in the debate to do so when they speak) is the dramatic drop in the vote it received in the Goyder District between May 18 and June 8, even though the 31 of them in the House were all industriously working in the Goyder District, compared to only three of us.

Mr. Keneally: If it had been the reverse, you would have lost.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When I beetled up the Port Wakefield Road in my Mini Moke I saw these wealthy members whipping past in their expensive motor cars, going on their way. Just to remind us of what happened, Senator Hall has up in his office now one of the L.C.L.'s little election dodgers which says that there is only one Opposition in South Australia, namely, the L.C.L., and it has a photograph on it. The photograph is significant: it is a photograph of all of them; in the centre of the front row is the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and every other member of the L.C.L. in both Houses is grouped around him in that advertisement. When we need a little light refreshment from our labours, we look at that election dodger up in Senator Hall's office. But what are the facts? What happened? On May 18, in Goyder, 9 120 people voted, of whom 4 574 voted for the L.C.L. I have checked my arithmetic and that, to me, comes to 50·15 per cent of the vote.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said L.C.L.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and that election dodger says that there is only one Opposition in South Australia, namely, the L.C.L. That election result was for the House of Representatives election. Three weeks later, 9 374 voted in Goyder, of whom 2 771 voted for the L.C.L. candidate. I have checked this twice (I invite members to correct me if I am wrong), and it comes to 29·52 per cent of the votes. What I now invite members of the L.C.L. to do is explain why, in three weeks, their vote in Goyder dropped from 50·15 per cent to 29·52 per cent. We have heard much twaddle talked about the A.L.P.-L.M. axis and that we would not have won the election if it had not been for the A.L.P. vote. However, that is the fact which honourable members in front of me avoid. Their vote dropped by over 20 per cent in three weeks between one election and the other. It was not as though all the facts were not known. It was known before the election that there would be no A.L.P. candidate. It was known that A.L.P. supporters were going to vote for the L.M., and had been told to do so. Yet, the L.C.L. still believed that it would win the election.

On the Wednesday before the election I happened to be at one of the television channels with Mr. John Vial, who is the General Secretary of the L.C.L. After the programme had ended I put to him straight out, "Who will win the by-election on Saturday?" He said to me (knowing all the facts: that there was no A.L.P. candidate, that the Country Party and the L.M. were exchanging preferences, and that the A.L.P. supporters were likely to vote for the

L.M.), "Of course we are going to win. Look at the Senate vote. We cannot lose." That is what their Chief Executive Officer said, knowing all the facts, three days before the election. What happened? The fact is that they are no good, and the people of Goyder realized that they were no good.

As for the A.L.P. vote having influenced the result, only one combination of circumstances could possibly have given the election to the L.C.L. on the paltry vote (2 771) that it received on election day: that is, if the A.L.P. had put up a candidate; and if that candidate had received about 25 per cent of the vote; if the A.L.P. had directed its preferences to the L.C.L. instead of to the L.M. or the Country Party; and if those preferences had stuck. Then and only then could the L.C.L. possibly have won the Goyder by-election. It is very unlikely that, under any conditions, all those circumstances would have been satisfied. If we had not won the election, there is little doubt that the seat would have gone to our friends in the Country Party. The L.C.L. vote was 29·52 per cent of the total, having been 50·15 per cent only three weeks previously.

Where do we go from here? It was certainly an unpleasant shock to the L.C.L. We only had to look at the *Advertiser* the following Monday to see what a shock to the system it had been. I do not intend (and the member for Hanson will be pleased at this) to refer any further (unless he wants me to) to what we saw in the paper on that Monday and on subsequent days. Suffice to say that it was obviously a very unpleasant shock to the members of the L.C.L. In my prophecy, the L.M. will continue to get stronger and stronger. Nothing has changed in the L.C.L. that I can see, except its name; but, apparently, it still hopes for a miracle.

Only a couple of days ago it was reported to me that a prominent South-Easterner in the Millicent Club was saying that I was about to rejoin the L.C.L. and the L.C.L. had booked time on television to make the announcement. Can anyone imagine anything more absurd than that? Yet, that is the kind of thing they keep saying to each other. I quote from a letter I received a couple of days ago from someone who is joining the L.M. and who lives in the Glenelg District (just to show that I am not romancing):

We both feel very strongly that the L.M. is attempting to bring us into the 21st century and not a return back to the 19th. We also commend Steele Hall for the stand he has already taken in the Senate and also for his keen judgment. To us, he has shown that you do not always have to show haste to win a point. The L.C.L. (or the Liberal Party and the Country Party) cannot progress on day dreams—why do they not get their advisers etc. to get out and report back what the public are really thinking and not to report back in a manner which they know will be acceptable to the Party?

The letter continues to comment about the present member for Glenelg, and I will go no further than that. Nevertheless, that letter represents the typical outlook of many people. The Liberal Movement, although it is represented by only three members in this Parliament (only two of us in this place), intends to take the lead in Opposition, as we were able to do in the last session and as we have already done (if I can say it with modesty) during the present session.

Mr Langley: I'm glad you mentioned it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am satisfied that members of both the majority Parties in this House will certainly not mention it if they can possibly avoid it. Obviously, there is a firm alliance between them both on this point. Indeed, it is ironic that yet again both you, Mr. Speaker, and the

Government have refused us any sort of recognition as a Party. It is ironic because it is in such contrast to what has happened in the Commonwealth Parliament, where the Liberal Movement is at present represented by only one man.

Mr. Mathwin: He's got the balance of power—you haven't.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the only sort of consideration, I have no doubt, that we get from the member for Glenelg on this matter. In the Commonwealth Parliament Senator Hall has been recognized as the Leader of a Party.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He'd better watch his step or he'll lose it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not only has he been recognized by the Government as the Leader of a Party but also I draw the attention of members to the Commonwealth *Hansard* list of Senators. There we find that Senator Hall is listed, not with all the *hoi polloi* of the Senators but after the Leader of the Australian Country Party in the Senate, as the Leader of the Liberal Movement—Senator Raymond Steele Hall. There we have it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you be satisfied with your name in our *Hansard* as Leader of the Liberal Movement?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That would be a modest step in the right direction.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'll bet that—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last year the then member for Goyder (now Senator Hall) wrote to this Government seeking recognition of the Liberal Movement as a Party, but he was refused that recognition. Following the Goyder by-election I wrote again to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Premier asking for this recognition. I received back speedily a letter from the honourable Speaker, as follows:

There have been occasions in the past where others have claimed representation, but there has been no precedent in South Australia for Party recognition of other than the official Opposition and the same practice will be continued.

It is extraordinary how conservative people can get when they want to. He then continues to deal with the matter of accommodation, as follows:

All members of the Opposition will be provided with office accommodation on the second floor of Parliament House and in this capacity you and Mr. Boundy will be accommodated accordingly.

I now find that we have been accommodated in the extreme north-western corner of the building, on the second floor, past all the L.C.L. members. No-one, I suppose, in the building is farther away from the Chamber than we are. It is a good thing that we are young and fit, which is in stark contrast to some other members in this place. Nevertheless, that will be of little consequence to us. But to add insult to injury, when I went to enter the room last Monday week (and even again today), the room was not ready for us. It is all right for me, as I have an electorate office, but the member for Goyder has no other accommodation at all. I must say it was rather galling for me to see in either the *Advertiser* or the *News* (I do not know which) a photograph of the elegant Premier's room which has been done out by Mr. Dean Berry—and none better—for the use of the Premier. I suppose he must take precedence; he is a very important person. I have not been into the room; it is many years since I have been there, and I have seen only the photograph. But I must say that it was rubbing salt into a wound to see this room completed and to find that I had nothing at all. I say all these things, as members realize, more

in amusement than by way of complaint, and I assure members that these trivia will not interfere with the quality of the work of my colleague and me in this place.

Mr. Langley: You might lose him at the next election.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have no doubt whatever about the result of the next election, both in Goyder and in Mitcham.

Mr. Langley: I think he'll be leaving the L.M. pretty soon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad that the member for Unley mentioned that, for I want to say a few words about it. Apparently some members of the L.C.L. have been feeding themselves on the vain hope that this might happen. One or two L.C.L. members in their speeches in this debate (including the Deputy Leader himself) expressed the wish that the member for Goyder might join what is now called the Liberal Party. I can tell the Deputy Leader and all other members—

Mr. Rodda: You're telling the member for Goyder at the same time!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is entirely unlikely. I have said publicly and I will say it again—

Mr. Nankivell: Will you change sides?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Mallee talks about people changing sides. Perhaps he should look at the people on his own front bench before he talks about that. I can see the three pretenders now. Let me say what I have said publicly before. There are three conditions which the L.C.L. must meet before there can be any discussions between us. The first condition is that that Party recognize ours as a Party and do not try to suborn individuals as it has in the past. The second condition is that it agree to divide into city and country. Whether the change of name is for that purpose, I do not know, but it may be a small step in that direction. The third thing which must happen and which must be acknowledged publicly is a change of leadership, in the Parliamentary Party in this House, in another place, and in the lay Party, before we can even consider having any conversations with them.

Those are the three conditions and, because of all the rumours and nonsense that have been raised in this place and elsewhere, it is a good thing that I have set these conditions out, so that we all know where we stand. When the L.C.L. is willing to accede to these conditions, we might be getting somewhere.

Mr. Langley: What about the member for Hanson?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to discuss the member for Hanson, except to say that I was surprised when I saw him still sitting on the front bench after what was reported to have gone on in his Party. It is now perfectly obvious that the fate that is in store for him is the withdrawal of his preselection. All Liberal Party preselections have been cancelled. All candidates have to start from scratch, and that, I think, we shall find is the explanation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are working very hard, are you not, to get some members to join the honourable member's sub-branch, temporarily?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the Minister is good at these things, but we in the Liberal Movement do not do that sort of thing. Let me now turn to three other matters of rather more substance than the L.C.L. I want to say a few things particularly to members opposite.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's our turn now!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The first two matters I raise arising from the Governor's Speech I will canvass shortly, but the third one may take a little longer. The first is the

relationship between the States and the Commonwealth Government. I had an opportunity to say something about this during the no-confidence motion moved by the L.C.L. last week, and I do not intend to go over all that again. I draw attention to the obvious friction that occurred between the Prime Minister and the Premier of this State at the time of the A.L.P. conference. I wish I could accept it as more than shadow sparring on the part of the Premier, because the sad fact is that, when we get down to tintacks, we find that a Labor man puts his Party before the interests of his State. I believe that, if a man does that, it is impossible for him to be both a good South Australian and a good Labor man, and I fear that, when the crunch comes, he will bow to the dictates of his Party, irrespective of the interests of his State. Therefore, I cannot accept at face value what the Premier said about, and to, the Prime Minister. But still it was better than nothing and it showed that even the Premier will, on occasion, speak out.

We then had the most absurd (I come right up to the present time) suggestion of the Prime Minister, transmitted to the Premier last Friday, about a reduction in salaries of judges and senior public servants. It was my bad luck today, of course, that the Premier was able to avoid answering my question by being out of the Chamber, and all we had was nonsensical waffle from the Minister of Education. It is a poor show when the Premier cannot spend even the hour of question time here to stand up and reply for himself.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He's answered your question in the press.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to know what answer the Premier gave the Prime Minister, not what he said publicly. That is what I asked but, of course, I did not get an answer to it. I say again what I said during the explanation of that question that, if a man like Whitlam makes such a request as that after he has been beaten in his own Party and in his own Parliament, one doubts his judgment on every matter, because there is no doubt that such a request was as absurd as it was petulant. How could we possibly take away the salary increases either voted by Parliament or given by those bodies constituted by Parliament? Yet that is what the Prime Minister has asked every State Parliament or State Government to do—after his own people had tried to get a \$5 500 increase in their own salaries, a move prevented only by the combination of Parties in Opposition in the Senate.

This throws grave doubt, I believe, on the capacity of the Prime Minister if he acts like that in a fit of pique. There is no doubt that inflation is out of hand and is a most terrible problem. None of us knows the answer to it and it was wrong for the member for Heysen, as he did by interjection when the member for Mitchell was speaking, to blame the Commonwealth Government entirely for it. I think the Commonwealth Government has added to it and, in many ways, it is worse than it might have been if the Whitlam Government had not been in power; but to lay the blame for inflation on the Government is absurd. No-one with any sense would do that, but we shall hear the member for Heysen on that in due course. None of us knows the answer but, although a few years ago I would have found it extraordinary that I should be advocating such a thing, I am attracted to the Adelaide plan which was published in the *Australian* last week and which was prepared by four South Australian economists from Adelaide University and Flinders University.

I consider that wage indexation on a 12-monthly basis (not a quarterly basis, because that would add to rather than lessen the causes of inflation) probably is the best and most practical way in which to tackle the problem. However, when we get demands for wage increases such as we are getting now, we despair. I have been given a copy of a log of claims that the Storemen and Packers Union served on employers this month. I know that it is only a log of claims, but I ask members to listen to what the union is seeking.

Mr. Wright: Are you willing to tell me your annual income?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I do not think there is any secret about that. I do not have a very large income.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you support the claim by lawyers for a 30 per cent increase in fees?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That sounds bad, and I do not know why the solicitors are doing it. Of course, it is a solicitors' claim, not my claim. Let me, for the benefit of the member for Adelaide, deal with the log of claims lodged by the Storemen and Packers Union. In part, it seeks the following:

- Weekly wage rates—a minimum of \$200 a week for all adult employees;
- extra payments—a minimum of \$20 a week in addition to all other payments;
- site allowance—a minimum of \$40 a week in addition to all other payments;
- district and divisional allowance—a minimum of \$40 a week in addition to all other payments;
- industry allowance—a minimum of \$20 a week in addition to all other payments;
- special rates—a minimum of \$20 a week in addition to all other payments;
- hours—a maximum of 30 hours a week.

The union is asking for more than \$300 a week for 30 hours work. It knows as well as we do that this claim is absurd; it is only a starting point. If that sort of demand is to be met, we will never be able to overcome inflation, and the people of South Australia and of Australia as a whole are in extreme difficulty. The rash of strikes is appalling. At Question Time this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition asked a question on that topic as the first question of the day, and it was a proper topic on which to ask that question.

However, we again had what we have had so often, namely, that whenever there is a strike (or, as we have now, a complete rash of strikes, with continual and complete chaos), the Government will not say one word against the strikers. I realize I am wrong in that statement; let me be completely fair. During the demarcation dispute on the Port Adelaide wharf, the Premier said a few things rather weakly. However, apart from that, we never get from this Government or from any other Labor Government a condemnation of strikes, yet sometimes one feels this community is on the edge of chaos because of strikes.

Regardless of whether we think of bread, milk, transport, and many other things, the employees are on strike. The Government has not said one word to give a lead and suggest that these strikes are ill advised and should be called off because the community is suffering by them. The real weakness of a Labor Government is that it cannot do that, because the unions responsible for what is going on are supporting it. That bad state of affairs shows up the fatal weakness of a Labor Government and its ultimate incapacity to deal with the frightening sort of situation (and it is frightening, more than inconvenient) that we have in our community now.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Will you use your good offices to resist the lawyers' 30 per cent increase?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a pity that the Minister did not use his good offices. The Premier sneers at us for saying that, but the Minister is a former trade union official and he knows that he is in a far better position than anyone else to use good offices to do a little persuading. The third matter with which I want to deal is industrial development in this State. We have heard much about plans, and so on, regarding industrial development and it all seems to have started in 1970, so far as this Government is concerned.

There has been unprecedented expansion in the number of public servants engaged in this field of endeavour, but I suggest that we have not much to show for all that has been said about industrial development in South Australia, and the Premier must admit that. I refer to the supplement on page 23 in last Tuesday's *News*: the 1974 industrial and export feature. In his foreword, the Premier states:

A vigorous approach to development with determination to keep a congenial lifestyle in a pleasant environment will, I believe, continue to ensure South Australia's position as a pace-setter State.

Lord only knows what that means, but it sounds good and most of us swallow it for most of the time. The report continues:

In 1970 we set out on a programme to get maximum industrial development and diversification.

Of course, nothing had happened before 1970! The Premier also states:

The results are plain:—

he makes the assertions but does not back them up—developments in a very wide range of industries and new markets around the world for our products.

It is easy to say that but harder to find the results. I am pleased that the Minister of Environment and Conservation is present, because he will be particularly interested in what I am saying. The Premier also states:

Perhaps the most exciting is the petro-chemical complex at Red Cliff. The project itself and its spin-off benefits will have immense importance to Port Pirie and Port Augusta. The Premier, at least by strong implication, has admitted that this is the Government's major project in industrialization since 1970. If we were back in the 1940's, 1950's, or even the early 1960's, we would be extremely enthusiastic about the Redcliff project, but we are nearly half-way through the 1970's and we should no longer be seeking industrial development merely for the sake of industrial development. We realize now that many other factors also must be weighed in the balance. Because of unhappy experiences in other parts of the world, we now think of ecology and the need to abide by the principles of conservation.

As I have said, we are aware of factors other than industrial development *per se*. It is ironic that the Premier, the Government, and doubtless all the Government's Parliamentary supporters seem to be taking the old-fashioned attitude of development at any price. I believe that what has happened (and this is not new: it has been said many times previously) is that the decision to site the operation at Red Cliff Point was taken first and the studies that have been commenced since must produce results to fit that decision. It is not a genuine study of the ecology and the problems of conservation. The decision was made, and now the facts have to be made to fit that decision. This is wrong, and it is leading the Government to cover up on this matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where would you suggest a possible alternative could go?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not here to suggest alternatives; I intend to examine what the Government has done regarding the petro-chemical complex at Red Cliff.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Aren't you able to suggest possible alternatives?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not be diverted by the Minister of Education. Experience has shown me that, when he interjects in anticipation, he is not looking forward to what I am about to say. I am here not to debate with the Minister of Education on this matter but to say what I think.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: My experience suggests—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that the decision to site the project in this position was made without any thought of the principles of conservation or the effect that it might have on the environment. As has been said many times before in this House, many people are doubtful about this project. Let me refer briefly to one such person, Professor C. Manwell (Professor of Zoology at the University of Adelaide).

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's bonkers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Professor will be pleased to hear the member for Kavel say that. Strangely enough, that interjection only confirms one of the things that the Professor said in this report: that the members of the two major political Parties have jumped into this project without considering some important matters. That the member for Kavel should try to write him down in that way seems to confirm that opinion. I refer now to the report written by Dr. Manwell entitled "The Redcliff Chloralkali-Petro-chemical Complex—The Politics of Pollution", part of which is as follows:

This case history is incomplete; in part because the plant is not yet built, production not anticipated before 1978; in part because a screen of secrecy and public relations has been imposed by the politicians and businessmen involved, ostensibly to protect proprietary processes and commercial skills.

I will not go through the whole report, which I have for members to read if they so desire. At the end of his report, Professor Manwell reached the following conclusion:

One wonders if it would have been wiser to have planned Red Cliff more carefully, and more openly. The Australian Government has entered into contracts with a variety of multi-nationals and representatives of foreign Governments in the last few years in scant knowledge of the impending energy crisis and its full implications. To this has been added the complication of the necessity for Japan and other highly industrialized, highly polluted and over-populated countries to export their pollution in the form of ethylene dichloride production, or the noise pollution of Japanese transistor wirelenses and motor-bikes. Australians in general, and Australian politicians in particular, have been largely indifferent to the consequences—

the interjection by the member for Kavel pointed that out—whether the fragility of much of the Australian ecology, and its special vulnerability to pollution, or the absence of laws on noise pollution, an absence not found in many other countries. Red Cliff appears to be one more example of this indifference and ignorance. It is likely to be financially, socially and ecologically a very expensive example.

But what has the Government done about this matter? I have here a publication dated May, 1974, which has been issued by the South Australian Environment and Conservation Department and which is entitled "Redcliff Petro-chemical Development. Plan for Environmental Study." We find that no environmental impact study has been made regarding this project: all we have here is a plan for one. Indeed, one does not have to go much past the cover to see this. On page 3, under the heading "Summary", one finds the following:

In order to assess the effects of the project on the environment, studies are required of the following areas. Six areas are then set out, after which the following appears:

These studies should comprise a definition of the existing environmental profile

Obviously, these things which I understand take a long time to do have not yet been done. They should be done before a decision is made, not after it has been made. This merely confirms what I said: that the decision was made first and now those concerned are trying to fit the facts to the decision, as can be seen from pages 3 and 4 of the report which has been issued by the Environment and Conservation Department and to which I have referred. Indeed, on page 5 one finds the following admission of this:

Some 2½ years ago the site at Red Cliff in South Australia was nominated by the South Australian Government as a suitable location for a petro-chemical plant.

That happened before any studies had been made to see whether it was suitable. The report then goes on to deal with Dow Chemical Company, and so on. Page 17 contains details of recommended studies. Although these things have not yet been done, we are told in His Excellency's Speech that members will have placed before them this session an indenture Bill that they must either accept or reject. This is a bad and serious thing. I am not alone in saying this; indeed, it has been said before. I refer now to a paper written by Dr. Lewis, the acting head of the Organic Chemistry Department at the University of Adelaide. I have been told that few people, at either of Adelaide's universities would support the Red Cliff Point site as at present proposed.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What would they suggest by way of petro-chemical development—anything?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I said previously (and I hope I made myself clear, even to the Minister of Education) that we must balance the advantages and disadvantages of these things: neither is absolute. However, it may well be (we do not know the answers) that a petro-chemical plant at Red Cliff will have more disadvantages to the community than it has advantages. That is what we must know before we decide to proceed. Yet the Government has already decided to site the complex in this position. Dr. Lewis said:

The plan for an environment study—

that is the one to which I have referred—

contains insufficient information on the chemical processes to be involved in the Redcliff petro-chemical plant to suggest any substantial degree of assurance that undue pollution of the surrounding air and the water in Spencer Gulf will not occur.

At the end, he says:

Obviously, the release of several tonnes of EDC—that is ethylene dichloride—

each day into the water of Spencer Gulf could occur. The likely effect of this on marine life in the upper reaches of the gulf must surely be properly assessed in advance of the final decision to permit construction of the chemical plant.

Members can argue with Dr. Lewis's opinion if they like. I want an answer. Finally (and I was prompted not by that report but by other considerations), I put some Questions on Notice this week about what studies had been carried out of the waters of Spencer Gulf. Yesterday, the Minister gave me certain replies with which I am dissatisfied, and I will tell members why. The first question I asked was as follows:

Have environmental surveys concerning the Redcliff petro-chemical project been prepared?

The reply was "Yes". My second question was this:

If prepared, are such surveys to be made public and when and, if not, why not?

The answer, which deserves a prize for vagueness, was as follows:

Some surveys have been prepared, some have been made public, and the remainder will be made public, when ready.

That is all I got on the general point. I then asked about the Spencer Gulf Waters Pollution Committee, as follows:

Is there a Spencer Gulf Waters Pollution Committee and, if so:

- (a) who are its members;
- (b) when was it formed;
- (c) what are its terms of reference;
- (d) has it prepared a report and, if not, is a report to be prepared; and
- (e) if a report has been, or is to be, prepared, does the Government intend to release such a report and when?

I got an answer to the first part of my question; I was given the names of the committee members, headed by Dr. Inglis. I was also told that the committee was formed in August, 1973. In reply to paragraph (c) of my question, I was told:

(c) The co-ordinating committee was set up to examine the report on Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Studies—Reconnaissance Survey, and make recommendations regarding the priorities, programmes, machinery, and resources for implementation and co-ordination of:

1. the specific studies recommended by the reconnaissance survey, and
2. such other studies as the committee may consider necessary for the short and long-term protection of Spencer Gulf.

The sorts of thing that Dr. Lewis refers to have got to be done. The next reply is vital.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I would have thought—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that the Minister did not interrupt me deliberately, and I hope that he will not interrupt me any more. I asked the following question about the committee:

Has it prepared a report and, if not, is a report to be prepared?

The Minister's reply was:

(d) No—possibly.

What the devil is the good of having a committee if no report is to be prepared? Further, I asked:

If a report has been, or is to be, prepared, does the Government intend to release such report and when?

The Minister replied, "See (d)." What I wanted to know was why a committee appointed in August, 1973, had not at the end of July, 1974, made any report on a matter that was obviously of some urgency. That, on the face of it, is entirely unsatisfactory, but what was more unsatisfactory was that when I talked with a couple of members of the committee I found that they believed that they had made a report last November, yet that has not come out in the Minister's answer. The committee met until about that time, having had only one meeting since. What is going on? I want the Minister to say whether a report was prepared and, if it was, what happened to it and why he denied in his answer to my Question on Notice that there had been a report. These things are too serious to be trifled with; it is a serious thing for the future of our community for anyone to play politics in that way on this project.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How it is—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to know from the Minister (and I hope I will get an answer other than by interjection now) whether the answer he gave me was accurate and, if it was not accurate, what the real position is. If it was accurate, why have we had no report from a committee formed nearly 12 months ago to study what is a vital aspect of the Redcliff petro-chemical project? That was the matter of substance that I desired to raise. I also

intended to deal with the lamentable explanation given by the Attorney-General this afternoon in answer to what I said yesterday about a Bill of Rights. I am content to let members and readers of *Hansard* compare what I said and what he said and to draw their own conclusions. I do not think I need to say anything more about it; it is not a big enough matter for me to say more on it now. I will be content with the way in which most people will decide between the Attorney-General and me on the matter. My time is up.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Will you continue your speech after the dinner adjournment?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You've eight minutes to go.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am flattered that members want me to come back after dinner. However, if I get answers from the L.C.L. and the Government, I will be more than content to give up the last eight minutes of the time available to me.

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

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, although with reluctance, I express my loyalty once again to the Queen of our country and the British Commonwealth and to His Excellency the Governor, who had the unpleasant task of reading a very weak Speech setting out what the Government may do during this session. The Speech was greeted with silence, and I regret that it did not contain more information. I had intended to welcome the new member, but he is not at present in the Chamber. Perhaps honourable members will remind me later, if he comes in, and I will then make a few remarks.

In the meantime, I shall make a brief reference to this matter. All my life I have believed that people should work together. I have tried to do that, and as a leader of the Australian Primary Producers Union I tried to get all the farmer organizations into one group. I think the Labor Party has found the value of people working as a group, although its members fight and have different views. However, they have met with success by combining as one group. I knew the father of the member for Goyder many years ago. He was a very fine citizen, and it is disappointing to me that this young man has come here with the handicap of being a member of a small group, not having the opportunity to work with others to form a Party that could oust the Government from its benches. I hope he carries out his obligations as a member of Parliament, and that he comes into the Chamber shortly.

Over the years that I have been a member of the Public Works Committee, I have reached the conclusion that the schools in greatest need of replacement are not in fact those being replaced. I make no accusation against officers in the department who make recommendations; they just have too much to do to be able to assess really satisfactorily which schools should be replaced. The Public Works Committee a year or two ago rejected an application for replacement of a school, and now it has before it another application for the school to be replaced. Admittedly, the wooden buildings are old, but the most luxurious home I have ever been in was in Boston, in the United States, and it was a wooden building.

What is the objection to wooden buildings? The rooms are airy, and the school concerned has a constant number of students, a number not likely to increase. For some reason, it is suggested that the wooden buildings be knocked down and replaced by a new unit. It could be argued that we need modern classrooms in which children can be taught

with modern methods. I would go along with that if that was the best course. This school apparently must be replaced as money is available, but although money will be available this year in considerably increased amounts, with the rate of inflation and the increased cost of building fewer schools can be built in South Australia this year.

I know of cases where surplus wooden buildings at some schools are being shifted, at considerable cost, to other schools. This is necessary because of increased attendance at some schools, but it is perpetuating a system in which the old types of school building are available, while at the same time wooden buildings are being knocked down at other schools. This is quite wrong. A public inquiry should be held, not an inquiry through the department itself. A committee should be set up, not to bring in a report into which another committee will inquire, as so often happens under this Government, but to determine which schools are in most urgent need of replacement. As I said, I do not blame the officer who makes these recommendations; he has too much to do. I know of a school where it has been necessary to knock out a door so that a table and chairs can be fitted in to make a room where teachers can spend their leisure time. At the same time, wooden buildings have been taken to that school, where the accommodation is not quite adequate. This matter, too, must be investigated as soon as possible.

Last year the South Australian Housing Trust built fewer houses than it had built for many years past, and yet the Auditor-General's Report last year showed that, at the end of June last, the Housing Trust had \$12 400 000 in cash, raised at an average interest rate of 6.2 per cent. On this money the trust was getting a return of 4.5 per cent. Surely, something must be wrong with the Housing Trust if it has so much money in the bank; it is something that should be inquired into. In certain areas many houses remain uncompleted. In Mount Barker, for example, few houses have been completed in the past 18 months, but many have been commenced. Some houses require only to be painted, but there is one painter to do the work. The trust should have sufficient enterprise to get painters. It could get them to go to Mount Barker, for instance, by making houses available there, having regard to the present housing shortage. At the instigation of the Government, the trust will build houses in the northern areas where many people are unemployed, but housing should be provided where job opportunities exist. To me, the situation is extraordinary, and I think the trust needs livening up.

Some young people came to me in Mount Barker and said they were in a Housing Trust house to which they could not get a title and which they were therefore occupying on a rental basis. They wanted to be able to take up their agreement so that they would pay less money in interest and gradually pay off their debt. I spent about half a day on the telephone, ringing the State Planning Office and various people, including officers of the Housing Trust, and I found that four or five months previously in the Lands Titles Office a slight technical difficulty had occurred, and a title to the property could not be prepared. The document had been sent to the Housing Trust surveyor, and for four or five months it had remained in his office. Surely, when these young people were pleading with the Housing Trust to be given an agreement to occupy the house, someone in the trust should have shown sufficient enterprise to see that the matter was put in hand. That is another matter in need of investigation.

Last week I asked a question in this House regarding the outer-metropolitan planning area. It is some considerable time since the State Planning Office displayed a plan

that was brought to the council concerned to give people an opportunity to object or make suggestions. That goes back almost a year now, yet nothing has come forward. I know that there have been negotiations with the local council, but certain people want to do things in that area. They want to know whether, in the plan, there will be an expressway through the centre of the town. That is about 20 years behind the times. Surely these people must be told as soon as possible that a modern plan has been developed for the town so that semi-trailers will no longer be diverted up the town's main street. We want solutions to these problems much more expeditiously than we have had them in the past. We are at a standstill.

The Government says that it is developing Monarto; it is paying about \$450 000 a year to two consultants. If Pak-Poy and Associates does not make a million within a year or two as a result of this Government's activities, it will amaze me. We are not getting anywhere with Monarto. The Minister in charge of housing says that there will be all kinds of thing in Monarto: people there will be able to press a button and a refrigerator will shoot out; they will have electronic gadgets so that they can see what their neighbour is doing; they will have every modern convenience. Yet, South Australia is going down the drain, and the waiting list for houses grows longer all the time. Surely there is need for enterprise in this respect.

I said, when we passed town planning legislation in 1967 that, if insufficient building blocks were made available, it would not be many years before land values here increased in the same way as they had increased in other States. As a result of insufficient blocks being made available (the Government says that the speculators are hanging on to the land), an acute shortage of housing exists and the cost of housing has increased steeply. The Government came out with a grandiose scheme involving thousands of acres of land it had acquired. But what did we find? One Minister had to contradict another Minister. This land will not be available for building purposes for at least another 10 years. The Government said that it had acquired all these pieces of land, but the basic problem is that insufficient blocks have been made available on which houses can be built, and the blocks have become expensive.

Regarding council rates on Government property, the Commonwealth Government (I do not like the term "Australian Government") wants the power to give assistance to councils. However, such assistance would not be required if the Commonwealth and State Governments paid rates on the property they own within council areas. There are acres and acres of pine forests in the Meadows and Gumeracha council areas; these are commercial enterprises, but the Government does not pay rates on that land. I believe that the Government should pay rates on all the land it owns in council areas. With the acquisition of more national parks and reserves, and more people moving into certain council areas, councils are receiving less and less revenue. Let us get down to fundamentals and be just and fair: Governments should pay rates on their property in council areas in the same way as ordinary ratepayers pay rates. Then, as the Minister of Local Government has said they should do, councils would be able to stand on their own two feet. We should not tie one hand behind a council's back and say, "We will restrict you to your just entitlement of rates on property."

Mr. Dean Brown: Does the Commonwealth Government pay water and sewerage rates?

Mr. McANANEY: It does not pay anything it can get out of paying. However, council rates are altogether different. If a council has to provide services on Government-owned land, the Government should be willing to pay the necessary rates. The situation is becoming increasingly aggravated as more and more national parks are created. In some Hills areas farmland is being converted into forest land. This means that no rates on the land are paid to the council, but the Government will derive revenue from the land. There is no conceivable argument why this land should not be rated.

The Emergency Fire Services is most active in my district and in the Kavel and Fisher Districts. Some time ago a committee was appointed to inquire into its activities. One of the chief supervisors in my area is a member of the committee, which submitted the report. Although I am not sure, I believe that he is reasonably happy with the report. There are all kinds of vague rumours that the service will be made compulsory or that it will be taken over and made into a paying service. If it is taken over, it will cost the State Government much more to operate and, no doubt, will not be as efficient. Possibly, there should be more co-ordination and co-operation between the fire-fighting units. I believe that a central office should organize the service's activities and that its director should be not a member of the Police Force but the head of a fire-fighting organization. People who know the area, its dangers and local conditions should be given greater assistance and the opportunity to organize more efficiently among themselves. We should not bring outsiders, ignorant of the problems in the area, into the situation.

There is a motion on the Notice Paper with regard to the Engineering and Water Supply Department's restrictions on supplies to land in watershed areas. The Ombudsman has raised this matter of the department's refusing to grant an application. I have argued with the department for years that each case should be judged on its merits. The department has said, "We cannot do that, because we might be accused of being unfair." Instead of leaving it to the department (which admits it does not know where pollution comes from) to decide, I advocate that an independent committee be appointed to assess each case on its merits. The department could report on why it had refused an application. In sandy areas, where there is little danger of pollution or of houses being built nearby, an independent body should be appointed to decide whether subdivision should be allowed. I agree that the department must have a rigid policy, otherwise it might be accused of favouritism. Once it gave in to a subdivider or a person who wanted to buy a property, it would be under pressure to give in to other applicants. This could be overcome by having an independent committee.

I wish to refer now to the problem that arises from the Government's unwillingness to pay sufficient to councils to assist them in their rate problems. It is becoming more and more obvious to me and, I hope, to other members that more and more control should be in the local government area if councils are to remain independent and control their own affairs. Local government is close to the people, so the people can use their influence in council matters. Councils will be able to achieve their proper position only if roads are financed by a petrol tax.

The old method of taxing properties was a good way to raise finance when the landowners had all the country wealth. They provided most of the traffic that used local roads or main highways. However, with modern developments, just as many city people as local people use the

roads, and we must consider the matter from a wider viewpoint rather than rate property on the basis of how much should be paid by local people.

I have been saying since I was Chairman of the Strathalbyn Council about 20 years ago that the only fair way is to finance the roads by a petrol tax on the people who use them. We cannot continue to increase car registration fees. Further, many people who are paying the rates are not using the roads. A local stock agent may use the roads more than a local farmer does, but some farmers are paying \$600 or even \$1 000 rates in addition to a road maintenance charge for any stock taken out on the road. This is unjust, and one weakness of the Liberal Party at present is that it is getting away from the basic principle that the people who use services should pay for them.

Heavy transport operators should pay large sums towards road costs, but it is ridiculous that the pensioner who has no car and lives in a small house (say, in Port Adelaide, to look after Mr. Speaker's district) must pay \$50 a year in rates so that people may drive past his house. Similarly, the people who use the railways should pay for the services provided.

The greatest achievement by the Minister of Transport since he has been a Minister is the Bee-line bus, which provides a good service for the people. It may even be argued that the service is economic because it encourages more people to use the railways and, therefore, the Government is getting additional money. I may have this idea because I am an accountant, but we cannot assess situations fairly by using figures, and we should not think we are being good-hearted to everyone when we are robbing almost everyone.

The railways should be made to pay their own way. The member for Alexandra may disagree with me on this, but the line to Victor Harbor is costing \$500 000 a year at present. We see two big engines drawing two carriages, and even members who cannot count beyond five can count the number of passengers on the train. I ask why we should perpetuate this position. Overall, the railways should pay, but a railway service such as that from Port Adelaide to Adelaide may be economic if it attracts more people because of the existence of the Bee-line bus service.

Suburban lines must provide a fast, efficient and good service so that people will consider leaving their car at home. Yesterday and this morning I used the Municipal Tramways Trust bus service and found it extremely good. I was fortunate enough to get a bus passing my house immediately I went out, but I found the service extremely good and I would use it again.

Mr. Chapman: One good reason for retaining the Victor Harbor service is that it supplements the railway services of the State.

Mr. McANANEY: A high-class road to Victor Harbor and a first-class road to Strathalbyn are being built and more and more people will use the road because that is cheaper. The roads can compete against rail services now. Money should be spent on the main line to Melbourne and on the main arterial lines.

Mr. Chapman: The Victor Harbor service is the South Coast Bee-line service.

Mr. McANANEY: But hardly anyone uses it. If we ran a service to Victor Harbor on a road that can carry traffic at 90 or 110 km/h, a Bee-line bus would provide good service for the people. The trip to Victor Harbor in a slow bus is well worth while, and occasionally people can see their local member on the way past.

I wish to refer now to primary production. Members speak about the hard deal that primary producers are getting. I represent all the people of South Australia, and we must assess the effect on every section. When a primary producer who is producing wheat wants the dividend on his wheat this month so that he can pay for superphosphate but cannot get the dividend because Sydney wharf workers are on strike and the wheat cannot be taken out of the country to feed the hungry people of the world, I complain. What state are we getting into?

I have hundreds of friends in the trade unions. I speak to them in the hotel, and they are nice people. However, when a unionist is silly enough to be misled and to be involved in delays and destruction of property, he is not the average unionist. However, union leaders today are getting us into this situation. Although certain members talk about the subsidies that have been paid to primary producers in the past 10 years, those subsidies are nowhere near as great as those which have been paid to people working in, say, our factories. Indeed, with wage increases, primary producers are paying about a 50 per cent subsidy to every worker in this State without their living standard being improved one iota. What has happened to get us into this situation?

I should like now to refer to what Bruce Guerin, journalist, has said in this respect. I do not intend to attack the press because, although I consider it to be unsatisfactory not only here but also throughout the world, I believe that most journalists do their best. Perhaps those in charge of the respective newspapers distort the truth. Mr. Guerin, for whom I have much respect and whose reports I read before those of anyone else, says that the present inflation is caused by cost inflation and wage pressures. However, what has really caused the inflation that we are at present experiencing? In the first six or nine months the inflationary spiral was caused mainly by a large demand overseas for our primary produce. Although the price of meat sometimes rose to unrealistic figures, in many cases prices have merely equated to the increased wages and salaries being received. One can buy more meat now than one could buy with the wages one received in, say, 1962.

Although I will not blame the workers and their wage demands for this inflationary spiral, I will blame the Australian Government, which has permitted the demand for goods to become too slack. About two years ago, because the Commonwealth Government budgeted for a big deficit, the demand for goods in this country crept up to our capacity to produce them. Had the Australian Government budgeted last year for a slight surplus or a balanced budget, we would not be experiencing the sudden shortage of goods that we are experiencing. Two years ago, when people had plenty of money in the bank, the Labor Party said that 200 000 people would be unemployed by the following Christmas, and people then stopped spending their money. With the additional money circulating within the economy last year, we had a more balanced economy, the demand for goods being more equal to our ability to produce.

The Australian Government made certain promises that anyone could see it could not honour without imposing large increases in taxation. Although it budgeted for a \$600 000 000 or \$700 000 000 deficit, the figure had increased to \$1 500 000 000 by March. Bad economic planning caused the shortages to which I have referred. Although Government members refer to private enterprise and the large profits they make, I have had 80 shares in Chrysler Australia Limited for some time but have not yet

been paid a dividend. Indeed, I would sell those shares today for their face value if I could. Although they were once worth \$4, they are worth only \$1 now. Chrysler was offering \$80 a week for unskilled 18-year-olds, when tradesmen were not receiving as much. This caused much discontent amongst unionists, and with some justification. A person high up in the Chamber of Commerce and Industry was horrified at one of their meetings, because it was said that things were booming and employees would be given a \$20 a week increase. However, only some employees got such an increase.

In some industries the unskilled labourers are receiving \$15 a week more than tradesmen. How we can get around this, I do not know. This aspect is not getting away from the basic cause of the problem with which we are confronted today. The Commonwealth Government spent much more money than it received, and this caused people to rush out and buy things quickly because they thought prices would increase. In this way an excess demand was created and, quite justifiably, workers claimed greatly increased wages. I do not know how we will stop this. Indexation was tried once, but it failed. I have learnt that one should never repeat one's mistakes. Perhaps under certain conditions indexation can help: if there is no inflationary spiral and there is correct economic management, it can possibly be beneficial. However, what do we do when inflation is so high and so much pressure is being applied for 10 per cent price increases before Christmas? If all States had a prices department, such an increase would perhaps be granted before Christmas. However, it is already within the cost structure and, if more taxes are imposed, inflation will increase. Unless the biggest crooks in the world are put in charge of price control, prices will increase.

Price control has been proved useless in many countries of the world. In some circumstances it may act as a circuit-breaker, but I doubt it. There is justification for having such a circuit-breaker, but only if the Commonwealth Government at the same time realizes what is correct economic management. Perhaps then such a policy could be implemented for a certain period. Some people doubt whether, if States ever hand certain powers to the Commonwealth Government, they can later be taken back. If this cannot happen, any change made in this direction would be a permanent change. The Australian Government sometimes requests more power, stressing that it is unable to cope with certain situations, but this only shows its incompetence. It already has sufficient power to enable it correctly to manage the economy of the country.

The Prime Minister said that we must have it because Canada and some other countries have it, but at one stage those countries had a rate of inflation greater than ours. I am afraid that in the next month or two our rate of inflation will be greater than that of other countries. Australia had a wonderful opportunity when the Commonwealth Government reduced tariffs by 25 per cent; that was a wise move which should have had a good effect. If the Australian Government had applied correct economic management and had not spent excessive sums, our rate of inflation would have been kept far below that of other countries. If that had happened, we would have been able to export manufactured goods to Asia and we would have been able eventually to produce the goods that we are efficient at producing. We could have become a great trading nation, but we lost the opportunity. In view of the present rate of inflation, it will not be long before there is a demand for increased tariffs or import restrictions. I can remember the time when import restrictions were introduced; it was the worst thing we ever did, because

industries did not have to worry about competition from overseas and, as a result, they became inefficient. If those import restrictions had not been introduced, there would not be so much discontent nowadays and we would have a brighter future.

Two or three years ago, when the member for Ross Smith and I were in Sydney investigating containerization, we dined with some shipping people. One of them said, "We have a terrific trade union representative working with us, and we have complete harmony in our industry." I think his name was Mr. Carmichael! The men were on a 35-hour week and receiving \$170 a week. Because the cranes were 45 metres high there were two gangs. It took so long for the men to come down for morning tea that this was necessary, so they really had an effective working week of 20 hours. No wonder he said it was wonderful. At that time most trade unionists were on a 40-hour week and earning \$65 a week; they were the ones who were paying for the conditions I have described. The manufacturer has a profit margin a bit below the bond interest rate. There is hardly a business today that pays a profit equal to the Commonwealth bond rate, yet the member for Mitchell this afternoon spoke about excessive profits. Actually, they do not exist.

Every time the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs has been asked about grocery prices he has always reported that there is competition in the industry and that the prices are reasonable. Competition is essential. The proportion of wages in the gross national product rarely varies. I feel sorry for trade unionist leaders who rush around proclaiming what they have achieved. Admittedly, they have achieved a great deal in connection with working conditions and industrial safety, but what have they achieved in regard to living standards? They have achieved higher wages than ever before, but they have taken away from Australia the opportunity to trade on world markets in the goods that Australia is most efficient at producing, and they have taken away from Australia the opportunity to get goods from other countries more cheaply. Last Friday, Mr. Hughes, a lecturer at Flinders University, said that when the Labor Party gained office he was hopeful that we would see a glorious time, but he admitted that he could not see any answer and that we were in a mess.

Mr. Dean Brown: We have 180 000 men unemployed and inflation is running at the rate of 14 per cent.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not like people who forecast numbers, but I know that one can forecast trends. The Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration would retrain everyone and get them producing something else, but factories and know-how are still essential. The Country Party caused trouble in the motor car industry. One would think that the Country Party would look after country industries but its then Leader, Mr. McEwen, said, "We must get industry." The primary producers were willing to make sacrifices to get industry in Australia, but the proliferation of car models has been unwise. We now have an inefficient industry that must be restructured. I commend the Industries Assistance Commission, which made the report on the motor car industry.

Many good reports are being made, but who takes any notice of them? The Treasury makes reports now, but the Treasury has made more mistakes over the past 10 years than has anyone else in Australia. Until recently I thought Dr. Cairns was one of the soundest people on economic matters, but in the past week he has gone round the twist. I have heard people say that Mr. Crean is all right but, after watching his television appearances, people have said, "What is he muttering about?" Someone in the

Australian Government must develop a policy. From the business viewpoint postal rates must be increased. If wages have increased, someone must pay more for the postal services. I believe we have to get back to the fundamental principle that one must pay for the service provided. We should look after the sick and the other people unable to look after themselves, but why expect one able-bodied person to pay for the service someone else is receiving? With fair competition in a correctly adjusted economy, the demand for goods is equal to the capacity to produce.

Mr. Jennings: When did that ever happen?

Mr. McANANEY: It happens every five, six, or eight years, by accident. All sorts of things have been tried. Everyone is saying that we have an economy out of balance and out of shape. One person suggests that there is a bulge here and that he will push that in, while another person says that there is a dip there and he will pull it out.

Most members are too young to remember Heath Robinson. He built crazy things many years ago, and he would certainly be in his element now. He could now say, "I have made my greatest achievement. I have the Australian economy completely out of balance, totally disorganized, with people pushing in every direction." It is necessary for us to get down to basic principles and take an overall look at the economy, not continue to try to correct problems by raising interest rates or altering income tax. Those changes are based merely on guesswork. No-one knows what will be the final result of such changes.

I repeat that, if one wants to continue with the private enterprise system, stable conditions must apply if the economy is to prosper and produce the maximum amount of goods. This can be achieved only under stable conditions in the economy. The national Budget should be divided into two sections. The first section should deal with day-to-day expenditure. Clearly there should then be only one form of tax, income tax. This is the only tax that is not inflationary in nature.

The income tax system needs adjustment to remove the ways in which people can avoid paying their correct amount of tax. Although there are ways this can be done, I have never found them. Nevertheless, if this were done and an accurate means of levying the tax was made according to ability to pay, which was uninflationary and fair, I believe we would be getting somewhere.

In a balanced economy there is a steady demand for houses and consumer goods. This allows industry accurately to forecast what is required. Having large numbers of forecasters in the Premier's office trying to determine what future consumer demand will be is simply messing around in an artificial way. The balance of the economy varies according to the attitude of the people and, in a stable situation, these attitudes vary less than in an unstable situation. During the depression there was great demand for goods. I worked in a bank then and saw that no-one came in to borrow funds, because they had no hope of meeting any repayments.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: They had no collateral.

Mr. McANANEY: They could not even contemplate any borrowing, because they had no hope of making repayments or of getting a loan. When there is an excess demand for consumer goods, the economy is unbalanced. The second part of the Budget should relate to capital expenditure. On the first indication of unemployment, I believe that the Government should use credit. To emphasize this point, I have records of Loan funds raised during the past 10 years, coupled with the sums involved

in Reserve Bank borrowings. When the economy is slack, credit facilities should be used to increase demand, but when the economy is booming loans should be raised and placed in reserve. By this means Government expenditure could be kept on an even keel. However, it is the means of financing it that determines whether there will be demand equal to the nation's capacity to produce.

During the Second World War the Commonwealth Government boasted that it kept interest rates down. It did a great job, but it imposed price control for several years after the war. It is completely impracticable to have price control applying on all articles. In those days price control applied only to certain essential articles. I remember the period 1947-48 when one could buy any item of junk in Rundle Street, because price control did not apply on those goods. I believe price control has proved to be ineffective.

People should be looking more at how to achieve a balanced economy rather than looking at many individual facets. An overall examination is required. But who in Australia is even trying to create a balanced economy? Instead, we have excessive demand for goods and labour, and we have today's unsatisfactory situation.

We have hundreds of economists attempting to work out a short-term solution. How many economists are attempting to work out a long-term plan to create a stable and satisfactory economy? Most of my life I thought Australia was a good place in which to live. True, it was not a sufficiently good place for some groups who, over the years (especially during the depression), did not receive sufficient. I was unemployed then for six months and worked picking grapes and taking cattle from the Mile End railway yard down to the reed beds.

The rate of succession duties applying in Australia needs revision. I do not believe that these duties should be eliminated; I think this would be unreasonable and completely unjustified. Nevertheless, the exemption is now completely insignificant. If we are to have private enterprise and family property, no matter what area it is in, these things must have the opportunity to survive. Although the rate of succession duties has been increased on bigger estates, it is essential that the exemption currently applying be increased, as current duties are too much of a burden on private families.

Joint tenancies and tenancies in common are exempted from any benefit under the primary producers rebate. This is especially unjust in respect of land, the value for which in money terms far exceeds its productivity. I refer particularly to the Hills area, where land is being sold at high prices and is assessed on that basis, whereas its actual productive value is much less.

Mr. DEAN BROWN moved:

That the honourable member for Heysen be granted an extension of time.

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders do not provide for an extension of time.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): In supporting the motion, may I say how pleased I am that we have such a distinguished South Australian in our Governor to deliver this Speech. Like other members who have spoken, I extend my condolences to the families of the two former members of this House, and I congratulate the new member for Goyder on his maiden speech. I am sure he is pleased that that is behind him.

I am sure, as has been said by other members, that Liberal Party members opposite were probably surprised when the honourable member for Goyder was elected to

this House. Although I know it has been said that we in the Australian Labor Party told our members and supporters to vote for the Liberal Movement candidate, I assure members that the reason why we did not nominate a candidate was purely financial. Perhaps some of our supporters voted for the Liberal Movement, but that was entirely up to them. The honourable member was the one elected.

I listened intently to the member who has just resumed his seat, and although I did not agree with everything he said, at least he believed that what he said was in the interests of the district he represents as well as of South Australia and Australia. He did not talk a lot of hogwash, like some other members who have spent most of their time rubbishing unionists and union officials. What we never hear from members opposite is that union officials are busiest when strikes occur, so it is not in their interest to have strikes. Secondly, union officials prevent many strikes, but we never hear that, either.

We on this side do not spend our time rubbishing the officers of the South Australian Employers Federation or the Chamber of Commerce and Industry because we believe those people are doing their job for the employers they represent. That is what they should be doing. All employers should belong to those organizations, because they are the organizations representing employers; likewise, I believe all workers should be in the trade unions that represent them.

I want to refer now to some items in the Governor's Speech that are of special interest to me. Paragraph 5 of the Speech states that the State Planning Authority is continuing to purchase open-space areas in furtherance of the Metropolitan Development Plan, and also that it is hoped Australian Government financial assistance will become available for the purchase of the remaining areas. Recently I wrote to the Minister of Environment and Conservation in an attempt to interest him in purchasing a piece of land at Banksia Park. I received a reply to the effect that the purchase of this land for open space could not be contemplated at present because of the large amount of land of higher priority still to be purchased. I appreciate that, where only a certain sum can be spent, there must be priorities. Unfortunately, however, in the meantime land that could be acquired for this purpose is being subdivided and sold by greedy developers. For that reason, I hope that the Australian Government will be able to give some money for this purpose.

Paragraph 7 of the Speech deals with the work of the Housing Trust, and again it is noted that the Australian Government is taking an interest in welfare housing and that, if the States can show that they can put the money to productive use, money will be granted for this purpose. From my personal observations, I believe the need for welfare housing seems to be increasing, as one-parent families, unfortunately, also seem to be increasing daily. I suppose other members, too, receive many requests from these people as well as from pensioners who cannot afford to pay the high rents being asked for private accommodation.

Mr. Dean Brown: Like the water rates.

Mrs. BYRNE: I think some of the rents I have heard about are higher than some of the water rates. I do not know where these people go, but we all know they do not end up in the street. In some places they seem to own only a few sticks of furniture and they have no money in the bank. We are indeed fortunate not to be in such a position.

The life span of the aged is increasing, so that more elderly people need to be housed. The availability of cottage flats is not keeping pace with the demand. Many elderly people have come from overseas countries to live with their families. The arrangement perhaps has not worked out and then they want to live on their own, but there is not much alternative accommodation available to them in the price range they can afford.

Some interest should be taken in attempts to make the lives of elderly citizens more useful. At present, many are unhappy because they feel unwanted. They do not want to work, as we do (although perhaps some people think we do not). Perhaps some might think a solution is that they should be given part-time employment, but for medical reasons, perhaps, many of these people cannot take even part-time permanent employment. Nevertheless, they want to lead useful lives and to feel that they serve some purpose in the community. I do not know the solution to this problem, but perhaps it is something in which the Community Welfare Department could take an interest.

Recently in my district Meals on Wheels was introduced for the first time for the benefit of people who cannot, for various reasons, mainly medical, cook meals for themselves. A doctor in our area suggested to me that, instead of the meals being taken to their houses, once or twice a week the meals should be taken to a central point, such as the senior citizens headquarters, and served there. This would get people out of their houses and into the company of others, and would help make their lives more cheerful. I thought it a very worthwhile suggestion.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is it still necessary to go to Northfield to pick up the food?

Mrs. BYRNE: It is still necessary to go to Strathmont, but I understand that is only for a limited period. While it is unfortunate, we are thankful to get these meals from Modbury Hospital and not have to prepare them ourselves.

I want to refer now to the need in South Australia for an accurate and unbiased service to advise and educate the public on all aspects of housing finance. Because so many new houses are being built in my district, this subject is raised frequently (probably more often than it should be). Recently, a land agent from my district wrote an article that appeared in a newspaper. In part, this is what it states:

All too often potential homebuyers do not begin to think about housing finance until they are ready to buy a home. And unfortunately many of them find that they are unable to do so because they are not eligible for a loan. Many others make inquiries in advance but have not made the wisest preparations for a future loan because the only sources of information open to them have a "barrow to push"—

too true, I am afraid—

and all the options open to them are not fully explained. Some lending institutions appear to hold out the promise of an assured housing loan in the future provided funds are deposited or saved with them, but the actual position is not fully explained. When the time comes to buy a home the buyer finds that there are more conditions involved and, in some cases, they cannot be met or the lending policy has changed. In the majority of cases it is left to a land salesman or land agent to sort out the finances of a potential purchaser and, because of the nature of his job, he is apt to recommend any sort of finance that would get him a sale, not necessarily the best source.

That is the crux of the problem. The article continues:

The South Australian Government's attitude towards consumer protection is reflected in the Consumer Credit Act of last November and the new Land and Business Agents Act due to come into force.

This legislation has now been enacted. The article continues:

An extension of these policies into the housing loan education and advisory field would be a very welcome and worthwhile service to the home-buying public.

The press article was written by a land agent, and I support what he said. The Minister in charge of housing, who read the report with interest, assured me that he would give this matter his closest attention. I hope that some good will come from this soon.

Paragraph 9 of the Speech refers to roads and highways, and this position is at present somewhat clouded. If, unfortunately, there is a need to cut down on some of the plans that have been made in this respect, I hope that Lower North-East Road, in my district, will not be affected. This road is in poor condition, and work is required to be done on it as soon as possible.

Paragraph 11 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the Australian Government's financial assistance to community health centres. I have heard the Australian Government denigrated fairly often, but I have not heard much said about the good work that has been done as a result of its financial assistance. My district has been blessed and, no doubt, the constituents of many other members have been grateful for such assistance, but Opposition members are not willing to admit this. Community health centres are a good idea, and such a centre is to be established at St. Agnes. In this case, the Government will use \$26 000 of the Commonwealth grant to extend an already established private medical centre to provide comprehensive medical and psycho-social care. The development will also permit the extension of some out-patient consulting facilities from Modbury Hospital to the health centre and will provide for comprehensive teaching in community medicine to undergraduates, post-graduates and clinic staff. I look forward to seeing this centre established and the scheme put into effect.

The Speech also refers to domiciliary care services. Although I do not know much about the details of the scheme, I look forward to receiving further information on it. Paragraph 12 of the Speech states that the Australian Government has assured the State of financial assistance for a comprehensive water treatment programme to upgrade the physical quality and safety of the water supply for metropolitan Adelaide. All members receive many complaints about the water quality. I certainly receive my share, so I am pleased to see that this programme will commence soon. I was present when the Commonwealth Minister for Urban and Regional Development made a statement in connection with this project. He said it was estimated that the Australian Government would spend \$1 300 000. In 1973, the Australian Government embarked on a national programme to ensure that sewerage would be available to everyone in the major urban centres within the next decade. In Sydney, 17 per cent (505 000) was without sewerage. In Melbourne, 15 per cent of the population was without sewerage (that comprised 370 000); and in Perth, the proportion was half the population. He said that Adelaide was much more fortunate in this regard.

The Minister paid a tribute to two previous Premiers in respect of this fact. He said that, because the State Government had planned ahead and taken the necessary steps to provide sewerage services for Adelaide, South Australia was relatively disadvantaged under the new Australian Government programme. Whereas other capitals would be receiving some Australian Government money for sewerage services, Adelaide did not need it. That is why we received this money for the water treatment plants.

It is estimated that the scheme will cost \$80 000 000 initially. Three treatment works will be constructed. Construction has commenced at Hope Valley; the next works will be at Anstey Hill; and one will be at Chandler Hill. The Minister pointed out that the north-east and eastern sectors of Adelaide were the areas that suffered most from poor water quality.

Paragraph 14 of the Speech refers to the South Australian Land Commission. Land has been acquired in my district with money available for this purpose. Paragraph 15 refers to education and to the Australian Government granting, for the first time, funds for pre-school education. I am pleased that the Australian Government has decided to enter this field; this was one of its election promises. This has been of advantage to people in my district and to others, too. With money already approved, kindergartens will be built at Fairview Park (nearly completed) and Holden Hill, and they will be under the control of the Kindergarten Union. Two free-standing buildings will be built at the Ridgehaven and Para Vista schools, on Education Department property; this is something new. Technically, the Para Vista school is not in my district, but children from my district attend there. An existing building is being developed at the Strathmont Infants School, and work on this project has commenced.

What I find happening throughout the metropolitan area is that play groups are now springing up. Some people have perhaps not heard of them. They came into being because of the shortage of kindergartens and to cater for younger children, say, those under the age of four years. A play group is not a kindergarten or a child-care centre. Essentially, it involves both mother and child and brings benefit to both. Children, in a warm, secure atmosphere, with adult approval and support, will play more creatively and spontaneously.

The first five years of life are the most important years and many mothers with children under five years of age recognize their limitations and the limitations of modern city life and small families. Social contact for both mother and child in play groups can do much to help the lonely mother and the bored toddler. These groups can be organized in different ways. Some comprise four or five pre-kindergarten children of similar age who attend each house in turn. The sessions are organized by the host mother and many authorities favour this type of play group, which is an extension of family life. Further, play groups can be larger. Initially the number of children attending each session may be few, such as five or more, but as the play group expands numbers may increase quickly.

It has been found that 20 children at one session is the maximum number desirable if the people concerned do not want absolute chaos. It is allowable to have 24 children on the register, as there are always some absentees. Different kinds of accommodation are used for these play groups. Some of the groups are conducted by mothers in the home and other groups are organized in halls. The Mothers and Babies Health Association arranged a public meeting, I think on June 5, to try to co-ordinate the activities of these play groups. If too many restrictions are not placed on the groups, I think we will hear much more about them in the future.

During the session 52 Bills are to be introduced and other matters will be placed before us, so obviously we will have a busy session. However, I hope that we will not be sitting after 10 p.m. too often, but that remains to be seen. One Bill to be introduced will deal with builders' licensing. Unfortunately, Parliament watered

down the original Bill and the Act is not as strong as I should like it to be. I still receive complaints about poor workmanship on houses and in two recent cases, when I examined the matter, I found that the builders had got into financial difficulties. In one case, the builder is operating under a scheme of management, pursuant to the Bankruptcy Act, and the other firm went into liquidation.

Under the regulations, builders must prove their financial stability, but builders are still getting into financial difficulty to the detriment of people whose houses are not being completed or are unsatisfactory. I consider that there should be a tightening up in this matter and it may be necessary to check builders' stability more frequently, perhaps half-yearly or even quarterly.

A Bill is to be introduced regarding noise control. It is difficult to produce effective legislation on this matter, because what annoys one person does not necessarily annoy another, but all members have probably received complaints from constituents about noise from high-revving motor cycles, heavy quarry trucks, air-conditioners (in hospitals or near houses), discotheques, and barking dogs. I do not understand how we can eliminate noise from barking dogs, but legislation regarding noise is required and I hope that it will be effective.

Recently the member for Florey spoke about secondhand car dealers. Although the Government has done much regarding these dealers, members still receive complaints. Last weekend a person who interviewed me had paid about \$1400 for a motor car that apparently did not operate satisfactorily for more than a day, and the police ruled that the vehicle was defective. Many things on the car were faulty, and I shall mention some of them. The engine had to be recovered and a roll bar had to be provided. The rims had been double welded, and it was illegal to do that. The indicators did not operate and a front bumper bar had to be fitted. The windscreen glass was not safety glass and the windscreen wiper operated too slowly. Despite the legislation, some secondhand car dealers still are unscrupulous, so perhaps the legislation should be policed more effectively.

I shall deal now with some matters which are not mentioned in the Speech, but which interest women mainly. Recently, a newspaper report stated that the Women's Electoral Lobby and, apparently, the Women's Liberation Movement intended to ask the Australian Government and State Government for grants to establish a women's shelter in Adelaide. The report stated that the project had the support of community organizations, which had expressed concern that distraught or troubled women had no place to go to.

I think this assessment of the situation is correct, because deserted wives and some wives of husbands who are alcoholics have approached me. Even on Christmas Day a woman came to see me. She had to get out of her house because her husband was disturbed mentally. Later, the man went to a mental hospital. I did not know what to do when the woman was at my house. Eventually, she was taken to the Travellers Aid Society, but it is not the society's function to deal with such matters.

There is a need for accommodation for people in these circumstances until they can find somewhere to go to permanently. It may not be necessary for the Government to spend much money in this direction: perhaps a building is not being used fully or could be converted. For example, I think about half of the old Vaughan House is used by the Enfield office of the Community Welfare Department,

that part of the building not being needed for its original purpose. Perhaps other buildings similarly could be used for the purpose that I have mentioned.

I do not expect that many people would be needing such accommodation at the same time. The report stated that ample accommodation seemed to be available for men in similar predicaments. I do not know what the male members of this House may say about that, but I do not have coming to me men who are seeking this accommodation, probably because such men have money and can afford to stay at a motel or hotel until they can become settled, elsewhere.

I refer now to the single mothers in our community and the problems with which they are confronted. These women approached the State Government, through the Minister of Community Welfare, requesting a building to which single mothers could go when, for instance, they came here from other States or when they had been asked to leave their parents' home and had nowhere else to go. These women would be able to stay at such a centre while looking for more permanent accommodation. The Council for the Single Mother and Her Child, which has been set up to look after these mothers, keeps stocks of clothing, furniture and so on, and it needs somewhere to store such articles. The Minister has taken an interest in these people, who have been granted the use, on a temporary basis, of a building, for which they are extremely grateful. Naturally, they look forward to obtaining their own permanent building.

The Government originally offered the council a subsidy of \$12 500. I hope that the members of this council will soon be able to raise sufficient money to enable them to get a building of their own, which is not easy. This organization has expanded to such an extent that it now has an office at Elizabeth, which, I have been told, has been visited by many girls since it was opened. I understand that the council is now in the process of applying for a grant so that a paid executive officer can be employed on a part-time basis, and for a \$500 grant for the purchase of office equipment. I understand that at present the council does not own even a typewriter. The council would like to conduct a day-care centre which would be open to the public as well as single mothers. The girls could then return to the work force or to studies. This council is doing an excellent job in the interests of single mothers and its efforts should be encouraged.

The National Council of Women, the executive of which looks after its interests between conferences, is soon to hold an executive meeting in another State. I notice that South Australia has placed an item on the agenda for that meeting: the possibility of asking the Commonwealth Government to set up a ministry for the family. Dealing with this subject, the August, 1974, issue of the *Supplement to the National Council of Women's News* states:

The family unit as we understand it is perhaps suffering more than anything else in today's society. If various sections dealing with family life were taken out of the different portfolios, it could mean better co-ordination and a streamlining.

They foresee that this portfolio will cover family health, family planning, sex education for parents and children, the working mother and her child, the broken home, the one-parent unit, battered children, family housing, and so on. This suggestion emanated from a conference held overseas and attended by the State President of the National Council of Women. On Miss Davey's return to Adelaide last year, she was reported in the *Advertiser* of August 2 as having said that the matter had been discussed at the conference, which had been attended by delegates from 58 countries,

and that the delegates had been asked to request their own countries to set up a ministry for the family, with an adolescents department. This suggestion is now to be discussed. Part of the *Advertiser* report is as follows:

It could cover abortion and the unborn child, battered children, family planning, marriage and marital breakdown, housing, the necessity for Government subsidies to help families and the problems of adolescents.

This is an interesting topic for discussion and is indeed thought-provoking. Although an Australian ministry for the family would not be out of place, because of the differences between State laws, there ought perhaps to be such ministries in each State. However, I have not studied the possibilities in this respect. At present the Minister of Community Welfare looks after (in a sympathetic and capable manner) some of the social problems to which I have referred. Naturally, I shall be interested in the outcome of this agenda item.

I refer now to another matter which, although it may seem unimportant to many people, is worth mentioning: a woman has suggested to me that a perambulator ramp be placed in the State Bank Building. Having written to the State Bank Board, I was told that this suggestion had been considered many times but had been found to be impracticable. I was also told that the matter had been investigated recently by the bank's architects when they were preparing plans for remodelling the ground floor area. However, it was considered that, because of the limited space in the entrance lobby, a ramp could not be incorporated without major structural alterations that they were not disposed to recommend. Although I realize that nothing can be done about this now, I hope that (as a perambulator is not wide) if reconstruction takes place in this area or in any other Government building in which there are many steps, provision will be made for such a ramp. I think these have been neglected in the past because men do not have to push prams or carry them up steps.

I refer now to the use of the abbreviation "Ms" for women who could be addressed as "Mrs." or "Miss". The use of this abbreviation is becoming more acceptable to women generally and should be used by all Government departments. Indeed, I understand that one department is already using it. Sometimes a single woman is embarrassed if she receives a letter addressed to "Mrs.", and vice versa. I support the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, support the motion and, in doing so, express the usual condolences on the death of the two former members and His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester. I also add my congratulations to the new member for Goyder, who appears to be absent from the Chamber at present. It is possible that he is out on some military manoeuvres with his leader, or perhaps he has been conscripted or drummed into the regiment. Both he and the Lieutenant-Colonel are not in the Chamber at present. Nevertheless, one must do the right thing and congratulate him on his election to this place.

The Governor's Speech is a most uninspiring document. The most important issue at present is the question of grants to local government. The position in this respect is completely unsatisfactory. Last Thursday, in reply to the member for Eyre, the Minister of Local Government said:

In other words, they should not expect assistance merely because they have received it in previous years. Unfortunately, I cannot give a full reply to the member's question, other than to repeat that local government must stand on its own two feet. However, some money will be made available during the current financial year, but the extent to which it will be provided has not yet been determined.

What an unsatisfactory answer! All members on this side are well aware of the situation as regards councils, which are extremely concerned. Further, the Highways Department officers are extremely concerned about it, too. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I followed up the matter by asking further questions today and, if there had not been a debate on the motion of dissent to the Speaker's ruling, there would have been further questions. However, again today the Minister hedged. One can accurately assume what the position will be. Councils are faced with an increase in rates of between 25 and 30 per cent simply to cover the ravages of inflation, workmen's compensation, etc., and to cover the cost of their present staff. This would be necessary even if the councils were given satisfactory grants, but it appears obvious from what the Minister has said that councils will not get the level of grants that they received in the last financial year, despite the fact that they have to contend with galloping inflation.

A previous Commonwealth Liberal Government instituted a rural relief scheme which did a great deal for rural communities, but that scheme has been phased out by the present Commonwealth Labor Government, which has said it will make \$31 000 000 available—the same sum as was made available last year. The Governor's Speech refers to a general increase of 10 per cent, which does not cater for the inflationary trend. However, in regard to these specific grants, we cannot hope for more than the sum received last year. The Minister is obviously fighting a losing battle, because he admitted this afternoon that obviously we will have to protect daily paid workers in the Highways Department. So, it is clear that local government will face a reduction, which will have serious and widespread implications throughout country districts and urban areas. Members representing country areas know just what the ramifications will be in those areas.

What has happened to the great expansionary programme that the Commonwealth Labor Government was to launch? Obviously, it has gone out of the window. Councils and all members on this side are extremely concerned about where this will finish. It would appear from the Minister's reply today (he has been hedging since we opened up the topic) that, if councils cannot increase rates by significantly more than the 25 per cent to 30 per cent increase with which they are faced anyway, they will have to retrench employees. This will have the most serious repercussions in country and urban areas. From the tenor of the Minister's replies it is obvious that he is engaged on a cover-up exercise. The Premier has expressed his concern about this matter, but he cannot reveal too much concern; if he did, he would reveal the true state of affairs.

Dr. Eastick: He is failing to communicate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, because he does not know which way to turn. This afternoon the Minister admitted that he could not help local government, and that councils that had bought machinery and come to expect a level of contributions, debit orders, etc., could no longer expect these things. What a sorry state of affairs, and it has happened as a result of the parsimony of the Commonwealth Labor Government, which was going to work wonders in so many areas. I have mentioned this matter because it is probably the most serious situation facing our local communities at present. Such a situation does not obtain in Western Australia. Inquiries we have made from the Minister of Local Government in Western Australia show that district councils there have been assured of the same level of grants that they have enjoyed

in the past. What is peculiar about South Australia in this regard? I am glad that the Minister has entered the Chamber, and I invite him to make inquiries in Western Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I was dealing with more important matters.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister does not consider what I am saying important, he has no sense of responsibility whatever and is not fit to administer his portfolio. I cannot stress too much the seriousness of the situation. Western Australian councils have been assured of the same level of grants that they have had in the past, and with Commonwealth support.

Mr. Coumbe: Why isn't it happening here?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Because of the over-commitment of funds by the State Labor Government.

Dr. Eastick: Those sums are being paid now, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Western Australian councils know where they are going. The Minister here has said that he hopes to make an announcement in the weeks to come.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: In Western Australia, fees for the motorist have been increased by 60 per cent.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We have just about reached the end of our tether as regards taxing powers in South Australia, if we remember the pleas made by the Premier when he was in Canberra. The South Australian Government has been a spendthrift Government. Like other Labor Governments, it came to office with a bag of promises that no responsible Party could ever hope to implement; you name it, and we will spend it! This has been the downfall of the present Commonwealth Labor Government, which now has to completely reverse the financial policies it espoused during the last election campaign. It has had to adopt policies not dissimilar to the policies advanced by the McMahon Government just prior to its defeat. Unfortunately, it bought the votes of the Australian public, and the public is now finding out to its dismay and horror just what it is like to live under Labor. We know who is setting the pace. Yet in 1970 that was the theme song of Labor; it took about half a page of the Premier's policy speech. Members opposite are setting the pace all right. I now refer to pertinent press reports about pace setting. The South Australian Government got away with it when it had a responsible L.C.P. Commonwealth Government, but now we have the State Government and the Australian Government working hand in hand. Recently the Premier was depicted in the press on the doorstep, like a bridegroom. What will it achieve, this marriage of State and Commonwealth Labor Governments?

Mr. Coumbe: What happened to the honeymoon?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It was short-lived. One was going to drop something from an aeroplane, from a great height, on to the other.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You should get something original.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We will not forget that in a hurry. However, the honeymoon is over. A report in the *Advertiser* of the Premier's statements when it appeared that we were in for a period of financial stringency from the Australian Government, is as follows:

The chamber burst into fits of laughter, but the smiles vanished when the Premier proceeded to give the Prime Minister a 15-minute lecture on economic management. That is the pot calling the kettle black. The report continues:

He said Mr. Whitlam had not faced facts and his deal for road grants was the shabbiest he had received from any Prime Minister, including John Gorton.

All we used to hear about was Mr. Gorton and his successor. They were being served up daily. The Minister of Education constantly told us to speak to our Commonwealth colleagues to give us a better deal, until we were heartily sick of it. Every time the Minister opened his mouth at any function (and the same applied to the Minister of Transport) we always heard the same story. I remember a function concerning the wine industry held at the railway station, and the many references made on that occasion about the Commonwealth Government. Every official function resulted in an attack on the Commonwealth Government. However, what are Government members now saying? They said they had a lousy deal from John Gorton, and that he was the toughest we had, but the position is worse now. The report continues (and the reference is to a deficit of \$28 500 000):

"\$28 500 000 is an amount we cannot conceivably finance from State resources," Mr. Dunstan said. "This must be obvious. In 1970-71 we put on new and extended levies on stamp duties, succession duties, betting tax, charges on sales of electricity and harbor charges." Rail freights, rail, tram and bus fares, water and sewer rates and hospital fees all went up, he said. "In 1971-72 we followed with increases in land tax, duty stamp, motor tax, pay-roll tax, water and sewer rates, hospital fees and university fees," the Premier said. "And in 1972-73 increased water and sewer rates, bus and train fares and charges for departmental services."

That is setting the pace. The report continues:

"In 1973-74 we were forced to bring in the heaviest programme of tax increases in the history of the State. I raised an extra \$18 000 000. There were increases in pay-roll tax, harbor charges, water rates, a further levy on electricity sales and hospital fees."

How is that for a chronicle of setting the pace! The fact of life is that the Labor Party can outbid all comers at an election, but economically, it is hopeless. Now the Premier has that happy combination of a State Labor Government and a Commonwealth Labor Government—isn't he learning fast!

On his return from overseas, the Premier learnt of criticism of his trip. Yesterday we learnt he did a bit of bird-watching. The Premier said, "Fancy criticizing me; I am running the biggest business in the State." If anyone can take me to any other business leader in South Australia who runs his affairs in the way the Premier and the Prime Minister run their affairs, I will be surprised. What business leader runs his affairs in the same manner that the Commonwealth Labor Government runs its affairs? What other employee or manager consciously seeks to escalate costs in the same manner as that followed by the Labor Government?

What other business leader builds up a hierarchy of staff in his business to do the type of jobs for the boys that a Labor Government farms out? The growth in the Public Service after the Labor Government first came to office was the most rapid in our history, and now there is talk of curtailing that growth. What other business leader tells the Arbitration Commission that he supports a wage claim? What other business supports claims for additional public holidays, four weeks annual leave, the best superannuation scheme in the nation, and the best workmen's compensation conditions? Who else behaves like this? The Premier does, and he is running the biggest business in the State.

Dr. Eastick: Today 1 350 Government workers were put off.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The public is satisfied with the leadership of this Government, but it is not satisfied with the fragmentation of what was the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That interjection is not to the point, and it is not an answer to the questions I have raised. It has nothing to do with the crisis concerning grants to local government. That situation is so serious that it will force local government to put men off. A headline in today's *News* states that 1 350 men have been stood down over a strike. This Labor Government is setting the pace. I doubt that it did so deliberately, but the Government has destroyed the low cost advantage previously enjoyed by South Australia. As I have said, when the chilly economic winds blow this State will be the first to suffer.

I now refer to His Excellency's Speech (this shopping list), and I will deal with the last matter first, because it relates to what I have just been saying, as follows:

Over the next year or so the fiscal measures announced or contemplated by the Australian Government to deal with the problem of inflation will have their impact on the community.

That is an under-statement. The Speech continues:

In so far as these measures may result in a slow down in the economy, my Government is acutely aware that the people of this State are likely to suffer rather more severely than those elsewhere.

This is in the pace-setting State. When we got both a Commonwealth and a State Labor Government it was going to be all plain sailing, but now we will suffer more than other States. The Speech continues:

Whilst my Government is conscious of the role of the Australian Government in this situation, the well-being of the people of this State is necessarily in the forefront of its mind.

If that is not mealy-mouthed, I do not know what is. How is this for a pious sort of platitudinous statement:

Accordingly, my Government will keep the effect of the Australian Government's fiscal policies on this State under the closest scrutiny and will not hesitate to point out to that Government any hardship that may arise for the people of this State, particularly when that hardship is not shared equally by the rest of the Australian community.

He said it will not be shared equally; we are going to be worse off, and he will complain.

Dr. Eastick: Gough doesn't accept his own Cabinet and Caucus rulings.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier has already complained, and we know he got nowhere. He does not look like getting anywhere because the Commonwealth Labor Government, by its reckless policies, has plunged the country into a period of inflation that will take some controlling. Glancing through the Speech delivered by the Governor, which is the chronicle of the Government's proposals, I detect not quite the tone of self-congratulation usually accompanying this sort of document. Usually, a fair part of it is given over to the Government's patting itself on the back. A fair amount of padding has been used in just what a marvellous job the Government is doing for the State. The Government has not gone into so much of that nonsense because it knows it cannot sell it. There is a reference in the Speech to agriculture, and other members have mentioned this: we had a good opening, but rust may worry us.

Mr. Coumbe: Rust is worrying the steel on the wharf, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but this is an agricultural comment. The member for Chaffey made a most informed speech about the effect on his constituents of the decision

of the confreres of this Government. That effect is reflected on my constituents. Let me turn to more informed agricultural comment. I mentioned the say-nothing comment in the Governor's Speech, but let me read something for the Government's instruction, because I doubt whether Government members would take the trouble to read anything relating to rural affairs. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture in another place may do, but let me make a few brief quotations from the Callaghan report for the instruction of the Government. Next year, the Government might be able to fill out that comment about the rust affecting the wheat. On page 5, the Callaghan report states:

A nation neglecting its agriculture can only do so at its peril. In a country still so dependent on its agricultural industries for overseas income as is Australia, and as is South Australia in particular, agriculture is even of more transcending importance.

I hope the Minister is listening, because I have a great deal of regard for the man who wrote this report. At the opening of the Tanunda Show I heard one of the best, fairest, and informed speeches by this gentleman that I have heard. The report states:

Frequently overlooked is the tremendously important contribution made to the growth of industry by demand from the rural sector for farm machinery, transport vehicles, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and veterinary medicines. Moreover, rural industries support and stimulate large segments of commerce and finance through the transport, storage, processing and marketing of rural products, and the financing of production and distribution.

Where did that get a mention in the Governor's Speech? "We had a good opening, and there may be rust", is what we got. I commend this document to the Government. Let me conclude by quoting from a section on page 4 of the report on the present importance of primary industry to the State, as follows:

The following figures of present production highlight the importance of the rural industries to the State:

Rural production: Exceeds \$400 000 000 per annum in value; makes up one-third of the total State production; contributes 50 per cent to the value of South Australian exports; has a rural work force, including seasonal workers, of 42 000; and supports ancillary industries employing another 30 000.

Also, for the information of the Government, let me quote from another report before I leave that part of the Speech dealing with agriculture and primary industry. Along with other members from this side of the House, I attended some of the sessions of the annual meetings of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated. The President of that association is recognized in agricultural circles in Australia and is a member of various agricultural bodies in this and other States.

Dr. Eastick: He is a member of the Australian Meat Board, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is right. This is the annual report of the President (Mr. John M. Kerin), and in his opening remarks he states:

I refer to the fact that Government action since April last year has cost the Australian farmer at least \$360 000 000; I refer to a Government which, without any scruples at all, has driven a wedge between the country and the city; and I refer to a Government which seems intent on reducing initiative and replacing it with a society who are being encouraged to live on the efforts of a minority.

It was perfectly obvious to me during the election campaign that the Commonwealth Government and this State Labor Government have sought to drive a wedge between city and country and attempted to form a class society. The report continues:

Any division which exists between the urban dweller and the rural community is not of our making, but politically inspired to be used as the worst possible weapon for implementing policy at the expense of one sector for another.

Now let me quote from the remarks of the Secretary of the same organization. This is what Mr. Grant Andrews had to say:

What then has once again brought back the dark clouds of gloom and uncertainty? Perhaps the revaluations of our currency were straws in the wind. Certainly, the 1973 Budget left no doubts in our minds as to how the Australian Government intended to view the rural sector—through its decision to remove incentives and concessions far too prematurely. At that time the Government was taking considerable credit for the short resurgence of rural economic improvement—

We remember the nonsense we heard when the super-phosphate bounty matter arose. We remember the Prime Minister saying, "Look how we have opened up new markets for primary products". What a lot of nonsense! The report continues:

It would be interesting to see what responsibility they will now assume for the rural prosperity which we are now not enjoying.

Next, the Speech of the Governor states that the State Planning Authority is doing something about Hackney.

Dr. Tonkin: Again! It was doing something in 1968.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, still. It was doing something about Hackney before I became a member, but I do not know what. It has extended its activities, and is going to do something about Moseley Square. I was down there the other day, and I could not see that it had changed much since I was a boy.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You still are!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The remaining paragraphs in the Speech amount to nothing more than a cover-up. The Government has nothing on which to congratulate itself. One thing that emerges from the Speech is how heavily we depend in almost every area on additional support from the Commonwealth Government. Dealing with the State Planning Authority, the Speech states:

It is hoped that Australian Government financial assistance will become available for the purchase of the remaining areas.

That reference is to open-space areas. That is a fond hope. If the Government is relying on Commonwealth Government finance for the purchase of additional open-space areas, it is the faintest of hopes.

The Speech refers to a vigorous programme of exploration in connection with geologists for finding gas and fossil fuel. Does this Government not know that the Commonwealth Government has frightened away the overseas companies that were engaged in this area? Is the Government unaware that they have cleared out because the Commonwealth Government would not make clear its terms in connection with oil and gas exploration? They have already gone. Yet the Speech says that the Government will encourage exploration. Regarding the uranium project, I thought the Government squeezed every bit of mileage out of that during the previous election campaign. We will be dependent on the Commonwealth Government for establishing Monarto. Regarding housing, I believe that this Government has one of the worst records any Government could have.

Mr. Coumbe: It's building fewer houses than Tom Playford built.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Housing Trust built about 1 600 houses last year, only about half of the number built in the 1950's. As a total percentage of the total building

in the State, it is the worst figure since the Second World War. The member for Fisher, who has the complete figures, tells me that only 1 618 houses have been built. Yet, there is this mention of housing in the Speech. The Minister in charge of housing announced on television that we would not be able to realize the Australian dream of every Australian owning his own house. Coming from the Minister, that was the most pious announcement I have ever heard. Every paragraph in the Speech is an attempt to pull the wool over people's eyes. Regarding the quality of worklife unit, even the unions are not interested in such a scheme. Civil actions for damages will not be available for industrial disputes. The Government will attempt to remove the penal provisions from the Act, but just let it try! There will be a furore over that before the problem is solved.

Reference is made to local government, and I have already dealt with what I consider to be the most pressing problem in this connection. Councils will be starved for funds and will be left to sink or swim. I believe that, even with increased rate revenues to try to cope with the ravages of inflation, unless a miracle happens councils will be forced to retrench staff, and there will be rising unemployment throughout the State because of this disastrous decision. Paragraph 11 of the Speech states:

With the co-operation and financial assistance of the Australian Government, community health services will be extended.

That is a faint hope. The Speech also refers to water pollution and to the administration of comprehensive water resources legislation. However, the Speech gives no detail of what this involves. The proposed filtration of the water supply will again heavily depend on Commonwealth Government funds. The one feature of the Speech that had some appeal to me is paragraph 13, which states:

Legislation providing for a "small claims court" will be laid before you in this session of Parliament. This court will be the means whereby speedy and inexpensive justice may be provided for litigants in small civil claims.

Mr. Coumbe: Who suggested that first?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We did. Nevertheless, the Government has taken the credit for this. It is the only item in the Speech about which I can get enthusiastic. Since I have been a member (and I have had more experience in this field since being a member), the cost of justice has been high for the average citizen; so, I welcome the provision in paragraph 13.

The education section in the Speech is somewhat thin. The Commonwealth Government's intervention has allowed for the engagement of ancillary staff in schools. Pre-schools are referred to. A committee will be appointed to investigate this field. However, such a committee is already in existence. I inquired regarding the establishment of a kindergarten in my district and was told that this matter would be referred to the pre-school education committee that already existed. The Commonwealth Government has axed its pre-school programme. This Government and the Commonwealth Government have said *ad nauseam* that they will not cut back on health and education, because the public demands a satisfactory level of health and education. Every time the Premier or Minister of Education opened his mouth (even when the Premier was overseas and the Minister of Education was the maid of all work—Acting Premier, Acting Minister of Works, etc.), we got the health and education spiel: "We will not cut back on health and education." However, the facts of life are such that the Commonwealth and State Governments have no choice. The Commonwealth Government has taken the axe to the programme it considered most

essential, namely, pre-school education. I refer to some of the unfortunate election advertisements that appeared in the press during the recent Commonwealth election when questions were directed to the various political Parties by the Institute of Teachers. Although I do not necessarily think that the answers given in all cases were particularly astute, the answer given by the Liberal Party was the most responsible. Questions were asked on pre-school education, primary and secondary education, and technical and further education. The answers given by the Liberal Party included what I regard to be the responsible statement that, to make any real progress in education, that Party would first have to come to grips with inflation.

The Labor Party undertook to proceed with all these programmes, but within months it has gone back on its word regarding the pre-school programme. We cannot out-promise the Labor Party. No Party can do that: name it, and the Labor Party will give it to you! The number of things that the Prime Minister gave a firm undertaking to do but later said he would have to defer is legion, and one of those matters was pre-school education.

The Liberal Party was the only Party honest enough to admit that it would proceed with existing programmes but, before it could expand those programmes, would have to come to grips with inflation. That attitude has been borne out and I will not quote further from the document, as all members are aware of it. The Governor's Speech then degenerates, in paragraph 17, into a long list of topics about which we have not the faintest idea and which we call a shopping list.

In paragraph 18 the Premier deals with the juggling of books that the Government must undertake to try to keep a combined deficit on Loan Account and the Budget within manageable proportions. Again, I suggest that what the Government is doing would not be contemplated by a responsible leader running a business, whether large or small. I refer here to juggling the books to pay interest on money being used for revenue purposes, and that is what the Premier's reference means. Loan money, on which the State is paying interest, will be taken into Revenue Account to try to meet the tremendous deficit on that account. I ask honourable members to show me any responsible business leader in this State or elsewhere who would conduct his business in that way. I suggest they would not find such a person; if they did, he would not be in business for long. This is the sort of programme that has been put before us.

I wish to refer now to some other matters of particular interest to the people of my district. Not only was the agricultural community subject to the ravages of rust but, unfortunately, a tremendous outbreak of downy mildew throughout the grapegrowing areas cut back significantly the quantity of grapes harvested in those areas. I have never previously seen vines devastated to the extent to which some I saw in the Barossa Valley were devastated.

We hear from members opposite that we are supposed to hate trade unionists, and give the lie to the statement, but I consider that no member opposite has any conception of the sort of risks involved in primary production, and the primary producer has no control over many of those risks. Apart from damage caused by rust and downy mildew, much damage can be caused by a high wind during harvest, whether fruit or grain is being harvested. Further, a good frost in the district where I

live can ruin a complete crop. The position in rural industry is not as rosy as the Prime Minister and some people in this State would have us believe. It is not all beer and skittles for the man on the land and, despite what the member for Florey has said, the average income of the man on the land is far less than other incomes in this country.

I consider that the report on local government boundaries is likely to have wide implications in country areas. I am one of those who believe that decentralization in Government, as in other activities, is highly desirable. Unfortunately, this is the complete opposite of the political philosophy espoused by the Labor Party, which would seek to centralize decision making further and further away from the people. The balance between local authority and efficiency must be fairly finely made.

On a fairly quick perusal of the report on boundaries it seems to me that it has gone too far regarding country areas. I know that there will be much criticism of the report in some areas. The business of getting bigger and so becoming more efficient is so much cock-and-bull nonsense that it is not worth arguing about at length. The larger an instrumentality, whether governmental or semi-governmental, becomes, the less efficient it becomes, because more and more people are running around under less and less supervision and scrutiny.

Empire building occurs, and I consider that this has happened in Government instrumentalities, particularly in the Commonwealth Government. In government, the larger the organization becomes, the less efficient it becomes. I intend to quote briefly from a book by Bertram Cox that I read recently. This sums up fairly succinctly what I have been trying to say. It is a general comment on government and states:

We have read of autocracies, plutocracies, absolute monarchies, serfdom, and feudalism. We have experienced fascism, marxism, nazism, and communism . . . We are now observing a modern form of totalitarianism—bureaucracy. Simply expressed, any form of totalitarianism means that the interests of the State are paramount and that the interests of the individual are relatively unimportant. We must bear in mind that Lenin, the architect of modern Russia, originally defined communism as democratic centralism, and that the word "Bolshevik" itself means "a majority"—yet, added together, they have created a police state. Years ago, Sir Winston Churchill warned us against developing "a society in which the politician and the bureaucrat mean everything and the individual means nothing!" and never did Churchill sound a clearer warning—or one that has been so little heeded.

I consider that that is happening in government in this country. We have seen it escalate under Labor Governments in this State and in the Commonwealth Government, but local government has helped to keep it within check. I frequently hear comments by people involved in local government that they are being stripped of their powers, and I consider that there is an element of truth in this. The present Minister of Local Government in particular is imposing on local government pettifogging restrictions about when they are to meet and how they are to collect their rates. If the Government thinks councils are not responsive enough to the wishes of the local people and that they cannot make decisions that suit their localities, it must think that we are in a State that does not exist. To try to enforce rigidity and uniformity and to impose pettifogging restrictions on councils is making a mockery of local government. I consider that the report on local government boundaries will cause heartburns and that some modification will be necessary.

I now refer to what is happening at Chain of Ponds, which matter has illustrated the workings of this bureaucracy to which I have referred, under which Government instrumentalities will act with little thought for the welfare or the peace of mind of the citizens whom their decisions affect. I have seen more genuine worry caused by the activities of a Government department in the taking-over of properties at Chain of Ponds than I have time to describe now. Serious concern and worry has been caused to most people in that township. A Government decision made without their being consulted, and announced in the middle of the night, has caused the residents of this town to have to pull up their tent pegs and go elsewhere. I have seen bureaucracy at its worst in this exercise.

I am sorry that the Minister of Works is not present in the Chamber; apparently he is still itinerant. I heard him address a meeting and give certain undertakings (at which he is most adept), but they have not been honoured. He said that these properties would not be re-let, but that promise was not honoured. Some departmental officers then got to him and said, "We cannot pull down these new homes. We will put Engineering and Water Supply Department employees in them", so the Minister had to amend his previous statement. Thereafter, he said that no-one other than departmental employees would go into them. This statement was put on tape, to which the Minister did not object. However, a house was re-let, and I was told a pack of lies by the department, which said that it had had to put someone else into the house because it was going mouldy.

Having taken the matter further, I feel sorry for the young people who are in the house. I have not the slightest wish that they should be kicked out now. However, the Minister misled the people and did not stick to his word. Two years ago I again took up the matter and asked the Minister a question about it, as a result of which I received correspondence from him. Having raised the matter in the House, I received many letters from him, many of which were unsatisfactory. Indeed, the one for which I am now looking was completely unsatisfactory. I told the Minister that he had said previously that the houses would not be let to anyone other than the departmental employees to whom I have referred. In a letter that the Minister sent to me on February 28, 1972, he said:

Would you please take note that Mr.—

I will not mention the gentleman's name; however, he was not an E. & W.S. Department employee but the person who was put into this house—

of Chain of Ponds has been given three months notice of termination of his tenancy of the lease of the property at Lot 16, Main Road, Chain of Ponds. This notice will take effect as from the expiration of the current month on March 14, 1972.

They are still there, 2½ years later. These young people, who I understand are building a house at Williamstown, have had a baby in the meantime. I have not the slightest wish for them to be pushed out now. This shows that the Minister of Works misled the people in the public statements that he made at that meeting, and that the department has sent him around in circles. This exercise at Chain of Ponds was a disgrace, and it makes me pleased that we have an Ombudsman in this State.

Dr. Eastick: They don't even take heed of his directions.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I know. Originally, I was opposed to his appointment because I did not like to see a build-up in the Public Service. However, the more I

see of the actions of the bureaucracy (of which this is an example), the more pleased I am about his appointment. It is the policy of the silver-tongued Minister of Works—

Dr. Tonkin: Silver-tongued?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He was then. It is his policy that one has merely to ask for something and one will get it. The Minister then had to keep amending what he had said previously; he completely contradicted himself. No wonder the people are disillusioned with the Government. I have taken people to see the Premier, the Minister of Works and Government departments to try to satisfy them and alleviate some of their worries caused by this bureaucratic operation. However, some are still not satisfied, and I do not blame them. They have been led up the garden path, as was the Minister by his department.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think he is a pawn on the board?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think he knows what is going on. However, I was told lies and I, as a member of Parliament, object to being told lies. I refer to this to illustrate the way in which bureaucracy can work, and indeed has worked, and I deplore it. The Minister of Works has been equally dictatorial in relation to another matter, but I have not now got time to canvass it. It concerns my electorate secretary, regarding the appointment of whom I have had much correspondence with the Minister. I was told initially that Cabinet was making the decisions in this respect. The Opposition was not consulted, and it is obvious that the Government had no conception of what was involved in some districts. My district falls into two parts, some of which is in the Barossa Valley and some of which is in the Adelaide Hills, which part I can readily service. I was told that the Public Service Board was making decisions, and then I was told that the Minister was doing so. Unfortunately, I have not the time to canvass this matter now, although I intend to follow it up later. I am certainly not happy with the way in which I have been treated in connection with this matter.

If the Government is genuine in its desire for members to give their districts good and efficient service, it will certainly take more cognizance of the sort of facts that will be presented to it. However, if it gives blanket instructions, which make members' work much more difficult (and in my case it is virtually impossible to give prompt attention to my constituents), I will certainly have more to say about it.

Unfortunately, I shall have to leave many topics to which I wanted to refer, because I have insufficient time to deal with them now. I asked the Minister a question today regarding a teacher housing authority, the establishment of which is most important for the teachers of this State. Although His Excellency's Speech was a most uninspiring document, one has no other recourse than formally to support the motion.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I join in the expressions of sympathy that have been made by other honourable members to the relatives of the late Mr. Dawes and Mr. Edwards. It is customary on these occasions to express both condolences and compliments and, having expressed the former, it would be less than gracious of me, and lacking in generosity, if I did not say how nice it was to see that the Premier had returned safely, and to see him, together with so many members of his Ministry, also returned to the State, even though we do not see much of them in the Chamber. However, I know they are back, because

they have appeared here. I have no doubt that the Minister of Education will soon be undertaking a long and extended holiday. No doubt he will need a long rest cure after his onerous duties as South Australia's Pooh Bah, but the important thing is that all the Ministers are gathered together again; almost all, anyway (one is still missing) and how good and condescending it is of them to come. This has not been a frequent occurrence lately. How very nice of them to come for the session.

As we all know, the Premier and many a member of his Ministry have been travelling widely and expansively; perhaps "expensively" would be more to the point. I am tempted to say that the Ministers have been perambulating; the alliterative effect of "perambulating Premier" is satisfying, as it runs off the tongue very smoothly—"our perambulating Premier". I find on closer examination, however, that "perambulating Premier" is not really acceptable. The correct word is "perambulatory". So, the correct term should be "our perambulatory Premier"; but this does not provide the same sense of satisfaction, because there is some impediment to the free flow of syllables. Besides, it brings with it connotations of babyhood. Really, I think "our perambulating Premier" is much better.

One of the benefits of looking into the correct usage of the correct word at the correct time (and, in this case, the correct word to describe his activities) is that the exact meaning of the word "Premier" came to notice. "Premier" coming from the Latin, through the French, is now considered vulgar (that is, a vulgar noun) when used to describe a head of State. But, vulgar or not, we have our Premier—at least, this particular one for the time being—and the major problem devolves around the most suitable adjective to describe him and his activities.

As I said before, alliteration demands that the adjective begin with a "p", and on this basis "perambulatory" has a strong claim. Let us consider the suitability of the word in this context. I make it clear that I use as my authority Cassell's English Dictionary. I find that "to perambulate" means "to walk over". Well, that certainly has been done on many occasions.

Further, the word means "to walk through, especially for the purpose of surveying or inspecting, or to walk along the boundaries of a parish to survey or preserve them". Well, that is interesting, because, whatever boundaries of whoever's parish the Premier has been surveying to preserve them, they were certainly not South Australia's boundaries. He was not within or even near them for most of the time he was away from the State. Perhaps his efforts, made at some financial expense to the taxpayers of this State, to preserve the boundaries (and some have been redistributed, too) of his Commonwealth Labor Party colleagues would qualify him for the general description of "perambulatory", but his first duty, as always, should have been within the boundaries of South Australia. Obviously, then, "our perambulatory Premier", while it could be used quite validly to describe previous incumbents of the office, cannot be used to describe the present Premier. "Perambulatory", then, we must reject.

"Pedestrian" is a possibility that also catches the eye, at least initially. It relates to motion and travelling, "going or performing on foot". It may mean, too, "an expert walker". However, no mention is made of verbal side-stepping or issue-dodging. Now, one can be sure that the Premier did not walk overseas—either literally or on reaching his destination (that is, while he was there). So, "pedestrian" just will not do. What a pity! Used

figuratively, the word also means prosaic, dull, or commonplace, but no-one could possibly say that about someone who acts with such arrogant, almost flamboyant, disregard for the needs of the people of South Australia. There is nothing commonplace about someone who acts as if he has sole rights to a political philosopher's stone and thinks he can, with golden words, fool all of the people all of the time. No! "Pedestrian" is certainly not the word.

For similar reasons I have rejected "peddling"; I stress that the word I am saying is spelt with an "e". A pedlar is "one who travels about the country selling small wares or retailing gossip". This is not entirely accurate, and it is therefore not suitable, and we must reject it. Finally, I find the most suitable choice, the one nearest the mark, is "peripatetic". On the whole, I prefer this to all the others—"our peripatetic Premier". I will go into the reasons in a moment, but I am reminded of a previous Labor Premier who, when accused of being peripatetic, took great objection; it turned out that he thought a member had said "very pathetic".

Actually, I believe that "peripatetic" describes our Premier very well. I prefer the term to all the others. It comes from the pure Greek "peri", meaning "around". It also comes from "patein", meaning "to walk". It thus relates to walking about. Or, as an adjective it may mean "itinerant", and that certainly describes the Premier's activities best during the recess. He has been itinerant—coming and going, going and coming, almost as the whim takes him—off to Europe, back to Australia, back to Europe, back to South Australia, off to Coogee (for all the good it did) and back to South Australia. "Our peripatetic Premier" it shall be.

Mr. Dean Brown: I believe that the Minister of Transport is almost dying of laughter.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister, with other Ministers, has been practising peripateticism, too, but they are not in the same class as the Premier. Unfortunately, I must again sound a cautious note. "Peripatetic", as a noun and as applied to the Premier, lets us down to some extent; "one who walks about" is reasonable, but the term may also mean "one who cannot afford to ride". Obviously, the Premier thought he could afford to ride, and at the taxpayers' expense, there and back, and there again and back again, and with an entourage, too, and at considerable expense. We are still awaiting details of the full cost to the people of South Australia, who have been taken for a ride. I guess that we will ultimately be given a figure. The member for Hanson was given a reply by letter some weeks ago saying that not all the dockets were in yet, but I cannot imagine what has been going on in the meantime. Members would like those answers soon. In all the circumstances, it hardly seems surprising that South Australia has been plodding along in a pedestrian sort of way, in sharp contrast to the way in which inflation has been advancing during the Premier's absence overseas.

Mr. Langley: What about England?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not know whether the Premier visited England. I heard someone by interjection say that the Minister of Transport was listening in on the speaker system and splitting his sides. This may be evidence of a split in the Labor Party, which I will analyse in detail later in my speech. Members opposite can laugh it off, but I intend to go into it in detail later in connection with the State sphere and the Commonwealth sphere. The Labor movement in general is facing the greatest crisis it has faced since the conscription issue and the depression.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: In a general atmosphere of growing community concern and alarm at escalating inflation and growing industrial militancy or, to put it more simply, in an atmosphere where people are getting sick and tired of strikes hitting at the very core of their living, affecting milk, bread, petrol and all other items, and of rising prices of these commodities, it is pleasant to be able to refer to an imaginative proposal drawn up by a committee from Rose Park Primary School. For a short time, at least, I hope all members will forgive my being parochially proud.

Mr. Payne: We have managed to forgive the honourable member all his other indiscretions, and we will endeavour to extend the same courtesy to him now.

Dr. TONKIN: I am honoured by the honourable member's interjection, and I thank him for the compliment. I refer to a project concerning the creation of a workshop at that school. This project has been prepared and put forward by a committee comprising the school Headmaster (Mr. Tresize), Messrs. Ford and Payne, teachers at the school and Mrs. Daly, a teacher aide. This project is most imaginative and worth while, and is described as follows:

We wish to encourage creativity in the school and its environment by providing a centre at which both the physical surroundings and the materials for a wide range of endeavours will be available. More specifically, the aims of this project are as follows:

- (1) To enable school classes to use this centre if the teacher wishes to take advantage of its resources.
- (2) To enable children to follow up and diversify classroom experiences and activities outside normal school hours.
- (3) To promote the concept of a school as an integral part of the community.
- (4) To provide a suitable venue at which outside organizations may work creatively with school and other child-groups.
- (5) To provide a base for community-orientated children's activities involving film and television work, drama, conservation, etc.
- (6) To create an intimate theatre suitable for film screenings, the staging of dramatic productions and displays by both the school and the community.

We do not expect that all of these aims will be implemented immediately. Instead, we have planned a series of stages for their implementation which we anticipate will be compatible with the wishes and the needs of the children and the community. The first (short term) stage will involve the workshop's use by classes within school hours in the areas of creative art, drama, music appreciation, theatre, etc. Anticipating that this will prove successful, stage two is designed to co-opt interested parents, teachers and other personnel to assist in conducting open workshop sessions during non-school hours. Stage 3 which might be defined as the long-term plan is to extend activities as described in stage one and two so that the project may embrace other age groups (children and adults) within the community.

The building to be used is an old church located opposite the school. Gurney Road has been closed by the council, and a playground is being constructed. This worthwhile project deserves the greatest support. I hope it can be implemented and that the \$4 000 required can be made available.

The Liberal Party has long supported the principle of greater involvement of schools in community activities as an interaction. This was the subject of inquiry and report while I was a member of the Social Welfare Advisory Council. As a community we cannot afford to have such large capital sums tied up in school buildings and facilities without making better use of them, and throwing them open

for use by the whole community. The work of the school and the work within the community will be an interaction that will benefit both the school and the community. I happily support this project, and I hope honourable members understand that I am proud that this project is being undertaken in my district.

On a less parochial matter, but certainly one that gives little reason for pride either by members of the community or by the Government, I refer to a matter in the general field of health. Indeed, many sections of the general health area are far from satisfactory in South Australia. I cannot understand why the Government ever bothered to establish any committee of inquiry into health services in South Australia at all, if all it is going to do with the report is to say, "Yes, the report has a pretty red cover. Let us put it on the top shelf and forget it ever existed." Two committees were established, the first only one week after I had moved to have placed on the Notice Paper a private member's motion suggesting that an inquiry be held into the conditions of nurses in public hospitals. This was in 1970. One week later there was announcement by the then Minister of Health (Hon. A. J. Shard) that a committee of inquiry into hospital communications would be established forthwith. This occurred between the time when this motion appeared on the Notice Paper and the next day available for private members' business. Before we could say "Jack Robinson" or "Bert Shard" a committee of inquiry into health services in South Australia was announced. What a tremendous committee that was. It was comprised of experts and chaired by an eminent judge, a man whose contribution to the public life of this State is second to none. That committee's report is worth while, but there it sits, as far as anyone can tell, gathering dust. This state of affairs is shocking, and I intend to refer to it on another occasion in this House, I hope soon.

I refer to the situation applying at the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. After many delays this complex has been rebuilt in stages at a considerable cost, and it was completed in 1968. Of course, we can be proud that it reputedly offers some of the best treatment and training in the world. It has some of the best facilities, too, but it has one of the biggest waiting lists and inefficient rates of treatment for an institution of its size and facilities in the world. The number of patients actually able to be treated is worth noting, as is the cost per patient. These figures qualify the department to be described as having the most inefficient rate anywhere in the world.

A report in the *Advertiser* of July 20 states that South Australia has a crisis in dental care. I thoroughly agree. This is a recent article, yet South Australia (and this is what I am most concerned about) has had a dental crisis for many years. Thousands of people are on the waiting list. We are told that 9 000 people are waiting for dentures, some waiting since 1957. There is a small staff making dentures for about 20 pensioner patients a week.

This matter has been raised in this House on many occasions. All members have received complaints about the situation applying in the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It has been said that if a person wants his teeth fixed at the dental hospital he should contact his member of Parliament, because that is the only way a person can jump the queue.

Mr. Keneally: That's not true.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not know if it is true or not, but that point of view has been put to me. On March 19, 1974, the Minister of Health (Hon. D. H. L. Banfield) in another place answered a question on the dental hospital. He stated:

I have a reply to one of the many questions that the honourable member has been asking for a considerable time. The "university waiting list" referred to could more accurately be described as the "university treatment list". Currently, 646 persons are on these lists, and all of them either have been assigned to dental students for treatment or have had their treatment completed and are waiting recall for follow-up checking. In most cases these patients

are transferred from the main waiting list to the university treatment lists. There are 895 patients on the orthodontic waiting list. A large number of these patients could also appear on the other waiting lists as they may require restorative treatment as well as orthodontic treatment.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 1, at 2 p.m.