

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 27, 1977

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

## PETITION: BRIGHTON PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Mr. MATHWIN presented a petition signed by 528 electors and residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to provide an activated pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of the building known as the Brighton Senior Citizens' Club, Brighton Road, and Murray Street, Hove, to enable people to cross Brighton Road in relative safety.

Petition received.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JUVENILE COURT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The State Government has accepted in principle the report of the Royal Commission into the Juvenile Courts Act. The Government has established a working party to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The members of the working party will be Judge K. Newman of the Adelaide Juvenile Court; Ms. Anne Rein, Research Officer in the Attorney-General's Department; and Mr. Gordon Bruff, the Acting Director-General of the Community Welfare Department. The working party will consult with the Royal Commissioner, Judge Mohr, as part of its work. We believe that this report will bring about a considerable improvement in the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act.

Mr. Millhouse: When will we get legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As soon as the working party can prepare legislation together with Parliamentary Counsel.

Mr. Millhouse: This session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We hope so, yes. The working party will seek the advice of one of the leading world authorities on juvenile crime procedures, Professor Rosemary Sarri of the University of Michigan, who will be in Adelaide from August on a sabbatical year at Flinders University.

## NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: TELEPRINTER USE

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the following motion to be moved:

That in transmitting Party political propaganda via police teleprinter for use by an endorsed Labor Party candidate in debate against the member for Eyre in Ceduna, two nights ago, the Premier has been guilty of a scandalous misuse of public funds and police facilities, has further prostituted his position of Chief Executive of this State, and should resign forthwith, and that such suspension remain in force no later than 4 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. TONKIN: I move:

That in transmitting Party political propaganda via police teleprinter for use by an endorsed Labor Party candidate in debate against the member for Eyre in Ceduna, two nights ago, the Premier has been guilty of a scandalous

misuse of public funds and police facilities, has further prostituted his position as Chief Executive of this State, and should resign forthwith.

I take this action in the most serious possible vein. Last Monday, two days ago, a debate was arranged in Ceduna between one of the Labor Party candidates (Mr. Barry Piltz) for the District of Eyre and the sitting member for Eyre (Mr. Gunn). That debate received a considerable amount of publicity. It had been arranged for some weeks, and on Monday last before the debate the Labor Party candidate received a telex message originating from the Premier's office that contained Labor Party political propaganda. It is no secret in Ceduna that information was transmitted from the Premier's office via the police teleprinter in Ceduna. That channel, I understand, is unlisted in teleprinter directories, being reserved entirely for official police business and, of course, it is reserved in that way for emergency calls. I have in my possession a copy of the telex that was sent by the Premier's Department and a tape recording of the public meeting which shows clearly that the Australian Labor Party candidate relied heavily indeed on the information contained in the telex. The telex bears the Ceduna police teleprinter number, its source of origin being given as "Premier AA 82827", with the heading "Note for Barry Piltz". It states:

The Liberals in general are taking a totally anti-South Australian line—

This is on a police—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: The interesting thing which highlights the gravity of this entire situation is the attitude of the Government at present. It is a matter of the utmost gravity. The telex continues:

They are knocking and continually resorting to lies to try to establish some sort of picture of economic disaster in South Australia. Dr. Tonkin, for example, is continually going around the State telling lies which could easily be proved to be lies but this does not stop him.

That statement is actionable and, indeed, further action may be taken on it. Then it talks about two tacks that the Liberal Party is taking:

First, excessive State taxes, claiming we are among the highest in Australia and, secondly, large-scale drifts of industry to the Eastern States.

This is on a police teleprinter service presumably coming up before officers in the Ceduna police station or wherever this material is churned out. It then goes on with the twisted figures which the Premier quoted in this House last Thursday about the 1976-77 financial year's estimated State taxes a head. It is exactly the same situation as when we heard the Premier parrot forth last Thursday, saying that South Australia levies the second lowest rate of taxation a head in Australia but, mind you, this does include royalties. The reason for including royalties is that they are a State tax levied on a specific resource in the community. This is blatant political material designed for a political Party's candidate.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's still the truth.

Mr. TONKIN: If there is any doubt that this was designed entirely for that debate and for the benefit of the Labor Party candidate (or one of the Labor candidates) for Eyre, the message continues, as follows:

Again, New South Wales gets very large amounts of revenue from poker machines which South Australia does not want to introduce, so that some other taxes must be correspondingly higher. If Gunn brings up specific examples of areas where South Australian taxes are higher than the other States, just reply to him along the lines "Does he want poker machines as a revenue raiser or

does he think the State Government is somehow responsible for South Australia being a larger grazing area with a few large-scale mineral deposits such as bauxite or iron ore?"

That, and there is much more of it, came over the police teleprinter from the Premier's office. The other matters dealt with are manufacturing growth, unemployment, industrial disputes, home ownership, and general economic policies, and on it goes. There is even the general piece blaming the Federal Government for everything that has gone wrong in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. TONKIN: We have a situation in which police facilities have been used and public funds have been spent to promote, and help charge up with the latest twisted Labor Party propaganda, that Party's candidate for Eyre. Everyone in South Australia (in the world, probably) will recall the blatant misuse of power and Government resources in promoting a specific political Party that characterised the final days of Mrs. Ghandi's administration in India. What Government members find funny about that, I do not know: it was a disgusting and appalling situation. I know that some of them would totally support Mrs. Ghandi's regime and were disappointed when she was defeated, but that situation is totally foreign to our way of life in Australia. However, it seems that the South Australian Government is heading in the same direction, with the same arrogance that presumes to place it above public scrutiny and criticism.

The immediate issues may not be very big, but they are important ones. On the misuse of public funds, the Premier will say, "There is not much money involved; it didn't cost much to do." That is not the point: the point is that it was done. It is a matter of principle. The Executive, and that means the Government, has a duty to carry out the function of government without fear or favour and without regard to political advantage. It is a very fine line that is walked occasionally by this Government, and sometimes it goes overboard. This time it has gone right overboard. This particular candidate for Eyre has no formal status. I understand that he is a member of the Commonwealth Public Service, but he has no status with the Police Department or with the South Australian Government, yet the facilities were used to transmit a long and detailed screed of political propaganda.

Mr. Millhouse: How did it get to him once the message was received in Ceduna?

Mr. TONKIN: I understand from reports commonly circulating in Ceduna that someone called at the police station and picked it up.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: But you don't know?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How did you get it?

Mr. TONKIN: I understand the interjection; if we had not received a copy of this telex, it would have been all right! That is disgraceful. The misuse of police facilities and the independence of our Police Force is currently being compromised by this sort of activity. We have a Police Force of the finest and highest reputation, not only in Australia but, I would venture to suggest, in the world. It is independent of Government and, indeed it is a fundamental principle that the Commissioner of Police reports to Parliament and not to the Government. I know that in the past there have been some problems about undue influence, but nevertheless the Commissioner and the Police Department remain independent of Government.

We would not expect or ask members of the Police Force to act as messenger boys on a Party political errand,

and that is what has been done. They are being compromised by the pressures being put on them by this Government. I find a statement made by the Deputy Premier in December of last year very interesting. It reads:

I refute any statement that is made in relation to stand-over tactics on the part of this Government in relation to the Police Force. I use as my authority no less than the Commissioner of Police who said to a very prominent person in this State as recently as last Thursday that, of all the Police Forces he had been involved with throughout his career, this Police Force in South Australia suffered less interference from the Government than any other he had been connected with or knew of.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And I stand by that statement entirely.

Mr. TONKIN: In that case, why does the Deputy Premier condone the use of police facilities and police personnel to transmit Party political propaganda? He cannot have it both ways. The questions that arise from this matter are very wide. Has this sort of thing happened before, and if it has, how often? How often has the police teleprinter service been used in this way?

Mr. Millhouse: Have you any idea how it came that the message was transmitted?

Mr. TONKIN: I have no idea how the message was transmitted, and I do not know who could have given permission for it to be transmitted. It seems to me that the only person who could give permission would be the Premier himself.

Mr. Millhouse: He'll have an explanation.

Mr. TONKIN: He will certainly have to give an explanation. What other teleprinters in other Government departments are being used in this way? This is a particularly blatant example because it involves an emergency link with the Police Department, an unlisted number which must be used for official business. How many other teleprinters are there in Government offices in the State? For example, in the South-East, in the district of the member for Mount Gambier, there has been much activity. How many Government teleprinters are being used for Party political propaganda purposes?

This case shows an arrogance and an abuse of power that is beyond the comprehension of anyone in South Australia. I do not mind a front organisation coming forward and promoting the Labor Party, provided it does not use Government funds; we can live with that. The fact that the propaganda spewed out is mostly untrue does not matter; we live with that. The attitude of this Government is quietly creeping through, as it has done in the Government propaganda films—what the Premier on many occasions has tried to pass off as information films. I understand that about 20 of these films have been made at an average cost of \$7 500 each. This is taxpayers' money! I have said before that that is sailing pretty close to the wind, and I meant it. That cannot be justified: it is a misuse of Government funds for Party political purposes.

In this instance we see a specific department, which should remain independent of the Government, being used by the Premier's Department for the very purpose of transmitting Party political propaganda. The Premier will undoubtedly begin his defence with a tirade of personal abuse and denigration, as is his usual wont. We have come to expect that of him. His Government is now run down and he is depending more and more on public relations exercises and media propaganda to give the impression that all is well. A measure of what I believe to be his desperate electoral situation is that he is now prepared to use Government facilities (in this instance,

the Police Department) for pure Party political advantage. In this sort of activity is the beginning of scandal and corruption. These are the attitudes of arrogance and contempt for the fundamental principles of good government that finally destroyed the Whitlam Government. This destroyed the trust people had in the Whitlam Government, and I believe that that same arrogance and contempt will also destroy the trust South Australians have had in the Dunstan Government. The Premier is not above the laws that dictate the practice of responsible government. No Government can in any way afford to abuse the power entrusted to it by the people without suffering the inevitable consequences, and that is what I believe will happen. It is for that reason that I have moved my motion today.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I second the motion. This latest occurrence simply highlights what is happening in South Australia, namely, that probity in public administration is fast being replaced by shady political practice. The member for Playford, a Government member, when speaking in a debate last week alluded to the fact that, because of this kind of occurrence, members of the public were losing faith in their elected representatives. I notice that one Government member who seems to be taking this debate reasonably seriously is the member for Playford. We know that the Government's ploy is to huff and puff and try to laugh it off but, undeniably, there has been a blatant misuse of public facilities in transmitting Party political propaganda for Labor Party purposes. I remind members again of some of the things to which I have referred previously relating to the way in which this Government acts. Although perhaps they are not quite as serious and illegal as this present case, they indicate the lengths to which the Labor Party is prepared to stoop in its cheap politicking. First, I refer to its treatment of the democratically elected member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you think you'd do better to stick to the point, rather than go on to other things?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We well know that the member for Mitcham is a friend of the Labor Party, so I do not welcome his interjection. The fact is that the Labor Party is acting unconscionably in its treatment of the member for Mount Gambier. We well know that Government announcements are made via the endorsed candidate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The motion is quite specific. I ask that the honourable member stick to it. I am willing to discuss Mount Gambier and the member for that district, but he is not referred to in the motion.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The honourable member must stick to the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The point I make is that the Labor Party will go to any lengths, whether legal or illegal, courteous or discourteous, to promote its endorsed candidates and to try to discredit the democratically elected Opposition members. I will not pursue the point any further in relation to Mount Gambier, but we well know what has been happening in that seat and in the seat of Rocky River. Now, we have further evidence of an attempt to advantage a Labor Party candidate and to disadvantage a member of the House, and to do so dishonestly, as well as blatantly misusing public funds.

As the Leader has pointed out, the telex was a long communication of about 1 000 words. The police facilities were used for quite some time, apparently, to transmit

this telex. If the Labor Party had used the normal channels to get information to one of its candidates, the channels open to any member of the public and also to political Parties, it would have had to send a telegram. The full resources of the Premier's Department are obviously bent in the service of Labor Party candidates, because the material transmitted was obviously that given to this House in the previous week. If the A.L.P. had had to send a telegram, it would have cost probably hundreds of dollars. The communication was lengthy, setting out fully the material to be used by the Labor candidate in a public debate at Ceduna.

Mr. Becker: It could have been a letter.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If members opposite had been on the ball, they would have communicated with the candidate some time ago. Obviously, they were caught with their pants down for some reason and saw fit to use Government facilities. I do not intend to repeat all the points made by the Leader. I do not believe the Premier can come up with a satisfactory explanation, because it is obvious that the telex originated from the Premier's Department, it is obvious for what purpose it was sent, and it should be obvious to the Government, as it is to all members of the public, that this is a blatant misuse of public facilities and funds. If the Premier cannot come up with some satisfactory explanation, he and the Government have no alternative but to resign.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The facts of this matter, as I understand them, are that the candidate for Eyre (Mr. Piltz) requested some information from the political staff in my office. They undertook to prepare it for him in relation to a debate he was to have with the member for Eyre. I knew that material was being transmitted to him, but I was not apprised of how that was taking place. There is in the Premier's Department, as in most commercial offices in South Australia and many other places, a telex machine, and it is quite normal to use that telex machine, as one would use a letter, to transmit material. It is a perfectly normal operation. There is no difference between using Government paper and the time of Government stenographers to type a letter and putting something on a telex. I believe that that was done in this case.

Mr. Millhouse: It is a Government machine, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a Government machine; so is a typewriter.

Mr. Millhouse: But it is for the use of Government departments, presumably.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will come to the question of the Police Department's use in a moment. In relation to the Premier's Department, I make no apology for the use of the telex machine to transmit a message. It is no different from using a stenographer and a letter; it is no different from using a telephone in the department.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about Parliament House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are telex operations here, I understand.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Telephones, telegrams, postage—I suppose it is all Government business and they have never used stenographers in this place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is nothing unusual about sending out, by means of a telex, the same sort of thing that is sent out by letter, by telephone, or by telegram, except that, in the latter case, it would be much clearer. The question raised is, whether the telex should have been received on the Police Department telex machine in Ceduna.

It seems that the material had been prepared for telex and that it had been assumed by my officers, apparently wrongly, that a normal commercial telex outlet existed in Ceduna. When they found that there was not such a telex in Ceduna, they approached the Assistant Commissioner of Police because the Police Department has the only listed telex that my officers could find in the area. The telex was listed—it was not unlisted. Apparently Mr. Draper gave his permission for the use of the machine to transmit a message. Of course, it is usual in outback places for the police to be used to transmit messages that do not relate to the police: it is quite a common occurrence. However, permission was given for this telex, there being no requirement by the police for the machine at that time, and a message that took 10 minutes was transmitted.

I did not know about that at the time. When I was informed about it yesterday, I said that I believed it was quite inappropriate that a message should have been sent through the police telex machine and that that was not to happen again. I asked whether it had ever happened at another time and was told, "No". I believe that the message should not have been sent to the police telex machine and that the officers who did so were in error, but for that action to be the basis of a motion of no confidence on the ground of grand misuse of public moneys is strange. The degree of passion that the Leader managed to work himself into this afternoon is a simple indication of the desperate lengths to which he will go to try to dredge up something about which he can complain. The transmission of the message to the police outlet was wrong.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I think it warranted a question about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it would have been perfectly proper for a member to have asked a question, to which I would have given the same reply—that it was a mistake by my officer to use that as the outlet. Had the message been transmitted through a normal commercial outlet, I believe there could have been no complaint whatever. As the message was sent through the police outlet, that action was inappropriate for this purpose. I have given instructions that such action is not to happen in any circumstances. In those circumstances I do not believe this is a motion on which the confidence of this Government should be lost in the House, and I do not intend to resign.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I intend to vote for the motion; however, I agree with some of what the Premier has said. It is going rather too far to suggest that this is a matter of no confidence in the Government, but the Premier himself has admitted that a mistake was made that should not have been made. The only way I can show disapproval of this and of the Premier is to support the motion, as I intend to do. I would point out to the Premier that, whilst the mistake (and I use his word) may have been made by officers in his department, he, as the Ministerial head of that department, in the tradition of Parliament and our form of Government must take the responsibility for it, even if it is not personally his mistake. The Premier knows that well. At the very least it is quite unwise for Government facilities to be used in this way. I do not know what the comparative costs may have been.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You'd better ring Don Chipp.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me finish.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It's fair criticism.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is, and I will answer it in a moment.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: And truthfully?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope so. I do not know what the comparative costs are of sending a telex, a telegram or writing a letter. I suspect that if Telecom or Australia Post, whichever it is, had been used a telegram would have been more expensive. I strongly disapprove of the practice of all Federal Governments, presumably because the service is free in its own offices, of using long telegrams on matters on which letters could have been written. That happens all the time; it happens under the present Government, and it happened under the previous Government and the one before that. It is a bad practice and a complete waste of money. I raise several other points which have not been answered. First, I am surprised, quite frankly, that the Acting Commissioner of Police would sanction this. He is certainly under Ministerial control now; that is one matter this Government has got through Parliament. I am speaking without hearing Mr. Draper's side of the story, but I think that if he personally sanctioned this action he made a grave error in judgment in doing so; I think that in the circumstances we are entitled to an explanation as to why he did this or whether in fact officers in the Premier's Department put some pressure on him. One can imagine the sort of things that could have been said—that this was the only way to do it, it was urgent, it would not take up much time, and so on. I just wonder why Mr. Draper allowed this to happen.

The other point I raise (and this comes back to the earlier interjections) is, that obviously this material was prepared in the Premier's Department for Party political purposes. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to draw a line between what is governmental and what is political. I would certainly be the last to say that I could defend everything I have done or that I did when I was a Minister and say that it had no political content. It would be hypocritical to try to do so. Obviously, much time is being spent in the Premier's Department on preparing Party political material. That was not other than implicit in what the Leader said. It is an important consideration and all Ministers, and all of us, if we ever are or have been in that position, ought to be very careful not to do this sort of thing, because we should try to distinguish between what is governmental and what is political. It is impossible to draw the line.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Do you think the staff of the Leader of the Opposition should also be included?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not here to defend any person. As I have said, I do not think I could defend myself on these charges.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Truth will out in these circumstances. I noted the interjections from the member for Hanson and the member for Rocky River. I often do wonder what all members of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition do with their time. It must be Party political stuff, too, of course, and I certainly, as every member has—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We don't see the results in here, do we?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, that is the sad part of it; one does not see any results. Let me not be detracted from that. I certainly use the telephone in this place on Party political matters, as every member does. If that is wrong, I plead guilty and we must all plead guilty. I do not know how one can draw the line. The higher one is—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That's the same parallel, surely.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but what I am going to say is that the higher one is in the hierarchy in Government the more important it is for one to be careful. I accept that the Premier has given an instruction that this sort of thing should not happen again. I hope that he and all his Ministers, now that the matter has been brought forward (and it was properly brought forward even if it has been blown up into a no-confidence motion unjustifiably)—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How can you vote for it, then?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because, as I have said, it is the only way I can show disapproval of what has happened. I do disapprove of what has happened. I hope that every Minister will now carefully examine the activities in his department to try to keep on the right side of the line that I have said is so difficult to draw, because all of us ought to do that. I do not believe that this should have happened; the Premier has acknowledged it should not have happened. I hope it will not happen again. I do wonder why, if the Commissioner does still exercise an independent judgment in these matters, the police allowed this to happen and their facilities to be used in this way. They should not have done that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): No doubt the member for Mitcham finds himself in a great dilemma. He does not want to be recorded in *Hansard* or possibly reported in the press tomorrow as having voted against the Opposition move. On the other hand, he sees this matter as a waste of time and something that has been blown up out of all proportion. With that I must agree. I suggest to him that he does not have the courage of his convictions and that he is a hypocrite out of his own mouth. He could overcome his dilemma if he left the Chamber when the vote is taken, but it seems that he does not intend to do that, either.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I did that last week.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has made great play of the fact that the Acting Commissioner of Police actually consented to this telex being sent on the police telex. The inference was that the Government, because it has power of instruction over the Commissioner of Police, instructed the Acting Commissioner. He cannot conceive why the Acting Commissioner would approve such action. The honourable member knows that the Act that passed through Parliament provided that, if the Government issued any instruction to the Commissioner of Police, that instruction in all its detail had to be reported to this House. I am certain that if we had taken such action this time, that would have happened. As the Premier has pointed out, he was not aware of this incident until yesterday. The member for Mitcham is suggesting that one of the Premier's officers (and I do not know at what level that would be) heaved the Acting Commissioner of Police into giving consent.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you find out what happened and let us know?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That does not matter really. The honourable member can wag his little finger, but I do not believe that it is important, because of the points I have already made. In other words, the honourable member is suggesting that for every conceivable thing, and something as trivial as this, we would dare to instruct the Acting Commissioner of Police to do what

we wanted him to do. The honourable member knows that that is ridiculous, and I fail to see why he even bothered to raise the question. He has accepted the explanation of the Premier, and the fact that the Premier made clear to the House that he did not approve of the action and that when he was made aware of it he took action not only I suppose to reprimand the officer involved but also to issue instructions to ensure that such a thing did not happen again. All that has been done clearly.

Mr. Dean Brown: What a spineless creature he is, sliding out from beneath.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Who is a spineless creature?

Mr. Dean Brown: Sliding out from beneath his responsibility.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To know one you have to be one.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport must withdraw that remark. He cannot refer to any honourable member in that way. He cannot address an honourable member as a "spineless creature", and I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order; I am asking the honourable member for Davenport to withdraw the remark.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have used that expression in this House and it has never been picked up. I would like to know why, suddenly, if I use the expression, "The Premier is a spineless creature"—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. I have asked the honourable member to withdraw the expression, and he will withdraw it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the expression that the Premier is a "spineless creature for sliding out from beneath his responsibility".

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suggest to the House that the Leader of the Opposition saw this as an opportunity to embarrass the Government severely. I should have thought that a censure motion, or a question to the Premier, would have been adequate in this case.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the difference between this and a censure motion?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is a very great difference between this and a censure motion. First, the Leader ought to know that no vote is taken on a censure motion because it is talked out as a rule and expires.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're talking about an urgency motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I apologise: I meant an urgency motion.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, I think the Minister was referring to an urgency motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader is correct. That would have enabled him and members of the Opposition to discuss this matter adequately, or I think more properly he could have directed a question to the Premier on this matter and it could have been cleared up. What he has done is put in question, so far as I am concerned, exactly what facilities have been used by the Opposition and members of this House for political purposes over the years and been paid for by the Government. The Leader is provided with, I think, one press

secretary, with a second one in the pipeline. I guess that they, of course, are simply there to talk about Opposition policies if the Opposition ever becomes a Government: nothing else.

The Leader would have, in addition, a research officer, who would certainly be looking only at matters that deal with policies to be enunciated by the Opposition: nothing to do with politics! The Leader would have stenographers (I do not know how many, but probably two or three), who would type nothing, of course, but matters to do with the policies or alternative policies to be put forward by the Opposition. As Minister of Works I am responsible for the payment of telephone accounts in this building. It is remarkable how those accounts increase when any preselection ballot is taking place. That is nothing to do, of course, with policy: it is to do with politicking. I am talking about Liberal Party preselections; there have been some recent ones, and I am expecting some pretty heavy accounts.

The member for Mitcham can be included in this, too. He has had much activity because he has changed Parties a few times, and every time there has been a change, or marriage, or remarriage, a divorce, or something, up goes the telephone bill. The postage bill occurs in about the same manner. For these people to come into this House this afternoon and take the serious move they have taken, which calls on this Government to resign for the action they describe as so serious, is to me a big joke.

Mr. Tonkin: You have made that pretty obvious.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did not have to: the Leader did it for me. I think that the Opposition ought to find something better to do with the time available to it for this purpose. So far as I am concerned, this matter has been blown out of all proportion. The matter has been quite adequately and properly answered by the Premier, and I agree with him. I cannot understand why the member for Mitcham does not have the courage of his convictions. The motion will gain the fate that it deserves.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): There is not much that one can say about the remarks of the Minister of Works except that he made one or two pertinent remarks about the member for Mitcham. He went on to broaden the debate and to drag up everything he could possibly think of to remove the direction and thrust of the motion. It is not a question of raising this matter as a question during Question Time, as the Minister of Works well knows. How could all of this material have been brought forward by way of question?

Then he talked about the possibility of using an urgency motion, which, as he said himself, is something that it talked out and does not go to a vote. Is he afraid of a vote? Is that what the answer is? That is what it sounded like. The Opposition wants this matter put to a vote, because there must be at least one or two Government members who resent what is being done and who have a feeling for good and responsible government. We will see whether they show themselves. It may well be a vain hope, when one considers that the Deputy Premier regards this matter as one big joke. If South Australians were to know (and they do know) that he regards this matter as a joke, they will know what action to take at the next election.

This is not a joke: it is a most serious matter. Indeed, the Government's best efforts have tried to turn it into a joke or something that does not matter. It is a measure of the Premier's disturbance on the matter and also a

measure of the importance he attaches to it that he has actually stood up in the House for the first time in a considerable time (probably this has happened only about three times in my recollection) and admitted that the action taken was wrong. Even then he tried to blame someone on his staff. He dobbed in his political staff and tried to dob in the Acting Commissioner.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have not.

Mr. TONKIN: The Premier has. I wonder whether the Acting Commissioner was told of the contents of the telex or whether it was just a case of "This is a most urgent matter, Mr. Acting Commissioner, and we would appreciate your best offices." When that kind of request is made by the Premier's Department, what is any public servant in this State to do?

Two important points have arisen in the debate. First, a defined political staff is working in the Premier's Department (he called it his political staff). We would be interested to know how many people in that office are working as members of the political staff. They are obviously engaged in servicing A.L.P. candidates. I should like to know what part of the Premier's staff is engaged on such duties, how extensive it is, and what it costs the South Australian taxpayer. The other point is that there has been no denial whatever that this incident actually happened, and this is a measure of the fact that the Premier has been painted so far into a corner that he cannot deny that it has happened.

This is one incident that has risen to the surface, and we still have no idea of others, because the Premier carefully did not give any assurance that this kind of activity was not going on in other teleprinter links. "It is a matter of office procedure," he said, "that is commonly done." That is an appalling attitude to adopt. It has not simply been blown up out of all proportion, as Government members would like to say, but is a matter of the most extreme gravity, because on it hinges the credibility and honesty of an entire Government. If this is not worth a no-confidence motion, what is? An Executive has a duty to carry out the function of government without fear or favour and without regard to political advantage. That is a principle to which this Government has never adhered, and it is getting farther and farther away all the time. I should like to see an inquiry into the use of teleprinters in the Public Service and into the extent to which they are used by the Premier's Department, particularly by the department's political staff. Let us look at it and see exactly how much the people of South Australia are being manipulated by the political staff of the Premier's Department. I do not think that anyone can condone this sort of activity; small though it may be in commission (and that is only as far as we know), it is immense as a matter of principle, and as a matter of principle this Government stands condemned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

## QUESTION

## CONSTITUTION ACT

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Attorney-General advise the House whether it is constitutional for a person to be a Minister if he is not an elected member of Parliament? With your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House I desire briefly to explain the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. This, again, as with the question asked yesterday by the member for Semaphore, is a question of legal interpretation.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: No it's not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes it is.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the House that the Speaker will decide whether or not the question is admissible. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I put it to you, Sir, that it asks for a simple reply, but the honourable member is asking a question which involves the interpretation of a Statute, the Constitution Act. That is all he is asking: "Is it permissible for a man who is not a member of Parliament to be a Minister?" If that is not asking the Attorney for a legal opinion, I do not know what is. If there is something more behind the question, perhaps the honourable member could reframe it, but the way it is framed it is asking for a legal opinion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I was hoping that the honourable member for Price would be able to explain his question but, after all, he was not given an opportunity to do so. I ask the honourable member for Price to explain the question.

Mr. WHITTEN: Thank you, Sir. Perhaps I could reframe the question and ask the Attorney whether the Act requires any amendment to disallow a person from becoming a Minister if he is not a member of this House.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, that is getting—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you ask, "Does the Government intend to amend the Act?"

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What about the member's explanation, Sir?

The SPEAKER: I thought—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I thought that, by the honourable member for Price having sat down, he had finished his question.

Mr. WHITTEN: I sat down in deference to your speaking, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Very well, continue.

Mr. WHITTEN: I did wish to explain the question. What concerns me is that I know that in some countries a person does not need to be elected to Parliament or to a House of Parliament to perform the duties of a Minister. I am concerned that what could happen, and what I believe members opposite may wish to happen, is that someone who does not have the confidence of his Party or the confidence of his district may wish to be put in a position of being a Minister.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Sir. It is customary under Standing Orders that a member at least seek your leave and that of the House to explain his question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable member for Price did that earlier amidst the confusion. Has the honourable member for Price finished his question?

Mr. WHITTEN: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney-General.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Do you still rule that that question does not seek a legal opinion?

The SPEAKER: I cannot at this stage say that that is asking for purely a legal opinion. The honourable member is asking the Minister responsible, the Minister within whose portfolio such a question should be directed. I cannot altogether see that it is essentially seeking a legal opinion. In other Parliaments in Australia there are Attorneys-General who are not lawyers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With very great respect, that does not alter the fact—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member for Mitcham to continue the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I ask you, Sir, to make a ruling one way or another.

The SPEAKER: I have. It is within the province of the Attorney-General to reply to the question. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Sir. Most certainly, the Constitution provides that a person shall not remain a Minister for more than three months unless he is or becomes a member of this House.

Mr. Millhouse: His opinion is right this time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As usual, when I am crossing swords with the honourable member, my opinion is right and he has to bow to that opinion. If, of course—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Does that mean—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry is out of order.

Mr. Venning: He's never been anything else.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is also out of order by interjecting.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If a shadow Minister who has been denied preselection by his Party, which has had such little faith in him as not to preselect him for the forthcoming general election, was to be successful at that election, he would be entitled to be a Minister in any Government. If, of course, as a result of the lack of faith shown by the Liberal Party in one of its shadow Ministers, that Minister (and I suppose we are talking about the shadow Minister of Transport) was to be unsuccessful at the election and, by some amazing quirk of fate the Leader actually recommended to the Governor that that person should be a Minister in any ensuing Liberal Party Government (which, of course, would be the most unlikely thing of all time—nevertheless, if in the most extraordinary circumstances that one could imagine the Liberal Party did become the Government of this State and the shadow Minister of Transport, as he is called, did become a Minister but was not a member of this House), he must resign his commission as a Minister within three months.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S TOILET

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a personal explanation. Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I apologise for taking up the time of the House with the earth-shattering matter that was raised on the front page of the *Advertiser* this morning relating to the fundamental question of the provision of a toilet in the Bank of New South Wales building. I wish to make it clear that I discovered the toilet about 10 months after my moving there. Until then I did not know that it was there.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was located about 50 metres away from where my office was situated.

Mr. Millhouse: Metres?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. It was on the other side of the building near the lift.

Mr. Millhouse: It sounds as if it was out of the building and down the street.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a fairly long building in that respect. It could have been 40 metres. I could be wrong by 10 metres or so.

Mr. Dean Brown: It was probably 30 metres at the most. I have seen the building and the area involved.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The toilet was not installed there at my request or approval: I never knew it was there. For the first 10 months of the 18 months I spent in that office I thought the toilet was a broom cupboard until someone (I forget who) told me that it was the Minister's toilet. The toilet was installed in case another woman Minister of Education is ever appointed. She would not be able to use the general toilet. That was a problem that arose in the old Education building in Flinders Street. This toilet was even more expensive than the member for Davenport suggested, because in the 18 months that I was in the office I would have used it only twice, which makes it \$2 500 a pop. That probably is still the position, because I understand that the present Minister of Education did not know it was there in the 18 months he was in the building, nor did the Acting Director-General know until this morning: he, too, thought it was a broom cupboard. I have raised the point so that the facts are known accurately. The toilet was not installed at my request but was installed, as I understand it, in case it should subsequently be required if a female Minister of Education is appointed, because some extremely expensive alterations were required to the old Education building in Flinders Street in 1968 when that occurred.

*At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 26. Page 157.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): We have had some pathetic contributions from Government members in this debate.

When one looks at members opposite, it is easy to understand why their standard of debate is as it is. The Government has tipped its hand in relation to its tactics leading up to the next State election. It has taken the opportunity to complain bitterly about the revamped Liberal Party and the new policies we have released to the public, the attitudes we have adopted towards campaigning in general, and the fact that the Liberal Party in South Australia is gearing up for government and can demonstrate conclusively to the public that it is far more competent and capable of taking government and administering government than ever before. This must worry the Premier. When the member for Florey last evening heaped praises on the present Ministers of the Government, he did not say that there was not one Minister in the present Government competent to manage or capable of managing a multi-million dollar industry or organisation. Is it any wonder that the finances of this State are in a tremendous mess when we consider the people who are in charge of the various Ministeries?

Mr. Max Brown: What about the—

Mr. BECKER: The member for Whyalla is trying to make his usual inane interjections. He has never made a good contribution to a debate; he spends half his time asleep on the cross benches. The tactics of the Government and his shadow Ministry in every way possible. The State Liberal Party has been linked with the Federal Government and blamed for everything that is happening federally. After all, the crisis the country faces at present was created by that idiot Whitlam and his cohorts in three years of government, and the country is still paying for it. Some members opposite have raced to the aid of the unions, particularly the radical left wing unions, and accused the Opposition of union bashing. Every time someone dares to criticise a union in this State and every time someone wants to stand up for his democratic rights in this State, he is accused of union bashing. That is the typical attitude of the present Government in South Australia.

I said several years ago in this House that we were on the way to being a model socialist State, and that has been the plan of the present Government for many years. That dream is coming truer every year, every month that we have to tolerate the socialist Labor Government in South Australia. Statements have been made in the press and complaints have been made to various members on this side of the House that, if a person has a confrontation with the Minister of Labour and Industry, the Minister is not frightened to stand over him and threaten and intimidate him in any way he can. I said once before that this was nothing short of Mafia tactics, and they are the sort of tactics we have come to expect from some of the Ministers in this Government.

Mr. Dean Brown: He's a bully.

Mr. BECKER: I agree, and that would be putting it mildly. During this debate, the Labor Party in this State, through its back-benchers has been trying to throw across the red herring of the uranium issue and the attitude towards this matter of Opposition members. I said last evening, by way of interjection, that I stand by the vote we took in this House some months ago. Let us not fool the back-benchers of the Government into thinking they can storm around the State spreading wild and woolly rumours, and in particular some of the stupid nonsense contained in the telex message sent a few days ago to Ceduna for the Labor Party candidate.

Mr. Keneally: Did you read it?



Mr. BECKER: I read it. I think it was the greatest nonsense I have ever seen. It was written by someone completely out of touch with reality. There are plenty of such people hidden in the rabbit-warren offices in the Premier's Department; they live in a little world of fantasy, of boo-boos and absolute nonsense. All they are interested in is trying to perpetuate in office the present Government in this State. They are on the greatest racket they have ever been involved in in all their lives. They do not want to lose it; they have a really cushy job.

Mr. Dean Brown: They are bleeding the taxpayers of this State.

Mr. BECKER: You are being kind to them; I would not be that kind. There is no way they should be allowed to get away with what they are getting away with in the Premier's Department, but nothing can be done about them. Anyone who criticises them is simply accused of being a liar. That is typical of the attitude of the present Government, which will not tolerate any criticism at all. It will not tolerate anyone pointing out to it the areas of need, the areas of fault within its own policy, or the areas that can be improved within the community. The Ministers will not listen. They are so arrogant that their attitude is unbelievable.

The Government back-benchers have also raised the issue of unemployment, saying that the Opposition wants to see rising unemployment. I assure them that I am doing everything I can to assist people to obtain jobs, if they want to work. I have had many people coming to my office over the past couple of years and generally I have been able to find them some kind of job. It is only in the past four or five weeks that those avenues have dried up.

Mr. Keneally: I wish you'd been—

Mr. BECKER: If the member for Stuart thinks that we are trying to perpetuate unemployment, I assure him that I would not be associated with any organisation or political Party that wanted to put people out of work. There is no way I would support that, and I will do all I can to ensure that confidence is returned to manufacturing industry and all sections of the community so that we can return to full employment in this State. These are basically the issues the Government back-benchers have raised to draw red herrings across the forward-looking, progressive, modern policies that have been and are being prepared by the Liberal Party in this State in its run to the next State election.

A couple of weeks ago two young people came to see me, complaining that they were unable to receive unemployment benefits. They had been here from New Zealand for just 10 weeks, and they were worried because the Department of Social Security was being difficult with them. When we investigated the whole case, which took several days, I found out that many young people are coming to Australia from New Zealand on what is partly a working holiday. When they enter the country, they are required to sign a declaration whether they are visiting Australia or whether they intend to remain in Australia permanently. Of course, most of them say they intend to remain in Australia permanently. They can then go to the Commonwealth Employment Service, enrol and sit back and wait for unemployment benefits.

This young couple had arrived with little money and were in trouble because they could not continue to pay the rent. I found that unemployment benefits in New Zealand were considerably less than those in Australia, and that is why many young New Zealanders want to come to this country. Between the ages of 18 and 20 years

the unemployment benefit in New Zealand is \$(A)27·65: anyone over that age as a single person receives \$36·22, and a married couple receive \$30·18 each. The girl told me she was a shorthand typiste, and I understand that there is difficulty in obtaining such work. The lad said that he was a spray-painter. I tried to get him a job and, after about the sixth phone call, he began to look worried, and he then told me that he was colour blind.

These people are up to all the tricks, because I am sure that he did not want to work. Eventually, I was able to obtain unemployment benefits for this young couple, and they will be receiving a substantial amount. A few days later someone from the Social Security Department telephoned and asked me how I managed to obtain these benefits, and whether I could assist the department in placing several other persons the department was trying to help. One officer said (although he will not say it publicly) that the department received about six similar inquiries each week from New Zealand people. He also said that for some time many young New Zealanders who arrived in Sydney went straight to the Commonwealth Employment Service to register for unemployment relief.

It is impossible to ascertain how many people from New Zealand say that they intend to reside permanently in Australia in order to receive unemployment benefits. This situation is unfair to genuine unemployed people and to the Australian taxpayer, who has to foot the bill. The figures that I have been able to obtain show that for the June quarter, 1976, 927 such settlers arrived from New Zealand; for the September quarter, 1976, 1038 arrived; and for the December quarter, 1976, a total of 1118 arrived. In January this year 551 arrived, and 511 arrived in February, a total of 1062 for two months.

I understand there will be a substantial increase in the number of young people coming from New Zealand, and many of them will apply immediately for unemployment benefits. At least six people a week apply for them in Adelaide, indicating that the Australia-wide total would be large. Australian taxpayers are paying a large sum of money to these people, and my disgust at this situation was heightened when this young person told me that he was colour blind but was a spray-painter. That is the sort of situation facing the Federal Government, and much of it is a hang-over from the previous Labor Government, which granted free transfer and travel between the two countries. It is time that we sent a bill to the New Zealand Government so that the New Zealand taxpayers could accept their responsibility.

Concerning the finances of this State, we have not yet received the Revenue Account figures for the financial year that ended on June 30. When we consider how late it was that we received the figures for the financial year that ended in May, the Government's credibility regarding the State's finances must be kept constantly under challenge.

Last year the West Torrens council area was revalued, and what an absolute shambles that was. As a result, a part of the council area had to be revalued again because of a glaring mistake in the policies that were adopted. Several constituents had asked me to try to have their valuations reconsidered and, as I believe in writing to the Minister concerned, I sent him the details.

One constituent operating a small business was concerned because, at the end of December, he and his co-director, after paying all the business expenses, had nothing left, so they had worked the whole year for nothing. In a letter from the Minister of Lands, the Valuer-General stated that the property was last valued in 1972 at an annual value of \$5 330 with an unimproved

value of \$69 500. As a result of the general revaluation in the West Torrens council area on June 8, 1976, the figure was increased greatly. These people objected, and with the help of my correspondence, the unimproved value was reduced from \$368 950 to \$252 000, a reduction of \$116 000. These figures prove how ludicrous the system is, when the department can make such a reduction.

It is most unsatisfactory to have a system capable of producing such errors. The annual value was reduced from \$22 720 to \$18 550, so at least these people will receive some relief in land tax, council rates, and water and sewerage rates. Because they were interested enough to object to the valuation and contacted me, we were able to do something. However, many people do nothing. I have noticed in the past four or five years, especially in the various council areas in my district (and even with my property), a wide variation between the estimated market value and the valuation placed on the property by the Valuation Department.

In one case a young chap purchased a house in Cummins Park in 1974 for \$97 000, and the valuation on a market value was \$91 000. He did not complain, because that was about \$6 000 below his purchase price. However, another person has a house in a suburb not far from him in Camden Park on which the estimated current value was \$28 750, and the department valued the house at \$28 400, only \$350 different, whereas it was \$6 000 different on the higher priced property.

I have found throughout the whole of my district that the variation between the estimated market value and the departmental valuation, except for that instance where it was one-third, has varied between 22½ per cent and 3 per cent. There is something drastically wrong with the method adopted. As I have said, a property valuation is an educated guess; it has to be, because nobody can really say accurately what is the current market value. One does not know until the property is put up for auction or left up for sale by general inquiry for at least a month or two. The longer one leaves it, perhaps the lower the price.

Using this valuation method as a system for calculating council rates and water and sewerage rates and land tax is extremely dangerous and unfair to many residents. It is a system that virtually destroys incentive. We now have the situation where many young people (and many people my age) are wishing to extend their properties rather than buy a new property. They are making additions costing \$6 000 to \$10 000 and then finding that as soon as the alterations are completed the Valuation Department is informed by the local council and their property valuation is increased, so their land tax and water and sewerage rates and council rates are increased. As a result, the incentive to improve their properties is being taken away from people. That, in itself, is a reflection on the present Government. The Government has not yet been able to overcome the system, and once one starts destroying initiative and incentive at the average level it has an effect up and down within the standards of that community.

The Government has a real responsibility in this area. If the Government is to give the average owner a fair go, that is one of the main areas that it must look at again very closely. If one owns a house one has a tremendous struggle, but even if one is renting property the costs associated with keeping that property are written into the rent of the property, so nobody escapes that valuation system. From the Treasury point of view, it is an excellent method, because the Treasury benefits through inflation, as it has in the past three years of high and unusual inflationary trends. What happens now that there is a glut and there is not the money available to purchase established houses? What happens

now that property values are starting to decline? What is going to happen to the person in Camden Park who had a margin of only \$350 between the market value and the departmental valuation?

I would think that that person's property is now over-valued. I believe that if time and money were made available and spent in certain areas to check (and there is no way anyone can appeal now, because the valuations have been dealt with in some areas) many property owners would find that their properties were over-valued. There have been no announcements by the Government of any downward property valuations. I do not know what we can do, but something will certainly have to be done to alert the taxpayer and the community and to try to obtain from the department a current valuation of properties to ascertain how that valuation links up with present market trends. One cannot get an exact figure, because that is difficult to do, but I would feel savage if I was a taxpayer paying rates and taxes on a Government valuation that was hundreds or thousands of dollars above the current market value. That is where incentive is destroyed.

The Government is destroying the average person's incentive to improve himself. The Government has benefited from its own legislation by the alterations it has brought about in various Acts. Several years ago the minimum size of an average building block was 7 500 square feet; today the average minimum size of a block of land can be 6 500 square feet. There is a considerable difference in the average size of blocks, and valuations are based on the total area of a property, so by changing the various Acts the Government is forcing people who purchased Housing Trust or private development houses 20 to 25 years ago on much bigger blocks of land than today to pay much more for rates and taxes than, say, a person buying a house in a new subdivision such as West Lakes. Much has been said about the comparison between water and sewerage rates and certain factors from State to State.

I recently went to Sydney for two days to attend a conference. While there I consulted relatives and found a house of comparable value to my own. My council rates are \$170. The council rates on the comparable house in Sydney were \$187, but the rates included two garbage collections a week, ratepayers having the option, if they did not want the two garbage collections, to have their rates reduced by \$28 per annum, bringing their rate back to \$159, which is slightly less than my rate. The benefit there is that ratepayers have two garbage collections a week in that huge council area on the northern side of Sydney. The water and sewerage charges were \$123 per annum, almost half the water and sewerage charges that I pay on my property. The Government cannot argue, as those costs are at least 50 per cent cheaper than ours. The better quality water goes without saying.

The water pressure was unbelievable. They have ¾ in. pipes running on to their properties, whereas we have only ½ in. pipes. In the western suburbs of Adelaide, particularly near the coast, the water pressure is absolutely hopeless. I cannot see why we should have to pay tremendous prices for our water when we cannot enjoy the water pressure that other water consumers have. The Government cannot say that its services are better than services anywhere else in Australia or that its rates are comparable with those anywhere else in Australia: it simply cannot match the claims I have made. I had to check the matter personally to be absolutely sure about it.

Much has been said about many of the broken promises of this Government. Much has been said about this Government's attitude of grabbing a headline whenever it can and of fooling the people as much as it can. There is a tremendous empire in the Premier's Department to promote the Government and its Party for political purposes; there is no way one can argue about that. I refer now to two announcements, one of which was made in the *Advertiser* of February 12, 1973, of a \$1 000 000 playground for young and old, and a subsequent announcement in the *Advertiser* of December 19, 1974, of a \$1 000 000 plan to boost a recreation reserve. If ever there is something South Australians will miss, I believe that this is it, and it comes out plainly in the *Advertiser* reports, which have never been refuted. The report in the *Advertiser* of February 12, 1973, written by John Satterley, was the first of the promises made before the elections, and stated:

Six years ago, Frank Lewis, then 71 and chairman of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust, said lightly: "It's all right for some fellows to take it easy, but when the darkness gathers and we want to see something this size completed, we just have to get on with it." Since 1955, more than 400 acres of wasteland north of Glenelg between Tapleys Hill Road and the sea have been getting the treatment. A park for 500 caravans has been created. So have eight ovals, 12 baseball diamonds, a riding club, an 18-hole golf course, 14 tennis courts and many other sports areas and just places to relax. They're part of a playground complex for old and young alike at West Beach that's destined to be the biggest and best in Australia. It's the West Beach Recreation Reserve—an exciting \$1 000 000 project that certainly deserves a better name.

I could think of a good name, but *Hansard* would not print it. The report continues:

The Minister of Environment and Conservation (Mr. Broomhill) has authorised the State Planning Office to prepare a master plan to put the finishing touches on the entire area for consideration of the trust. As one of its first tasks, the S.P.O. is planning a public picnic area on 50 acres between the Glenelg Treatment Works and Marineland. This project was the dream dearest to Frank Lewis at the time of his retirement from the trust. In acknowledgment of the outstanding part played in the establishment of the whole area by the former chairman, the trust has resolved to name the picnic area the Frank Lewis Park. The Coast Protection Board is involved as the picnic area will have an extensive beach frontage and it is planned to preserve as much of the sandhills as possible.

That would have to be the joke comment of the decade. The report continues:

The trust is concerned about protection of the sand dunes from storm and wind damage which has resulted in large sections of the beach and sandhills being washed away in the past few years.

I have been told more than 30 metres of sand dunes has been washed away over the past couple of years. The board sanctioned the bulldozing of the sand dunes there and, when I cried out for support, the conservationists went into hiding, because there was nothing in it for them. One sand dune was levelled and made into a car park, together with a boat ramp into the sea. The area has so far survived, but it has become cracked and undermined. That is typical of the attitude. Promises were made on February 12, 1973, of a \$1 000 000 playground for young and old, particularly the 50 acres to be known as the Frank Lewis Park, to include a grassed amphitheatre, with emphasis on family recreation and family picnic grounds. On December 19, 1974 (about six months prior to the 1975 elections), a further announcement was made in an article headed "\$1 000 000 plan to boost recreation reserve", which stated:

Development of the West Beach Recreation Reserve into what is claimed will be the biggest and best multi-purpose sports centre in Australia may begin in a few months. Preliminary plans envisage an expenditure of more than \$1 000 000 on the 400 acre reserve. Scope of the plans could include cultural and educational facilities as well as recreation centres. Plans were outlined yesterday by the trust chairman (Mr. J. A. Wright), who said the trust had almost completed a brief setting out what it wanted developers' submissions to cover. Submissions would be invited next month. Several preliminary submissions had been received. It was hoped work would start in 1975-76. . . . Next month drawings by Institute of Technology architecture students, done as a study exercise, would be displayed in the city.

The plans were in the foyer of the National Bank, and some exciting and outstanding contributions were made by the students. The report continues:

The trust had been receiving requests from sporting and other bodies for accommodation in the reserve. These included a submission from a group with 35 000 playing members. Basketball, volleyball, squash, a creche, and a heated swimming pool were among activities being considered, together with a request for equestrian facilities. Marineland was in a 50-acre area between Military Road and the coast that was being studied as part of the overall plan.

We found that, following the articles in the *Advertiser*, the following appeared on page 66 of the *Advertiser* of April 3, 1976:

A West Beach recreation reserve special committee has been established to report and make recommendations on the future use of the West Beach Recreation Reserve. Any person, group, or organisation wishing to make representations to the committee on this matter is invited to do so . . . .

In May, 1974, there was also an announcement, namely, "Amateur group plans stadium in the West Beach trust area". In following this matter through, I was concerned at the sum the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust was receiving. Whilst I support unemployment relief moneys, because they create employment, I found that up to September, 1976, the trust had received \$736 000 for unemployment relief work, but nothing had been done to the 50-acre site or to commence work on the so-called \$1 000 000 plan for the area. In asking further questions in the House about additional unemployment relief moneys for the trust, I was told that the total exceeded \$860 000. Since the announcement of the \$1 000 000 project, nothing concrete has been done regarding the 50-acre reserve generally, apart from a few cleaning up operations in the area. In April, 1977 (when we were approaching another election, and, no doubt, the Government was preparing an announcement), I asked a Question on Notice in the House on April 19 (page 3503 of *Hansard*). Apart from other matters, I asked the following:

When will the reserve west of Military Road be developed into a family picnic area and, if not, why not?

The reply was as follows:

No decision has yet been reached as to the development west of Military Road, nor has the manner of development been determined. The matter is still under investigation and the Coast Protection Board must approve any proposed development in so far as the whole area now lies within the Coast Protection District and is subject to the provisions of the Coast Protection Act.

The matter goes further than the 100 metres approved under special legislation in the House some years ago when we gave the Coast Protection Board authority to control the land 100 metres in from the high tide mark. It seems to me that the 100 metres seems to be getting farther and farther away or that the tide is creeping up, because the winter tides are higher than are the summer tides. However, we will not argue about that.

I thought I should keep looking, because all this money was being spent in the West Beach reserve area with very little action. I understand that \$142 000 was spent on the filtration plant for Marineland. That was necessary, because the previous plant had not been well constructed and had been the source of many problems with industrial disputes and allegations about pipes coming in from the sea. Regrettably, several errors had been made, and the new filtration plant was necessary. There has been some general improvement. A few trees have been planted, and the Patawalonga golf course is in first-class condition and is a credit to the curator. Some effort has been made to clean up the area along Tapley Hill Road. A few trees were planted and surrounded by pebbles, with a hideous barbecue pit, untidy and partly covered in grass. Generally, one cannot see much for the \$860 000.

I am alarmed at some reports I have received about criticism of the non-event of the West Beach trust area. Following certain investigations, a person connected with the media was told to withhold a story I had given him challenging all and sundry on what was being done in the area. The original promise regarding the development of the 20-hectare Frank Lewis park had not come to fruition, and we wanted to know when the public would be able to use the area for recreation. I was informed that plans had been drawn up, and I understand that Ministerial approval has been given for a 100-site *en suite* caravan park to be established in this area. It is to be one of the most unique caravan sites in South Australia, and possibly in Australia, supplementing the huge caravan site already established. What we knew as the Frank Lewis Memorial Park is to be this lavish caravan park costing between \$400 000 and \$500 000.

Mr. Rodda: There must have been a change.

Mr. BECKER: Quite a dramatic change. Obviously, there has been a need for some income to supplement the cost of running some of the ovals, and it has been decided to commercialise part of the area. It is tragic that the Minister could give approval to such a project and that a group of people could come up with it after three years of investigation, knowing that the people need a recreation area. The late Frank Lewis, who gave so much of his time and effort to the West Beach trust, would have been most disappointed that this area is to be lost to the public.

I understand the strip of coastline between the Glenelg treatment works and the Holdfast Bay Yacht Club will be given to the club to do whatever it wants and that the beach will be virtually closed to the public, with only one means of access north of the club through the sand dunes. So many promises and statements have been made about the area. This is another broken promise. Instead, we are to get an *en suite* caravan park, each caravan having a strip of cement with its own toilet, shower, and washing facilities. This is another area about which the Government deserves a swift kick in the pants.

The Minister was not aware recently of what the trust was doing. He has been making statements and backing up the promise of a multi-million dollar scheme in the area, but obviously he did not know what was going on. I wrote to him on May 12, seeking approval to receive copies of the minutes of the West Beach trust. The trust is a Government instrumentality, and has two representatives from the West Torrens and Glenelg councils, plus a couple of appointees of the Minister. This Government boasts of open government and, as the

member for the area, I think I should be entitled to copies of the minutes of the trust. On May 20, 1977, the Minister replied, as follows:

As you are aware, the West Beach trust is a statutory authority and is responsible for the administration of the West Beach Recreation Reserve. The minutes of the meetings of the trust are confidential documents and should not be made available to the public. Indeed, as the Minister responsible for the administration of the legislation, I have not myself called upon the trust to supply me with copies of their minutes.

For these reasons, I do not propose to accede to your request. However, should you wish to be informed on particular matters concerning the administration of the trust, I will arrange for such information to be supplied to you.

I am the victim of censorship by the Minister. As Minister in charge, he has never called for the minutes and he has admitted that he does not know what is happening, but if I want to know anything I am subject to his usual dictatorial censorship. That is typical of the department of the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Rodda: You are not on the coffee list.

Mr. BECKER: Regarding anything that has gone on at the treatment works or with the West Beach trust at Ministerial level, the member for Hanson has received only one invitation.

Mr. Rodda: How did you go in relation to the Royal visit?

Mr. BECKER: We were able to watch from the nature strip in front of my office. I had one of the best views. I am surprised that the Minister has not given more consideration to the development of this area. This is the last opportunity for a large recreation reserve to be developed as a playground for the people. The maintenance of the ovals may cost money, but I do not think any taxpayer would object to some contribution to the trust to maintain the ovals. Its commercialisation, with luxury caravan facilities, would be an absolute disgrace. The Minister has a poor record regarding broken promises.

I have been most concerned about the so-called redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station. In his 1975 policy speech, the Premier made the following statement:

A modern administration building for the State Transport Authority, an international hotel, restaurants, shops and an 8 000 seat stadium . . .

It is necessary to go back to what has happened over some years in order to understand that statement. In the *Advertiser* on November 2, 1971, the Minister of Transport is quoted, as follows:

For instance, the air rights over railway properties had considerable commercial value. These should be exploited to offset the deficit expected from the operation of a public transport system.

In the *Advertiser* of June 2, 1973, the quote was as follows:

The recommendation that the Adelaide railway station be redeveloped into a shopping mall would be given serious consideration and a study made into the viability of the proposal.

Then in the *News* of May 15, 1974, we see the following quotation:

State Cabinet has given the go-ahead for architects to draw up plans for the complete redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station site.

The *Advertiser* of May 16, 1974, contained the following report:

The State Government plans to build an 8 000-seat entertainment stadium as part of an \$80 000 000 redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) announced yesterday a Cabinet decision to commission Adelaide architects Hassell and Partners to prepare designs. Early suggestions are that the stadium should cater for large indoor pop concerts,

tennis tournaments and other forms of entertainment prohibited in the Festival Theatre by its size and design.

Mr. Virgo said that preliminary plans for the 14½-acre site included: an international hotel; an administration centre for the railways and State Transport Authority; office accommodation; and shops, restaurants and other commercial facilities.

Frequent statements have been made about the Adelaide railway station, at least two of them involving detailed proposals for redevelopment. Despite the election promises of 1975, nothing has been done, except for a plan. On August 10, 1976, I asked a Question on Notice (page 501 of *Hansard*) about the Adelaide railway station, as follows:

1. What progress has been made on the redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station and surrounding land?

2. Has the original plan been amended and, if so, what are the variations?

3. What are the main benefits of the project?

4. What is the estimated cost, commencement date, and completion date, respectively, of this project?

5. What has been the total cost of the project to date?

6. How will the project be funded?

This was nearly 2½ years ago after architects were commissioned to draw up plans for redevelopment. The Minister replied:

Since the concept plan was produced by Hassell and Partners Proprietary Limited, it has not been possible, due to financial restraints, to proceed further.

The concept plan was produced but the whole project has been scrapped. As shown at page 808 of *Hansard* of September 7, 1976, I asked a further Question on Notice about the Adelaide railway station, as follows:

What was the total amount of fees paid to Hassell and Partners for sketch, design, and all work associated with the Adelaide railway station redevelopment?

The Minister replied, "The amount is \$32 893·73." Just 15 months after the policy statement in 1975, the whole project was scrapped and cost taxpayers \$32 893·73. That demonstrates the folly of the Government's announcements whether during election campaigns, leading up to elections, or what have you. That is how the present Government operates. What happens is that a light flashes in the think tank of the Premier's Department, and a brief statement is made. Then, after the shooting match is over, something must be done about it so consultants are called in, people are engaged, contracts are let to consider the folly of the announcement, and a sketch plan is drawn up. Here we find that \$32 800 later the project is not to proceed. It was a multi-million dollar project.

I would object to any Government's wanting to demolish the facade of the Adelaide railway station. It is not the cleanest looking building; it is pretty scruffy; it is stained and looks as though it needs a jolly good overhaul; and inside, I am told, it is not very efficient. I just could not support the waste of resources that would be involved in demolishing and rebuilding a new building. Attitudes must be changed. We should consider making the best use we can of the station. I have always supported the idea of covering the air space and using that as a central transport junction. Certainly something along those lines could be done. To destroy the Adelaide railway station would be absolute folly as far as this State is concerned. When one goes back 50 or 60 years one sees that the Labor Party has a fairly poor record of handling the affairs of the railways in this State.

Like all other members, I get a considerable amount of correspondence from constituents. That correspondence is usually dealt with as efficiently as possible. Every now and again a letter arrives that needs to be aired publicly. We can all remember when the Attorney-General, just

before Christmas last year, used television to warn the public about unscrupulous commercial entrepreneurs, retailers and so on. No doubt the Attorney found it a valuable means of using \$50 000 of taxpayer's money to promote the Attorney-General's Department and the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. The letter I received stated:

On December 7, 1976, I wrote a letter to the Commissioner of Prices and Consumer Affairs complaining about an obnoxious secondhand car dealer. After waiting for over two months for an answer, on February 24, I wrote again to remind the Commissioner and his officers that I was still alive and I thought I was entitled to the courtesy of an answer (remember those pathetic T.V. adds of Mr. Duncan in which he told us, "We are here to help you"—the Consumer Affairs Bureau that is?) Nothing has happened so far. The department refuses to acknowledge my existence. I was told the car dealer has "influential friends" at the Commission. I would not know whether this is true. One can not help wondering, however. As it is over five months since I bought the car, my chances of a recourse against the dealer have diminished, thanks to the Commission's procrastination. I am not asking for your help, but I am sending you this data (and any further information you require) to enable you—if you wish—to expose the sheer stupidity of the great socialist dream, that indolent, inefficient public servants could replace highly trained experts and the Consumer Affairs Bureau is nothing but an organisation staffed by over-paid yokels, designed to lull the public into a false sense of security.

They are strong words from my constituent, but that is how the public gets taken in by Ministers who use the media and taxpayer's money. This is a classic example of how the Attorney-General spent \$50 000 in the media trying to sell the Public and Consumer Affairs Department to the community. I do not object to the Government's using an education programme as a means to educate the public to use the services of various departments. I have had much to do with the Public and Consumer Affairs Department and have much respect for its officers. The department is certainly understaffed and is hammered from all directions.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you favour increasing the staff?

Mr. BECKER: I do. At least the department is of benefit to the community; at least there is a saving to the community.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not what your constituent found.

Mr. BECKER: I know. What I want to know is why it took five months to answer his query. Of course, that is a reflection on the Attorney-General, and he should be made aware of the situation. If he is going to use the media to promote the department (and I think it was himself more than anyone else he wished to promote—it was just an ego trip), the commercial could have been handled far more satisfactorily by someone else. I can see no reason for the Attorney's getting into the act at all. That five months was necessary to follow through my constituent's inquiry, seems a little lax of the department. That letter was dated March 16. On May 31, my constituent wrote to tell me that at long last the department had contacted him. He thanked me very much and said that I must have telephoned them and sprung them into action. I want to warn the Government that it is under attack; its image is slipping. It knows it is in trouble but it should not try to play the people of this State for fools. They are not fools, and neither are Opposition members. We are ready for Government and we will give the people the Government they are looking for.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Last year at the beginning of the last session of Parliament I started my speech

on the Address in Reply by canvassing my then political position. I had at that time just had the unpleasant experience of being deserted by four of my Parliamentary colleagues and many of my Party colleagues and of seeing the Party that we had been building up smashed to pieces. This year I have to begin again in the same way by canvassing my present political position. The difference is that this year it is a change for the better rather than for the worse. I am still a member of the new L.M. and I am glad of it. I am also a member (and there have been a few snide remarks in the last four days about this from both sides of the House) of the Australian Democrats, which is the new national Party that we are forming in Australia. We are still in the process of getting it established and organised but I believe that it will be a Party with substantially the same outlook and political philosophy and policies as those of the new L.M.

Mr. Mathwin: If you were a member of a trade union, you would be a member of the Labor Party, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not sure of the relevance of that contribution from the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Mathwin: They pay a sustentation fee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think perhaps I had better leave it on one side because even I cannot make any sense out of that. Having said that the two Parties were similar, I was going to quote from a paper written by Mr. Lance Milne, who is the Chairman of the steering committee for the Australian Democrats in South Australia, in which he sets out in a few sentences what we are trying to do. I believe Mr. Milne is known to members on both sides of the House. He states:

Let us be quite clear at the outset on what it is we are worried about and what we have to do. First, we are very concerned about the survival of our small nation as a democracy. Secondly, we are concerned about the progressive loss of personal freedoms, and, without that personal freedom, which Australians have had in full measure (or more than most other people in the world have had), democracy does not exist. We want practical, sensible policies for reform, but not at the expense of the loss of this precious freedom which nearly all Australians take for granted.

I think that sums it up fairly well. On another aspect of the Party, I quote briefly from the latest national journal of the Australian Democrats in which a *precis* is made of *Confronting the Future* by Professor Charles Birch. It is on a level different from that of most of the matters and debate in this place. A quotation is as follows:

There is such a thing as scientific certainty. In fact, the whole affluence of our lifestyle, which we so take for granted, even though it is only a few generations old, is based on the ability of science and technology to foretell, even in the most complex industrial processes, the result of bringing together certain materials and forms of energy. This would be a most happy and comfortable state of affairs, were it not that those very same scientific techniques bring us today a stark and disturbing message. It is the simple and, if you stop to think about it, rather obvious message that our present lifestyle cannot continue much longer, because the fuels and minerals on which it depends are rapidly disappearing, because the accelerating growth of world population is making them disappear faster and faster, and because the overloaded rivers, oceans, and atmosphere are failing to cope with the industrial and agricultural wastes with which we are polluting them in increasing quantities every day. That message is not a prophecy of doom, but is a warning that we face difficult choices. The sooner they are made, the less difficult the road ahead will be.

I hope that once the Australian Democrats are formally organised (and that should be following the convention we are holding in the third week in August) the new L.M. will cease its separate political activity and that its members will become active, and indeed most of them

have already become active, in the Australian Democrats. Of course, the new Party may come to nothing and there are plenty of people in this Chamber and elsewhere who are hoping and saying that it will come to nothing. I hope it has a future because I believe that that will be to the benefit of the whole of Australia. Up to date the signs are rather good, and I want to mention some of them, especially a poll which appeared in the *Age* last Friday but which has not been reported in South Australia, no doubt because of the loyalty of the *Advertiser* and the *News* to the established political Parties. It makes very interesting, and for me, encouraging, reading. It brought me much comfort and, in one of those telephone conversations that were mentioned this afternoon between myself and Don Chipp, I found it had brought him much comfort, too. The following poll appeared in the *Age* on last Friday, July 22:

Centre party a good thing: support for a centre party in Australia is potentially high. The latest *Age* poll shows 60 per cent of people say a centre party in Australian politics would be a good thing.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: How many would vote for it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister can contain himself, I have the answer. I will have a few things to say about him later on, too. The report continues:

This view is shared by most sections of the community including 55 per cent of Labor voters and 57 per cent of Liberal National Country Party voters. Twenty per cent—

that is the answer to the Minister's interjection—

said they would vote for a centre party candidate, 29 per cent possibly would, while 45 per cent would not.

That was in answer to a question, "If a House of Representatives election were held tomorrow for which political party would you vote?" The poll goes on to show that a clear majority of both sexes, 62 per cent of men and 59 per cent of women, thought a centre party would be good for Australian politics, and that view I am glad to say was strongest amongst those aged 18 to 21 years, where it rose to 72 per cent, and weakest amongst those (the Minister will find a fellow feeling here) aged 60 years and over, where it was down to 50 per cent. In all fairness, the report goes on to say that these figures have to be treated with caution; they assume the Australian Democrats are able to put up a candidate for every seat. The report continues:

The figures suggest a measure of disenchantment with the major Parties. They also indicate a high level of sympathy for the idea of a centre party and a potentially large reservoir of supporters for such a party.

Reasons were given why this support was forthcoming. The highest number, 60 per cent, supported the view that the major Parties failed to sort out their problems. I think that is self-evident. The next highest number, 54 per cent, supported the view that the two major Parties are too identifiable with unions and business. The next highest number, 52 per cent, supported the view that a centre party would hold the middle ground. The next highest number, 47 per cent, thought a centre Party would hold a balance of power and force the major Parties to moderate their policies. Members can laugh at me, as they often do, or at the idea of a centre Party, but at present throughout Australia support for the idea of a centre Party is running at about 20 per cent, and no member in this place is so dumb as not to know that that is more than a quota for a Senate seat.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What's the percentage again?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is 20 per cent. About four or five weeks ago it was reported to me that someone from Beacon Surveys—

Mr. Dean Brown: Is that why you're running for the Senate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member can wait a while for a reply to that question.

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you running for the Senate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am not. I am the member for Mitcham and here I am. I am flattered to think that the honourable member is so fascinated by my intentions. I know that all members of his Party are, and my opponent, the Liberal candidate in Mitcham, is going from door to door saying that I will be standing for the Senate and that he will take over the seat. He knows that that is the only chance he has of winning, but that is what he is saying in the District of Mitcham now.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: It doesn't show much probity in public affairs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid it does not. However, I have made my point, and pass on to discuss reasons people have given. I was saying that people in my district were polled because Beacon Surveys was out about six weeks ago in Mitcham. I had a report of that immediately, and I thought at the time that it was the Liberals having another go to see how they were getting on. They have done that often enough, but it was not them: it was this poll. I do not blame people in Australia for being disenchanted with what is happening in politics in this country. Frankly, and I say it with charity toward my fellow members of this place, what has been said in the past four and a bit days of sitting here would be enough to confirm that opinion.

It is easier for me now, as I am not a member of either of the two bigger Parties represented in this place, to see the futility, the absurdity, the waste, and the abuse of privilege that goes on here and in which all members participate. Virtually nothing has been achieved in Parliament since this session began. We have passed one Bill to stop up a so-called loophole in the Stamp Duties Act, but apart from that, really, it would not have mattered tuppence if everything that has been said had not been said. It was no wonder that the *Advertiser* political roundsman referred to the Liberal Party's efforts last week as being lack lustre. One thing about the Liberal Party that has surprised even me, knowing what I do about it, is to see the member for Gouger still sitting on the front bench as a shadow Minister. That could mean only one of two things: either his Leader, in whose gift these positions are, is supporting him in the forthcoming election for the new seat of Goyder, or he is too weak to make a change. It seems an extraordinary thing that the member for Gouger can lose his pre-selection to the present member for Goyder but retain his position on the front bench as a possible Minister if the Liberal Party were to gain office.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We are—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, you cannot get over this. The fact is that people who sit on the front bench are supposed to be Ministers if their Party wins office. What will the Leader of the Opposition do during the next election campaign? Will he go into the Goyder district to support his shadow Minister, or will he oppose him? It is an extraordinary situation to see a man who has been defeated and who will not have the endorsement of his Party still remain a shadow Minister in the Parliamentary Party. It shows the situation to which the Liberal Party has

fallen. I also include in that the situation of my good friend from Murray who has been defeated by the member for Heysen for the new seat of Murray. There again we will have two apparent colleagues opposing each other.

That is all I intend to say about the Liberal Party, but in all fairness I think I should point out to you, Mr. Speaker (and none knows better than you), that the same sort of thing is happening in the Labor Party at present. You, Mr. Speaker, having bucked the system and won the seat of Pirie at the most recent election as an Independent, having been put into the Speaker's Chair because you had the balance of power, and having then been enticed back into the Labor Party, have now been given a seat that you know (and every one of us knows) is almost impossible for you to win at the next election. I wish you luck in any contest you may have, but you have Buckley's chance of winning.

The SPEAKER: Order! I trust that the honourable member is not in any way intending to reflect on the Speaker. And I remind him that all the experts said that at the most recent election.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not often we get speeches from the Chair, but I accept that one in the spirit in which it was made, and I wish you good luck. However, I know the feeling about you in your own Party, and I sympathise with you in what is being done to you. Now let me come to the Speech, because, after all, that is what we are discussing. I used the words "lack lustre" a moment ago about the Liberal Party's performance. If ever a document was lack lustre, it was the Speech: it is utterly fatuous. After I had heard it, I thought one new thing had been included in it, and mentioned to those with whom I had lunch last Tuesday that I thought that a new bridge over the Murray River had been announced. They told me that that was not under way, but that was the only thing I found in the Speech that I thought was new. I found I was behind the times. The Speech is full of the most fatuous nonsense, which would have been better never written. As an example of this fatuousness, paragraph 12 states:

The effect of my Government's policy of expanding the electoral base of local government will become apparent in the ensuing year and my Government will continue to further its policy of encouraging local government to be responsive to and representative of its whole community.

What that means or how it furthers anything, I do not know. I am pleased that the Minister for the Environment is present and holding the fort, because I refer to his paragraph, paragraph 19, the second sentence of which states:

In furtherance of its interest in environmental matters legislation will be laid before you to control off-road vehicles and to expand its programme of environmental impact statement assessment.

I do not know for how long we have been hearing this promise from the Minister. We will see whether we can find out how long it is. I know that off-road vehicle legislation was promised for last session, and I think for some time before that. In last year's Speech appears the paragraph that the Minister then recommended to Cabinet and got in the Speech, as follows:

A measure covering many aspects of noise pollution will be laid before you in the forthcoming session— and that took about five years to get, but it did come— together with a Bill providing for environmental impact statements and a measure dealing with the cultural heritage of the State.

Both of those Bills (and heaven knows there are enough people in the community waiting for them) have dropped out of sight altogether. Even before the present Minister



came to office an environmental impact statements Bill was promised. I have a cutting from the *Advertiser* of December 11, 1973, when this was announced. The report states:

Strict environmental control for industrial development and expansion is planned in South Australia. Legislation requiring industrialists to provide detailed environmental impact statements on construction plans for public scrutiny and Government approval is expected in February or March.

There it was: we were going to have a Bill straight away. I know that the cultural heritage Bill is being impatiently waited for by many people, and South Australia, contrary to what we are usually told by Ministers, is badly lagging in this way. We know the reason why; the Bills are sent to the Minister; he looks at them and they are sent back again and again and again for redrafting, because the Minister cannot be sure that he has got them right. From what I have heard, recent drafts have not been right.

I know that it is a characteristic of this Minister to move slowly, but I hope that after all we have heard since before he came into office (when the member for Henley Beach was the Minister) that during this session we will get something. We are promised the off-road vehicles legislation again, but the E.I.S. Bill and the heritage Bill are gone. I want to know where they are. I would ask the Minister a question if it would not risk taking about one-third of Question Time to get the answer. Maybe in some other way he can tell us just what he proposes to do about this.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Would you be prepared to accept a copy of the off-road vehicles Bill next week?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If it comes next week I shall be delighted, but I will believe it when I see it after all that has happened. I am on common ground with other members in saying that I was sorry that Sir Douglas Nicholls had to resign as Governor of this State, but there is one matter that I feel it is proper to raise, and I raise it, I hope, without expressing any criticism of him personally. As I understand the nature of his illness and the state of his health, it was pretty obvious before his appointment that this might have happened. I do not believe that it is right that anyone should accept the office of Governor of this State without having had a thorough medical examination to determine whether or not he or she (and I here follow the lead set by the Premier last week) is in a fit state of health to cope with the duties of that office.

Mr. Evans: And also showing a history of good health.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Right. There should be a thorough check on these things. We know that the appointment is made by Her Majesty the Queen, but it is made on the advice of the Government. I believe that the Government was most negligent in tendering the advice of the appointment of Sir Douglas Nicholls, because it should have found out what his state of health was. I regret having to say that, but I believe it should be said. I am surprised that it has not already been said. There is another aspect which is important, and that is that last year we passed a Bill providing for a pension for former Governors. So far as I am aware, no pension has been given to Sir Douglas Nicholls. An order was made in December granting a pension to Sir Mark Oliphant, as was anticipated, but certainly under the Act as it was passed Sir Douglas Nicholls would qualify for a pension.

So far as I know, no order has been made. If it has, I make the point that it is a substantial pension for a

period of office that lasted for only a few months. Because, obviously, this is a matter that has either been decided or is in the course of decision now, I hope that steps will be taken next time to ensure that the health of the person recommended for appointment is such as to allow him or her to discharge the duties of the office, in all probability for a full term.

There are a few issues I want to raise, the first of which I raised in this place in this debate last year; that is, the question of massage parlours. I was surprised at the immediate reaction which I got when I raised the matter, almost incidentally, during my speech last year. I certainly did not expect the enormous public reaction that there was to it. Alas, the only result from what I said and to the reaction is that the daily papers no longer advertise massage parlours, but nothing else has happened.

The massage parlours are still operating, and I believe that the humming and hawing of both the Government and the Liberal Party on this matter shows a degree of hypocrisy. The Commissioner of Police in his report endorsed what I had said. Of course, it was common knowledge throughout the community that what I had said was accurate. This is what the Commissioner said in his report for 1975-76 at page 19:

With the exception of a few established health studios, most massage parlours are brothels. Some are reasonably clean, but the majority are far from satisfactory. That is the Commissioner's report, yet the Government will not do anything about it.

Mr. Gunn: You get into these places and get personal experience.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Only one. My son went into another one to do some installation for his former employer. He went back a couple of times, and he gave me a report on what he saw there. The Commissioner's report continued:

The Vice Squad pays regular attention to these establishments, but it has become extremely difficult to get the necessary evidence required to gain a conviction in the courts. The managements have developed extensive security systems, which include two-way mirrors, alarms, electric door locks and, in some cases, closed circuit television. Rumors occasionally arise suggesting criminal elements are involved in conducting these brothels, but so far police have not found any evidence to support these allegations.

I hope that they are not turning a blind eye to them, because there are certainly criminal elements involved with massage parlours in other States.

In answer to a Question on Notice asking how many of these establishments there were in and about Adelaide, I received an answer which stated that there were 52. I received this reply late in the last session. Of the 52 that were known to police to be operating, 23 were in the city and the remainder were spread over a number of the older suburbs. It was said that 160 people were working in them. Let us see how many prosecutions there have been for offences against morality that would be relevant to massage parlours. There were 21 offences relating to brothels in 1975-76, following 11 in 1974-75. The figures for living on the earnings of prostitution were 18 and 6 respectively. When those figures are compared with the known number of massage parlours and people working in them, one sees that there is reason for the Commissioner's complaint that it is difficult for the police to do anything about them.

This enforces what I believe is already a strong obligation on the Government and on Parliament to take some action about this matter. I know that it is extraordinarily difficult to come to a decision, as there



are conflicting arguments of morality and practicality, because that is the conflict. But when we have a situation like this under our nose, when there are young girls of 14 and 15 (and my son said that he saw girls of that age, and had no doubt that they were no older than that, working in these places to which he went) working in these places, it is a scandal to let that continue. We cannot recognise this, and we cannot do anything about it because that would be to recognise it, and we have to take account of the convention for the suppression of traffic in persons and the exploitation of the prostitution of others! It sounds beautiful, but let us get to some practical situation here. We are not doing so. I received a letter from a medical practitioner only a few months ago (I will not mention his name, because I undertook not to do so). The letter, which is dated February 28, 1977, states:

The enclosed cutting from the A.M.A. Bulletin may be of interest to you. You will note that the notifications for the two venereal diseases outnumber all the others by nearly three to one. Having practised in the city for a number of years, I know very well that the figures are heavily influenced by the growth of massage parlours.

That is sufficient of the letter, but the cutting he enclosed gave the statistics on the infectious and notifiable diseases recorded for 1976. Gonorrhoea amounted to 1 855 cases and syphilis amounted to 484 cases. The next most prevalent was infectious hepatitis with 235 cases, and salmonella infection with 234 cases. Most of the others were in double or single figures. That is the kind of opinion which I value, which I think is of great consequence, and which we should all regard. It is common sense that that is the kind of thing which is happening. We have a choice, as I have said: we can make ourselves apparently virtuous by sticking to the law as it stands and not giving any hint of the recognition of what is inevitable in any community, namely, prostitution, or we can take some action to alleviate and regulate a situation which we have here and which is crying out for regulation and for alleviation. That is the position.

I notice, incidentally, that the escort business is creeping back into Adelaide, probably as a result of what little the police have been able to do in harassing individuals in massage parlours. I have a copy of *This Week in Adelaide*. It is not, as I understand, an official document, but it is a semi-official one, because it is said to be published in co-operation with the Tourist Bureau. I looked in it to see whether they had taken out advertisements for massage parlours, and they had. I noticed at least three advertisements for escort agencies, and this is prostitution under another name. One advertisement states:

Miss Adelaide of S.A. for a charming hostess. Discretion assured.

The telephone number is given, with the S.T.D. prefix. Another advertisement is for "Cindy's", for which the telephone number and the S.T.D. prefix are also given. The advertisement states:

24 hours, 7 days for hotel, motel, home, escort, studio service.

Another advertisement states:

Escorts. Our charming hostesses are available for all occasions.

One does not need to have much imagination to know what they are. They were knocked out a few years ago before the growth of massage parlours, the business merely going from one form to another. This is the very point: We cannot cut this out, however much we may try or personally disapprove of it. It will only go from one form to another. It is like trying to squash flat a bubble under a

sheet of plastic—you push it down here and it goes up somewhere else. We must recognise that that is the fact.

Mr. Keneally: Like trying to destroy private enterprise.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps: I should like to think that private enterprise were as resilient as that under some of the blows it has had under the Party of the member who has interjected. I am not certain, but I hope that that is so. I will now say something about a constituency matter that came to me only in the past week concerning the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Dr. Geoffrey Gibson is a resident of St. Michael's Road, Mitcham, and his block of land is of slightly angular shape, which has a frontage to St. Michael's Road and to Taylor's Road—two streets that meet at about a 45-degree angle. His house, which is closer to St. Michael's Road, fronts that road and is connected to the sewer in St. Michael's Road. Recently he had built in his garden but close to the Taylor's Road frontage what he calls a log cabin, which I had seen when I was door-knocking. I happened to call there, and I thought it was a separate dwelling. It is a two-storey timber structure that could easily be used as a separate dwelling. Before he signed the contract to have it built, he went to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and asked about the connection to the sewer. He set it out in a letter to a Mr. Button, of the department, a copy of which he gave me. The letter states:

On January 19, 1977, I paid my \$50 connection fee. I had visited your office in the State Government Administration Building, Victoria Square, some four or five days previously and ascertained that I had to pay the money, that there was a sewerage drain along Taylor's Road available for connection, and finally I obtained a form which I took home and filled in. I then paid my money, and the helpful young man at the counter told me that he had checked that there was a sewerage line available. I would like to point out that the initial inquiry was made before I signed the final contract on the small log cabin.

What happened after that was that the department said, "No, that is not right. We have your \$50. It is going to cost you not \$50 but \$1 800 to have the connection made." The department wrote a letter on June 15, from Mr. Cox, the Mains Extension Engineer, saying:

In response to your recent application for an extension of sewer main to serve the proposed additions at the above-mentioned property, I advise that the department is prepared to carry out the work providing you pay a lump sum contribution towards the cost of the work. The amount required is \$1 800 and, as this figure is a firm quotation, the department's offer can only remain current for a period of three months from the date of this letter. Consequently, payment will be required on or before September 15, 1977, and any further request made following this date would be dealt with in the light of costs prevailing at that time.

In other words, "If you do not pay up by September 15, it will be even more to get your damn sewer on." The irony of the situation is that the length of the sewer connection is 22 metres—\$1 800 to put this on. Dr. Gibson said, "All right, if you're going to do that, I'll get around that. I already have permission to subdivide my land. I'll subdivide it and you'll have to connect it, and not get that payment." He said that it would cost about \$150 to survey and the department would be able to charge the \$50, because it would be an initial connection. But not on your life! The department had an answer to that. He received a letter back, dated July 14, signed by Mr. Lewis, the Director, saying, "No fear, we won't consent to the subdivision of your land except on condition that you pay \$1 600." The department made a rebate of \$200 on the full cost of the land. The Director said, in effect, "You're not going to get away with that. Pay up, or you don't get your sewer connection." This is an absurd situation. The cost is more than \$80 a metre for the

extension of the sewer only up to his boundary. He would have to put it on to his house. That would not be included in the \$1 800.

Mr. Gunn: How many metres?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was 22 metres. In all fairness, I may say that the day before yesterday I got in touch with the department. Mr. Cox, the man who drafted the letter which Mr. Lewis signed, is away on holidays, having done a good job on the letter. I spoke to a Mr. Walkley, who knew nothing of it. Whilst he did not give his department away, I could tell from the tone of his voice that he was rocked when he got out the file and saw the facts. He said he would refer it back to the sewers branch for another estimate. He told me that no sewer work is done for less than \$45 a metre, but here the department is charging more than \$80. He said there was no question in the prepared estimate of its being in rocky ground. It is just a small job, and they are going to soak him for it, literally.

Mr. Gunn: How much would a private contractor charge to do the job?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know how much a private contractor would charge if he were able to do it. The two things are the scandalously high charge of \$1 800 for 22 metres of sewer and the fact that the department had already accepted his \$50 as a connection fee. That shows the most incredible inefficiency in that department and, if that is all the Minister can show after being in the office for seven years, I think there is reason for a change to be made there, to see whether anyone can shake them up. I complain very bitterly about that matter, as the doctor has complained to me about it, and I hope that something will be done.

Let me now say something about this place and the waste which I believe is taking place here. The Minister of Mines and Energy this afternoon got an opportunity to make some sort of an explanation about the loo in his old office when he was Minister of Education. Personally, I did not think it rang very true, and I remembered the little passage of arms I had with him in the previous session about *en suite* bathrooms for the Monarto commission, which he said he heartily disapproved of and which had been done without his knowledge, and so on—just the same sort of thing he said this afternoon about the loo.

We have had spent on this building about \$5 500 000. I have complained about that previously. I do not believe that it has made Parliament one jot more efficient or that it has made us, as members of Parliament, any more acceptable in the community than we were. I know that some maintenance had to be done on this place—electrical, plumbing, and so on—because it was getting to the dangerous stage, but I do not believe (and I remember that the Public Works Standing Committee reported against this sort of thing being done) that all that was done was necessary or done in the most economical way. Now, to add insult to injury, we are told that for prestige reasons, and nothing else, all the furniture must be changed—\$150 000-worth of furniture for members, and God knows what the rest of the building is to cost. We will find out on Tuesday, if we get an answer to the question on what the total refurnishing of Parliament House will cost.

I protest most strongly. There is no doubt that it is entirely unnecessary to refurnish Parliament House, and it will not add anything to our functioning here. The furniture we have is perfectly adequate. I know of no reason why we, as members of Parliament, should get

absolutely the best of furniture in the damn building. Certainly, most of us have got offices, and we have electorate offices anyway. Although it is only a small amount, I suppose, I believe it is quite scandalously wasteful, and I hope there will be sufficient publicity for the Government to change its mind about this.

Every time anyone on this side of the House complains about Government expenditure, the Premier asks (and it is an easy answer to give, given by all Governments to all Oppositions when they complain), "What expenditure would you cut out?". I know where I would start, and it is not the answer which I think members in the Liberal Party would give. I would cut down the number of Ministers. I believe we have too many Ministers in South Australia, and I have had some experience of Government and I have some idea of the administrative load. The Liberals are not in a good position to say this, because they have 13 members in their so-called shadow Cabinet when there are only 12 Ministers, so presumably they would like to increase it even more.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: It is the smallest Ministry in Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not care how big it is or what the other people do. I know it is possible for a Ministry to function at a lesser size than the present one, because I have done it.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: That was a Liberal Government, and you didn't do anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is no point. It is the same as the Public Service saying that it is going on and on increasing. That is what this Government is saying: I got that in answer to a Question on Notice. When I asked why there was to be an increase in the size of the Ministry I was told that it was to cope with increased governmental function. That is no answer, but it is in line with the philosophy of honourable members opposite that there should be more and more government. It is not my philosophy, and I believe that we could make substantial reductions in our costs by reducing the size of the Ministry in this State. I think we could probably dispense with two Ministers. The others would have to work a good deal harder, but it would be possible to do it and we would be no less efficient. I believe that would mean that we could have a corresponding reduction in the Public Service.

I come now to another point, a governmental one in a way, which is also a constituency matter. It concerns the Minister of Transport and the State Transport Authority which, in the past 12 months, has taken over the buses, in many cases from private operators. Last month, along with a Liberal member and a Labor member, I was invited to the Unley High School to see the state of the school and to listen to the views of members of the staff on the cuts being made in education moneys by the Federal Government. I listened, and I took some small part in what was said, but to me the most significant thing that came out of it was that, afterwards, the Headmaster gave me a copy of a table prepared by one of the masters who has the responsibility of hiring buses when the school goes on excursions.

The S.T.A. is supposed to be competitive, but I can tell honourable members that it is not, if they have not already found out about it. Private enterprise licks it hollow every time. Here I have the figures. They were not compiled for me or for any political purpose. Incidentally, my wife gave me another example. A youth association with which she is connected had made inquiries about hiring a bus for an interstate trip, and the S.T.A.

quote was \$900 higher than the highest private bus operator's quote. Yet we are told the authority is competitive. Let us look at the figures relating to local trips. The first was to take arts students to the gallery for the Chinese exhibition. The S.T.A. charter rate was \$45 a bus (92c a student). The private company rate was \$32 a bus (64c a student).

Mr. Dean Brown: That is 30 per cent less.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. To take geology students to Victor Harbor for practical work, the S.T.A. charter rate was \$145 a bus (\$3.60 a student), whereas the private company rate was \$95 a bus (\$2.60 a student).

Mr. Dean Brown: That is 30 per cent less.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. To take biology students to the Coorong, a three-day camp practical, the S.T.A. charter rate was \$260 a bus (\$6.50 a student), whilst the private charter rate was \$180 a bus (\$4.50 a student). There is a fourth example, but it does not give a comparison and relates merely to geography students who that time had to use the State Transport Authority.

Mr. Dean Brown: You're saying that the Government bus line is regularly 50 per cent dearer than private bus lines.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Davenport is enthusiastic to support me this time, for which I am grateful. I am not saying this; this is what is said by a master at Unley High School who had the responsibility of hiring the buses. That information was given to me and, presumably, to the member for Fisher, who represents the Liberals, and to Anne Levy, who represents the Labor Party. It is a telling comparison, first, on the theory of the Government versus private enterprise and, secondly, on the operations of the State Transport Authority. I have no doubt that if we could get other comparisons they would be the same.

Again dealing with the S.T.A., I have a private gripe (I do not believe that I have a fixation about this but some people may believe that I have) about smoking on public transport. A few months ago I asked whether the Government planned to ban smoking on trains and was told that it does not. Some time ago a chap in my district suggested that we should not have cigarette advertising on trains. He said that we had passed the relevant Bill here, that had all taken an attitude on the subject, and that it was wrong for cigarette companies to advertise on trains. The Minister does not agree with that for a moment. In a letter to me dated July 6, the Minister states:

The comments of your constituent have been noted. However, as you are no doubt aware, the State Transport Authority has very many contracts with various companies for the placing, on authority property and vehicles, advertisements for very many different products, including cigarettes. I am not prepared to enter into the pros and cons of cigarette smoking in relation to health.

At least the Government does that, even if the Minister does not. He continues:

Nevertheless, it would seem iniquitous—that is the word he uses—

for the authority to refuse to display cigarette advertisements, but to allow others for products which are of debatable value such as, say, alcoholic beverages. Under the circumstances, I intend to let matters stand in this regard.

I have never known anything quite so pusillanimous as that, and from a Minister whose manner in this place is anything but pusillanimous. I have just one last shot about the railways. The member for Hanson spent some time talking about the Adelaide railway station.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you listen?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did; I had to as I was next. In the past few days I have noted with pleasure that that obnoxious Royal Insurance sign on the railway station has come down but, to my alarm, the supports for such a sign have not yet come down. Last session I asked a few questions about the sign. I hope that we are not going to have another monstrosity on top of the railway station and that the supports for the advertisement—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: "Millhouse for Premier."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I will be altruistic. Even if the Government offered to put that on the railway station, I would refuse, because I do not believe that any advertising hoardings should be on top of the station. I hope that the Government will not allow that space to be used again for the same purpose. I will now deal with a subject that I regard as being of great importance. Last week in this House I raised the question of people being obliged to join unions. In line with many other cases that are raised by other members, I was disappointed that it got no publicity and was brushed off by the Government as it always is. I do not want to talk directly about that subject, but I do want to say something about the matter that was raised yesterday in the House by the member for Florey in a question to the Minister of Labour and Industry. The question was probably a "Dorothy Dixier"—I do not know for sure. Whether or not it was such a question it disturbed me greatly and shows a dilemma that will develop in our community.

The question asked by the member for Florey was about the unfortunate Vietnamese refugees who have come to South Australia with nothing at all and knowing little about our way of life except that it must be paradise compared to what they have come from. These people have been retrenched from Chrysler Australia Limited. Many others will never have had a job. They have said that they are willing to do any work for any remuneration rather than be unemployed. I do not know whether they qualify for unemployment benefits; that is something that I have not checked. This is a matter of humanity. They have come to this country and want to work. What do we get from the member for Florey (whose opinions, although I disagree with him politically, I usually respect) but a question that shows a complete lack of sensibility and understanding of these people? What the honourable member is saying (and the Minister backed him up 100 per cent) is, "No damn fear, we'll not let them work unless they get a full wage." How on earth could one expect—

Mr. Whitten: You don't want them used as a source of cheap labour?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not think it would be too long before a few of the unionist members opposite would come in on this.

Mr. Slater: What would you suggest that we do with them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am suggesting that it would be far better to allow people to work than to starve. That is what it will come to in our community. It will be impossible, unless there is a great upturn in the economy, which frankly I cannot see happening (maybe it will not happen because of the efforts of the present Government, which I am not debating now), we will have people like this who are completely unemployable. They are not an economic proposition at award rates of pay. Are we going to say indefinitely to such people, not only to refugees but to others in the community, too, "You are damn well not going to work." It is a loss of human dignity to them, quite apart from the burden on the rest of us who must keep them. I know it is an article of faith for members

of the Australian Labor Party, especially those who have been in a union, not to let fall the standards and wage rates they have fought for. We cannot, in a case such as this and in the economic climate we have now, stick to that.

I was disturbed to hear, not necessarily the reply of the Minister, but the Minister's attitude because I presume that it mirrors the Government's attitude on this question. I ask members opposite, because it is much harder for them than it is for members on this side of the House to do so, to consider again a problem like this. These people only want to work to earn their living. They have not been used to a standard of living anything like ours. As they have been allowed to come here (for which I am glad), let us give them an opportunity at least for a time to work on a wage less than an award wage.

I am certain that this problem is only just starting in our community. If the present economic situation continues this will become a problem not only for people who have come here as refugees from another country and another culture but also for our own native born Australians, and it will be impossible for members opposite, unions and unionists to maintain the attitude they have so far adopted. I have no time left to say anything more, and I will not do so. In fact, I am sorry I have gone on for so long. What I have said seemed to me to be the pertinent matters to raise.

I support the motion and hope that we have a good session. I suspect that the Government, despite all its press releases about a heavy legislative programme, will not have such a programme running up to the election. The Government knows that its best tactic is to play it fairly cool and to rely on the mistakes made by its political opponents. Let us hope for the best for the session.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I listened closely to the speech of the member for Mitcham, a man with an outstanding record of Parliamentary leadership in this House perhaps unparalleled by any Parliamentarian throughout the world. In a few short years he has been Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, Deputy Leader of the Liberal Movement, Leader of the new L.M., and he might even be Leader in this House of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Millhouse: In the future—

Mr. KENEALLY: The mind boggles, because the honourable member is able to change his Party as often as the rest of us change our shirts and he could be Leader of half a dozen Parties in the future, particularly if his fond hope is realised that a centralist Party in Australia will take on. We heard him wax at length about cigarettes and wild wild women, but we did not hear his thoughts on whisky. Perhaps he might be able to give us the benefit of his views on that subject at some other time.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and with other members convey my sympathy to the families of past members of this House who died during the break. I did not know any of the members personally but I knew them by repute, and they no doubt served their Parties and this State well indeed. I would also like to say how sorry I am that our former Governor, Sir Douglas Nicholls, was forced to retire through ill health. I think Sir Douglas had the potential to make a great contribution to race relations in this State. I well recall a well-attended Aboriginal evangelical meeting at Port Augusta which the Governor also attended. It was a successful meeting, and I have no doubt that some people attended because the Governor was there; he was a draw card. Even on that evening it was obvious he had the potential

to do so much, and we are sad in South Australia that illness cut short what would have been a significant term of office. I hope that he and his wife enjoy their retirement and live many years happily in Victoria. I am sure they will always be welcome in South Australia; they certainly will be welcome in Port Augusta. I will be speaking about some matters that are parochial and some general matters.

Mr. Dean Brown: We expected that.

Mr. KENEALLY: I trust that if the member for Davenport is not interested enough to listen he will be generous enough to allow me to make my contribution without his stupid and incessant interjections. If ever I have seen a man totally obsessed and paranoid in his political attitudes, it is the honourable member. I expect he will show this full well before my speech is finished.

Since I became the member for Stuart three areas of life in Port Augusta have concerned me. Thankfully two of these areas of concern have been overcome but the problem of housing is still with us. Assistance has been provided in two areas of concern, namely, problems relating to consumers and the Aboriginal community. The Government has set up in Port Augusta an office of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department and, as a result, the number of callers to my office has significantly dropped. This is a worthwhile venture by the Government that has brought great benefits to the people of Port Augusta. The Aborigines in Port Augusta have taken upon themselves the responsibility of looking after matters of their own welfare, and I think this is a significant and successful move. Some of the most outstanding developments in Aboriginal activities take place at Port Augusta and, because of the various successful agencies that have been set up there, the work of the local member has been reduced. I am always happy to see people taking their affairs into their own hands; they should be encouraged to do this. This has been done successfully in Port Augusta.

There is nevertheless a severe problem remaining in relation to housing. My comments are not to be construed as a criticism of the South Australian Housing Trust, which has been a good friend to Port Augusta, but currently there exists in Port Augusta a waiting list of two years for houses. Whilst I appreciate that this is not as long as the waiting period in some areas of Adelaide, it is the worst housing situation with which Port Augusta has been faced and the prospects are that it may get worse. I know people who drive through Port Augusta find it hard to believe that with the extent of the building taking place a housing shortage exists, but this is so. Because of the position of housing in Port Augusta, some unsavoury activities are being carried on by private landlords. People who cannot afford to pay exorbitant rents but who are unable to get Housing Trust accommodation are being ripped off by these unscrupulous landlords. I have frequently had in my office people seeking recourse against landlords, not only for their actions but particularly for the rapid and severe increases in rents that they are demanding. It is not uncommon in Port Augusta for people to be put in completely substandard accommodation, no more than tin sheds with a bit of lining for the walls and no ceiling, and to be asked to pay between \$40 and \$50 a week rent for such accommodation. This most unsatisfactory situation is not being improved by the attitude of the Federal Government.

Mr. Gunn: Oh!

Mr. KENEALLY: It is all right for the member for Eyre to say, "Oh!". He has no regard at all for the people in this community who are unable to find adequate housing.

This is one of the greatest problems in this State. The member for Eyre can be contemptuous of people if he wishes, but he purports to represent part of an industrial town in which Housing Trust tenants are in the majority. He will find that the Housing Trust has been able to provide a magnificent service, despite the attitudes of people such as he and his friends in Canberra. There has been no increase for three years in the funds made available by the Federal Government under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. When one takes into account the increase in inflation, it is obvious that fewer houses are being built. There are areas of great need. The State Government wishes to look after people such as pensioners, the aged, single-parent families and invalids but it is difficult to house these people, and they are the ones being forced to seek accommodation from private landlords; unfortunately they are being ripped off. I welcome the proposed landlord and tenant legislation. Incidentally, I am surprised that the member for Mitcham thought that the Speech was fatuous.

Mr. Millhouse: That was the word I used to describe paragraph 12.

Mr. KENEALLY: I was about to do the honourable member an injustice and suggest that he believed that all of the speech was fatuous.

Mr. Millhouse: You could take it that it was.

Mr. KENEALLY: Then I would not have done him an injustice. I thought the Speech was a good one, and for the honourable member to say otherwise is a reflection on him.

Mr. Gunn: You wouldn't know: you parrot something that you are told to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections, and the honourable member for Mitcham and the honourable member for Whyalla have no right to carry on a private conversation.

Mr. KENEALLY: Especially when the member on his feet is making such a notable contribution. The member for Eyre accused Government members of having to say what they had been told or allowed to say. No-one would take the responsibility for what he says: obviously, it is full of his own imaginings, and to suggest that someone should be responsible for that would be stretching things a bit far. The Housing Trust has been a good friend of Port Augusta, and will continue to be such a friend. A notable example has been the trust's willingness to be party to constructing a home for the aged to be established at Port Augusta. If it were not for the assistance of the trust, I doubt whether Port Augusta would be able to plan for and hope to have such a facility as early as it is now likely for us to get it. The trust has been magnificent with its assistance and Port Augusta badly needs such a facility. Most country towns or cities of the same size have it, and no doubt we have been lax in that we have not had it before. Some Port Augusta citizens have to go elsewhere in their retiring years.

Mr. Russack: Is the Housing Trust building it?

Mr. KENEALLY: The trust will build the units and the council will provide essential facilities and the land. As the honourable member would realise, this will save the community thousands of dollars, and we are thankful for that. The housing problem confronting people at Port Augusta will be worsened if the Redcliff industrial venture becomes a reality. We have an extreme shortage of houses now.

Mr. Dean Brown: What is the possibility for Redcliff going ahead?

Mr. KENEALLY: I do not intend to enter into the disgraceful conduct that Opposition members, especially their Leader, have entered into in debating Redcliff. I am sure the Government is acting on behalf of the people of South Australia in the most appropriate way in its dealings with Dow Chemical, as it did with the previous consortium that was interested in Redcliff. No doubt communities at Port Augusta and Port Pirie realise this and supported the Government then as they do now. The member for Davenport and his Leader would like to destroy any venture that they considered this Government would support. I had hoped that they would support the development of a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff.

Mr. Dean Brown: What do you think of your chances of the plant going ahead?

Mr. KENEALLY: Very good, but it will depend on many matters. The honourable member has discussed the question with the company and knows the situation. If it is possible for the plant to be constructed in South Australia, it will be: it will not fail to be constructed because of any action of the Government, but that is more than I can say about the actions of the Opposition. If I were Dow Chemical and there was a chance of the Opposition getting into office, I would think twice about going ahead with this development. The present housing situation in Port Augusta is critical, and will be worsened by the demand on infra-structure of the establishment of the petro-chemical plant. Despite this, and despite the enormous growth problems that will develop, it is still a worthwhile venture that is sadly needed in that part of the State. Some people in the northern part of the State believe that Port Augusta seeks to have all the development concentrated in that city, but that is not true. Port Augusta is not big enough to absorb the sort of development that will be required, and speaking as a citizen of Port Augusta I am sure that the community there would be delighted if a considerable development eventuated in Port Pirie, as that would be a sensible—

Dr. Eastick: You mean an "elect Keneally" programme?

Mr. KENEALLY: I would appreciate the honourable member's being patient. People at Port Augusta would appreciate a substantial amount of development going to Port Pirie, but also Whyalla has an infra-structure that could be used. I point out to the member for Light that the old district of Stuart included a part of Whyalla, but as the new district will not, it cannot be said that I am on an "elect Keneally" programme. I think it would be sensible for the Government to consider the infra-structure at Whyalla in order to take advantage of the employment pool that will be available. It may mean that some appropriate form of quick transport will need to be implemented that would enable people at Whyalla to get to the plant and return in the shortest time without requiring them to travel through Port Augusta. These matters have to be considered. This would save Port Augusta or Port Pirie from the rapid development that brings with it many social problems with which small cities cannot always cope.

On this subject I compliment the Government and the Minister of Local Government for providing the Town Clerk of Port Augusta with the first Keith Hockridge oversea scholarship, so that he will be able to study conditions in small cities such as Port Augusta which are faced with problems that may have to be faced by Port Augusta. Mr. Richards is a competent Town Clerk, and all members who know him would agree with that statement. The study tour on which he is now engaged could bring

great benefits not only to Port Augusta but also to neighbouring cities in which his experience will be used.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you think a uranium enrichment plant should be established there?

Mr. KENEALLY: My views on uranium fit snugly into those of the Australian Labor Party conference held recently in Western Australia. If the honourable member is asking me whether a uranium enrichment plant should be established at Port Augusta, my answer is that no plant would be established there. If it were my decision, it would not be there.

Mr. Dean Brown: You don't think there should ever be one?

Mr. KENEALLY: No.

Mr. Allison: Where would you put it?

Mr. KENEALLY: There should not be one in South Australia or in Australia.

Dr. Eastick: Who is knocking industrial development now?

Mr. KENEALLY: If the only possibility that we have in this State of having industrial development is to take part in the insanity of uranium development, I stand by what I say. I should like to have seen a reference in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech to the registration of chiropractic services in South Australia. I think it is time that we as a Government looked at this and decided that we should register these people. I realise that there has been the Webb inquiry in Queensland into chiropractic and other forms of alternative medicines, which I think is the term. I know from personal experience and the experience of my friends, and also from the number of people who attend chiropractors (and a chiropractor has his place of business alongside my office at Port Augusta, and my robust good health, which all honourable members would admire, is in some measure due to the activities of chiropractors), that chiropractors are recognised in parts of Australia and certainly in other parts of the world.

I am not suggesting that all people who take part in manipulative medicine should be licensed or registered, but I say that standards should be set and that people who meet these standards should be able to operate professionally and not be regarded by the community as quacks. Unfortunately, that is the attitude that is current today. In the practice next to my office the gentleman who is a chiropractor has a son who is a trained physiotherapist and is fully recognised as such. He is a very competent practitioner indeed. From my personal relationship with the son and father I see very little difference in the services that they are able to render. I think that the chiropractor as well as the physiotherapist should be recognised.

I also believe that chiropractors should be covered by the private health schemes and by Medibank. I also believe that the Income Tax Assessment Act should be changed to allow people to claim for chiropractic services. This is something that I hope that this Government will be able to look at in the near future as chiropractors provide a service to the community. I understand that chiropractors currently have patients referred to them by medical practitioners and in some cases by specialists, so there is indeed a need for these people to be recognised.

One of the interesting recommendations of the Webb inquiry is that physiotherapists should complete a post-graduate course in manipulative therapy. One wonders, if this is the case, who is going to train them. This is interesting, because I suspect chiropractors will have to train them, so in that respect they are recognised.

One of the unfortunate and most unpleasant aspects of political life in South Australia at the moment is, I believe, the campaign currently being waged by the Opposition on the law and order issue. I think that, if one looks at the Notice Paper to see the Notices of Motion and the questions asked, and looks at *Hansard* for the questions that have been asked about this matter, it is obvious that the Opposition thinks there is still some political mileage to be made from the law and order issue. This is not a unique attitude for it to take. The law and order issue was very successfully promoted by Adolph Hitler and, in more recent times, by Richard Nixon. The tactics are very obvious—one frightens people. One convinces the people that law and order has broken down, that crime is rampant, that people are unable to walk safely in the streets, and that people (particularly women) are liable to physical and sexual attacks. These are the tactics of the Opposition in its law and order programme. I will quote from a pamphlet that has been letter-boxed in the Mitchell District under the name of June Schaeffer, the Liberal candidate for Mitchell. On the back of the pamphlet is a questionnaire headed "Crime and Vandalism", which states:

There's been a major increase in crime in South Australia. Assault, robbery, housebreaking, vandalism and rape have risen markedly. Reported rapes and rape attempts alone have risen 44 per cent in the past 12 months. Do you feel secure walking the streets of your suburb alone at night? Would you allow young children to go unaccompanied to the local park or playground?

That is nothing more than an emotional fear campaign. It is despicable. It is the sort of campaign that societies throughout the past 30 or 40 years have condemned in the fullest terms and it deserves condemnation now. The pamphlet continues:

There has been a major increase in crime in South Australia.

The criminologists say that is not true. The records also say that that is not true and that there has been a decrease in some areas. Any increase in crime in any area is something that we should be concerned about, and I would not deny that, but for the Liberal Party to continue to maintain that there is a breakdown in law and order in South Australia runs counter to the Leader's statement this afternoon that we have the best and most respected Police Force in Australia. It is a direct reflection—

Mr. Millhouse: They are two different things.

Mr. KENEALLY: They are not. It is a direct reflection on the Police Force. It is also a direct reflection on the judiciary in South Australia—

Mr. Millhouse: No.

Mr. KENEALLY: —because it is implicit in what the honourable gentleman says and in what the member for Mitcham is saying that the police are not doing their job and that the judiciary are not doing their job. It has been quite clearly stated that heavier penalties should be enforced in South Australia. If that is not a criticism of the judiciary, I do not know what is. After saying these things, the hypocrites in the Party opposite say that we have the best Police Force and the best judiciary in Australia. June Schaeffer states in her pamphlet:

Reported rapes and rape attempts alone have risen 44 per cent in the past 12 months.

One does not dispute that reported rapes have increased in the past 12 months, but there might be a good reason for that. It does not indicate at all that rape or rape attempts have increased; it merely indicates that rape reports have increased. Ms. or Mrs. Schaeffer, whoever she might be, has no proof whatsoever that rape has

increased in South Australia during the past 12 months—no-one has. No-one knows to what extent the crime of rape is prevalent in South Australia, because ever since we have had a South Australia, I suppose, women have been reluctant to report this crime. It is only because of the very humane legislation that has been introduced in this State—legislation that Mrs. Kyburz, a Liberal Party member in Queensland, would like to see introduced in that State. It is only since we have had that legislation, and because we have rape crisis centres and because the police have had rape victims interviewed by women that victims have been prepared to report the crime. That is an indication of a healthier situation within the administration of South Australia. I am not saying that, because there are more reported rapes, that is a healthier situation, but women are now willing to report the crime. It is no good the member for Mount Gambier trying to suggest that there is not in South Australia a reluctance by women to report the crime. Certainly South Australian women are not as reluctant as are Queensland women about reporting the crime. I point out to the honourable member what happened to a woman in Ingham, the mother of a girl who was the victim of rape. The mother was so incensed at the treatment her daughter received from the local police and community that she wrote to the Premier and complained about it. What did the Premier do? He wrote back to the mother and canvassed the daughter's alleged sexual history.

If that is the kind of thing the honourable member would suggest as the appropriate way of dealing with the crime, it is no wonder that women in Queensland are not prepared to report rape. We know the notorious situation in Ingham and what goes on there, and we know that Bjelke-Petersen, the so-called defender of law and order is wont to say that the incidence of rape in Queensland is lower than that elsewhere in Australia, when everyone knows that it is just the opposite. There is a higher incidence of rape in Queensland than elsewhere in Australia but, because of the attitudes of people like Bjelke-Petersen and of the Queensland police, particularly in Ingham, and because of the general attitude that has developed because of people like Bjelke-Petersen, Queensland women are afraid to report rape.

For June Schaeffer or anyone else to suggest that an increase in reported rapes in South Australia is indicative of an increase in rape is stupid. They should be applauding the fact that women are now prepared to report this heinous crime. She says that rape attempts alone have increased 44 per cent in the past month. No-one knows how many attempts there have been in South Australia, or whether they have increased or decreased. This is typical of the fear tactics of the Opposition here, trying to make a political point and political capital out of the most despicable activities that one can think of in any kind of society—a tactic that was responsible for Hitler's coming to power in Germany and for Nixon's coming to power in the United States of America. What happened when they came to power? Law went out the window, and it was all order.

Mr. Dean Brown: But the people of Port Augusta want to get rid of you.

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member suggests that people at Port Augusta are anxious to get rid of me. I think that he should take the trouble to go to Port Augusta some time, where he would have all his fears put to rest. The people there have not been noted for changing their political representation in the past, and I suspect that the same will apply in the future. If they wish to get rid of me, they will do it in the appropriate way. They will not need

assistance from the member for Davenport. I do not think that they would take any notice of him, anyway, even if they know who he is, which I doubt.

I would have gone on to speak briefly about the other fear campaign the Opposition is mounting, except that it was appropriately dealt with last evening by the member for Florey. I think that, if the Opposition did not have unions to bash and people to frighten, it would have nothing to talk about. It has nothing to put forward in the way of alternative policies. One hears interesting comments from the Opposition every now and then, and the member for Eyre is often heard to say, while waving the Australian Labor Party's platform in the air, "Government members have signed the pledge," or "They have no freedom." The A.L.P. is a disciplined Party and, because of this, the people can and do have confidence in it.

When anyone votes for the Labor Party, he knows that he is voting for a platform to which that Party will adhere. Party members sign a pledge to do that. This is a good thing, because people who vote for the Party know that it will be consistent. In opposing this principle, Opposition members suggest that they have great freedom in how they act and vote. However, anyone voting for a Liberal Party candidate could not be sure that the platform for which he voted at the election would be followed, because the Party has no discipline. It says one thing one time and something quite different another time. No wonder people have no faith or trust in the Liberal Party. The smear about signing the pledge is a real furphy. We are willing to sign the pledge because we fit easily into the A.L.P.'s platform. We will abide by the platform, and our supporters know this. If any Opposition member is so naive as to believe that in this day and age people vote for individuals or that he has a personal following of more than 1 per cent in his district, he is wrong. I notice that the member for Gouger and the member for Murray blanched a little. I hope they prove me wrong but, unfortunately, personal support in any district is very marginal. People vote for a Party, and they expect—

Mr. Russack: That's not what happened in Port Pirie last time.

Mr. KENEALLY: If you spoke to the overwhelming majority of people in Port Pirie—

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

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member should address the Chair. He has referred to Opposition members as "you". I think he should refer to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member was referring to honourable members as "you" I missed it. He is one member who consistently uses the term "honourable members opposite", and I would hold him up as an example. However, as far as addressing the Chair is concerned, I have never asked any honourable member to adopt a drill-like stance. Whether the honourable member on his feet is addressing the Chair is a matter for the Chair to decide. The honourable member for Stuart.

Mr. KENEALLY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am prepared to address Opposition members as honourable members if they guarantee that they will not go up to my district and tell my constituents of that fact. Reference has been made to the seat of Port Pirie at the last election. I was going to point out that the people there voted for the candidate who was successful, because they believed that he was basically a Labor Party member.

*Members interjecting:*



Mr. KENEALLY: I think that is hollow laughter. I should have thought that events seemed to bear that out somewhat. Another scare word we hear frequently from members opposite is "socialism". One of the most laughable examples of that was the comment of the Leader and that of the member for Mount Gambier, who complained about money being spent at Mount Gambier because we were going to socialise the South-East. If public involvement in the affairs of South Australia or of any country is socialism (and I accept that it is), we are arguing here in this Parliament not about whether socialism is good or bad but about the extent to which we are prepared to accept socialism in South Australia.

We have in South Australia a mixed economy. We have private enterprise and Government enterprise, private activity and Government activity. If people opposite were to compare their stand today with that of the Liberal and Country Party when it was first started federally by Robert Menzies, when he got all those warring factions together in the early 1940's, they would find that, to those early pioneers of their Party, their political stance would be anathema. That does not apply to all members opposite; some members opposite would fit snugly into that reactionary nineteenth century political philosophy that existed then, although some members of the Liberal Party have progressed considerably since that time.

Members opposite are not opposed to socialism as much as to what they imagine socialism to be. Robert Tressell, in his very good book *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropist* (which I would recommend to all members opposite), said that it is not socialism that people are opposed to, but their imagination of what it is. Democratic socialism inevitably will become the majority political philosophy throughout the world. It is a trend that has been going on for 30 years, a trend that the reactionary people represented by honourable gentlemen opposite are fighting against. Their fight will be fruitless, because the result is inevitable.

Mr. Tonkin: This would be one of your worst efforts.

Mr. KENEALLY: I thought I was doing extremely well. I must be doing all right, because honourable gentlemen opposite are feeling compelled to interject all the time and to laugh hollowly. I can remember making a noteworthy contribution on primary industry, and 16 minutes was taken up by points of order and questions to the Chair. It was hurting then, and I suspect that what I am saying is hurting a little now. The old bogey was that if it was socialistic we did not have to justify our opposition. We have seen recent examples of this because a trade unionist is going to Yugoslavia. Because he is going to a communist country, honourable gentlemen opposite seem to suggest that there is something unsavoury about it, something that should be condemned.

It is the attitude of members opposite that would continue into perpetuity the cold war that existed for many years. Thankfully, the present incumbent of the Presidency in America does not have the same outmoded and archaic attitude towards other political systems in the world as do members opposite. They are obsessed and paranoid about communism and socialism. Anything to the left of Bjelke-Petersen is communistic or socialistic plotting and should be condemned. How stupid to condemn any Government for looking at what is going on in an alternative political system.

If we are to understand what goes on, and if we are to deal with these people better, and meet them on a better footing, we should understand what they are doing.

It is stupid to suggest that nothing of value is developed in a communist country, because we know it is. If we had the Bolshoi Ballet, the Leningrad Ballet, or the Moscow Circus in Adelaide, I suspect that people opposite would condemn it as socialistic or communistic plotting. We should not go along because nothing good comes out of Russia, you see! Unfortunately, they continue this sort of stupidity because the press in Australia thinks that people are so misinformed as to accept it. We have had the red hordes coming down at every election I can remember. The Liberal Parties in South Australia have this hot line to the communist countries: they only come down and threaten Australia at election time!

Mr. Becker: You're joking.

Mr. KENEALLY: Peking is closer to London than it is to Melbourne. If they are going anywhere in their little paper boats they will not come here. They might go north or west, but all this political rubbish gets a good press, and so they continue.

It amused me to hear honourable gentlemen complain about socialism in the South-East. If we can have more socialism of that type in Port Augusta in public housing, sewerage, E. & W.S., water, transport, and numerous other areas, we can do with it. The problem with members opposite is that they work on the basic philosophy that if it makes money it is to be given to the private sector and if it loses money the taxpayer can pick up the tab. The average South Australian citizen pays the profits of the private entrepreneurs and picks up the tab for Government services. Members of the Liberal Party subscribe to the philosophy of capitalising gains and socialising losses. "If something is not going to make a quid, let the taxpayer pick up the tab."

I have expressed my view on the subject of uranium, and what distresses me most and horrifies me about the debate is that, if we are ever so unfortunate as to be in a position where we develop and sell our uranium, the present Federal Government intends to give over the whole development of that industry to private enterprise. It has been said that that is a \$13 000 000 000 industry right now, with no risks involved. The Federal Government would opt out of a very dangerous industry indeed and leave it to private enterprise, whose only ethic is to make profits. Private enterprise has no altruistic attitudes towards society. It is there to make a profit.

It is suggested that, with no risk, a \$13 000 000 000 industry be given to private enterprise. That is a licence to print money. If we are ever so unfortunate as to have this industry established in Australia, it should be with the Federal Government. It should be under the control of a Government agency. If we are to have it, we should have at least that one control. I think this whole mythology, this whole scare, this word socialism, is a total and absolute farce.

Mr. Becker: You're trying to intimidate—

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member spent 20 minutes of his speech suggesting socialistic activities by the Government in this State and in his district. If he were asked to state his point of view he would say that he was horrified with socialism and socialistic philosophy, and yet he promotes them. As I have said, it is not socialism that people are opposed to but what they imagine socialism to be. In my view and in the view of the people on this side and of the overwhelming majority of intelligent and educated people in the world now, democratic socialism is the most humane political system yet devised.

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



Mr. KENEALLY: I have been encouraged by the support given to my comments made before the adjournment by Opposition members, especially those who have said, "You're actually saying what we believe and we wish that we had the guts to come out and support you, but you know what the system is and we can't do so." I was pointing out that one of the paradoxes of politics is that members opposite are totally opposed to socialism while they themselves are willing to participate in its benefits.

Mr. Wardle: Tell us what's happened in Sweden, Israel and India to socialist Governments recently.

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Murray is saying that in those countries socialist governments have just been defeated. However, one of the hallmarks of democratic socialist government is that such Governments can be defeated in democratic elections, and that is more than one can say about the Bjelke-Petersen regime in Queensland. He is making sure that he will not be defeated. In fact, if socialist governments have been defeated in Sweden, Israel and India, members opposite can be sure that the governments replacing them will not be replacing the programmes that those socialist governments implemented. Indeed, that is the point I have been making, that even the conservative forces throughout the world have moved so far to the left in the past 30 years that they would not recognise the base whence they started.

The newly elected governments will not be replacing the socialist or social-democratic philosophy or decisions that have been made by the previous governments. One of the most effective socialist lobbying groups in Australia has been the Country Party, which loves socialist policies so much that it wants to keep them to itself and deny them to the remainder of the country. It is well known that if it were not for Government assistance in various forms primary industry in Australia would be in a desperate plight indeed.

Mr. Evans: What about manufacturing industry?

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member refers to manufacturing, so we have another industry benefiting from socialism. We all love it, but we are not all willing to admit that. However, to prove that none of us is infallible, I am willing to say that before the dinner adjournment I made a mistake when referring to the personal vote of certain people. You, Mr. Speaker, proved that on occasions a personal vote is most effective, and I am willing to accept that. However, that is small solace to the Liberal Party, because at the next election that great personal vote that you, Sir, are able to gain in Port Pirie will be put against the Liberal Party candidate in Rocky River. This prompts me to say that I will regret after the next election that I will not have the member for Rocky River giving me all those usable interjections, as he has done. I fear (in fact, I am pleased) that we will not have the member for Eyre in this place, either.

Mr. Whitten: What about the personal vote in Goyder?

Mr. KENEALLY: I have already frightened the member for Goyder and the member for Murray sufficiently.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Labor Party will determine who will be the successful candidate in those seats.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Minister has clearly indicated the position: the Labor Party will decide who will be the member for certain districts in the next Parliament, so it ill behoves members opposite to interject in a rather nasty manner on a member of the Labor Party. It may rebound against members opposite; it may be counter productive.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If they talk about the furnishings in Parliament House, they'll be in trouble.

Mr. KENEALLY: Some members opposite might refer to furnishings in Parliament House, but they will never get the benefit of them or, if they do, it will be for a short period only. I was referring to the member for Eyre, who might not be here after the next election. My reports indicate that the honourable member was annihilated in a public debate that received some prominence last Monday evening. Moreover, the publicity about that debate and the factors leading up to it are the best publicity our candidate could have had; if he was not well known in the district before today's happenings in this House he certainly will be tomorrow. That can only benefit him, as any publicity our candidate receives in the District of Eyre must be productive, because the alternative in Eyre at present is appalling in comparison with our candidate.

I want to end on a more serious note by saying that the tactics of the Opposition in South Australia in trying to engender fear into the electorate by its law and order campaign is to be condemned in the strongest terms. As I stated earlier, it is the sort of tactics that some of the most notorious leaders in the world, such as Hitler, and more recently, Nixon, have tried successfully. However, it does their country, the world and our democratic forms of Government no service whatever. If the Liberal Party in this State can do no more than try to win an election by making the community in South Australia fear for its safety, that Party has no right to govern and little right to call itself an Opposition.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): First, I express much regret at the demise of some former members of State Parliament and I take this opportunity, as other members have done, of wishing the best in retirement to Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls. Similarly, I congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor on the efficient way in which he has been executing his duties, both during and since the Governor's tenure. The only regret I had about the Lieutenant-Governor's address was that it contained comparatively nothing that was new, especially regarding my district, despite the teasing which has been going on from members opposite; whether it is more serious than that I will find out later.

It is apparent that most of the contentious issues (and I will refer to those a little later) have been removed from His Excellency's Speech with obvious foresight. Contentious issues would not serve the Government well in a forthcoming election. I feel pressed to answer some aspects of the member for Stuart's speech, but the one matter which concerns me most of all is the tremendous conceit and impertinence of the Mount Gambier Labor Party candidate, who over past months has been attempting to act as a *de facto* member of Parliament, aided and abetted by this Government, which maintains that it is a democratic socialist Government.

If that is its form of democracy, I am surprised by the manner of its execution. I will refer more specifically to instances in the South-East that seem to have transgressed common decency.

An interesting point was raised by the member for Stuart, who seems much confused (and understandably so) about the fine line of demarcation between communism and socialism. This is nothing new. In 1848, Karl Marx wrote the Communist Manifesto of which the Parliamentary Library has the first edition in English, and page 9 of the preface states:

At the present it is undoubtedly the most widespread, the most international production of all socialist literature, the common platform acknowledged by millions of workmen from Siberia to California yet when it was written we could not have called it a socialist manifesto, but by 1888 when the English version was published they were thinking they should have called it the socialist manifesto.

As there were doubts in the minds of Marx and Engels in 1848, it is little wonder there are doubts now. We can bring the wheel full circle. An interesting comment from my friends in Britain suggests that there is a split in the Communist Party of Great Britain over a recent publication that was issued by the Communist Party called *The British Road to Socialism*. It is in the Parliamentary Library, and I found it by accident. It cost 30p from Central Books, 37 Grays Inn Road, London, and contains three contentious issues. In it the Communist Party states:

Socialism can be achieved in our country without civil war.

Government members should peruse Jim Cairns *Quiet Revolution* for a reference to that. The statement continues:

How do we do it: we co-operate with and support the Labor left in getting workers to vote for Labor because there is no hope of our Communist Party getting into power.

That sounds strangely familiar. Recently, the Attorney-General made an almost identical statement, if we believe the newspaper item read yesterday by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and it would seem that there is a split in the Attorney's office between his secretary, who advocates "vote communist" and the Attorney-General who advocates "vote Labor". The third and most contentious point contained in the statement states:

A socialist Government (meaning the communist influenced socialist Government) will stand down if it is defeated in an election.

That is where the split is, because Leninists say that they will not stand down even if defeated should they get into power, because they would expect a counter-coup from capitalism. I would not have raised these matters had it not been for the ideological arguments of the member for Stuart. I discovered these little tit-bits by accident whilst reading the *Border Watch*. Next to it the London *Times* was open next to this article, so I assumed that a Labor member was boning up on it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What are you going to do with all these tit-bits?

Mr. ALLISON: I will put them in *Hansard* where they belong, as a counter. This is really what we on the right fear: that the people who advocate that quiet communism infiltrate from the left will become dominant in the Socialist Party.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Will that happen in Mount Gambier in the next few months?

Mr. ALLISON: I am not sure what will happen in the future, but this sort of thing is already happening.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's insidious.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, and it is the Minister's comment and not mine.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much private conversation.

Mr. ALLISON: About Government spending in the South-East, my comments have already been published in the local newspaper.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Will you reiterate them?

Mr. ALLISON: Yes. I said that when the Premier visited the South-East we welcomed him with open arms because he comes like a Greek bearing gifts, and the extent to which he comes bearing gifts—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: All the Greek people down there are going to like this.

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister will not incite racial discrimination in the South-East. We have a united community there; we do not have that problem and do not foster it. Concerning Government spending in the South-East, we find that promises (and I will refer to the actual spending later) amount of \$26 587 800, give or take a few dollars, because some promises made do not have specific amounts nailed to them. Of the promises we have been given, so far we have spent about \$3 500 000. There is about \$22 000 000 to go, and admittedly some of that money will be spent. For example, \$1 800 000 is committed to the Mount Gambier Civic Centre; \$11 000 000 is committed to three gas turbine motors at Snuggery to serve the South-East; also \$8 000 000 is committed to the Woods and Forests Department in the next two or three years for re-tooling; and the other \$3 000 000 or \$4 000 000 has been spent in a wide array of comparatively minor grants.

In addition, we had more recent amounts, which I have not included in the original estimate, of \$300 000 as a straight-out business loan from the State Government Insurance Commission to a local company; \$200 000 spent by the Woods and Forests Department to acquire another local company; and a guarantee, to which the Premier referred in passing, to another South-East company. Also, I have not included the sum of \$800 000 that is committed to a road safety centre in the South-East as part of a network of similar centres. It is not completely committed, because a report from the National Road Safety Council, a copy of which I received yesterday, stated that the recommendation for that study was that the centre be established on land at present under the control of the Minister of Forests. The area is very suitable for the purpose and is situated on the Casterton Road about 3 kilometres from the city centre. A land price was placed on that area of about \$300 000, which is a considerable part of the \$800 000 set aside.

An interesting sideline is that the land was acquired some years ago at the base price of \$40 an acre. If there is any criticism by the Land Commission or the Premier of private enterprise making a few bob on land transactions, I suggest that the Woods and Forests Department is following the private enterprise pattern in no uncertain manner by setting \$300 000 on a \$40 an acre area of between 40 and 80 acres. That would be a considerable profit. I admit that it is a transaction from one Government department to another.

However, the road safety centre has to be paid for, and the question of construction and maintenance of the centre by three councils involved has to be decided by the councils.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You don't think it will get off the ground?

Mr. ALLISON: No, I am saying that I have not included that money in any of the moneys spent.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you think it will get off the ground?

Mr. ALLISON: Yes. I have another matter to which I wish to refer. Before this matter was finalised, the South-East Light Car and Motor Cycle Club offered to the Government (and this is the converse of the \$300 000 deal)

free of charge an area 18 km outside Mount Gambier which already has a considerable amount of road laid. It is used for motor cycle racing, and it was offered to the Government for nothing.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you think it would be a good idea for the Government to take it up?

Mr. ALLISON: I submitted this matter to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport as a proposition from the club.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you still think it would be a good idea?

Mr. ALLISON: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: In other words, we should abandon the other project and take on this project. Do you think so?

Mr. ALLISON: You are trying to twist my words. I am comparing the relative costs. I am talking of straight-out cost to the South Australian community.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Where do you stand?

Mr. ALLISON: The South Australian community will pay considerably more.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the honourable Minister that he is using the unparliamentary term "you".

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The honourable member for Mount Gambier is being a ratbag.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable Minister to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do withdraw, Sir, and I apologise.

Mr. ALLISON: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Speaker. I am not easily intimidated by bully boys, irrespective of the side of the political line from which they come; they can exist on either side. The group that offered this property in all good faith has not been given a reason for rejection. All I ask for in all dealings is common decency. There has been no attempt by those who surveyed the land to give any reason for rejection. If it is an out-and-out useless proposition, all right, but the group would like to know the grounds for rejection.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Where do you stand?

Mr. ALLISON: I have an open mind, but certainly not an empty mind.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is empty all right. You want the best of both worlds.

Mr. ALLISON: The Government should have the common decency to consider matters that people put forward. The Premier, in his message to the minions in the South-East at the Labor Party conference in Millicent, had some surprisingly illogical statements to make. A report on the conference says:

With a member interested in the area, he will get more for his district, Mr. Dunstan said. Others did not receive the extra things because the local member of Parliament had not been to see him. We regularly spend big sums in Mount Gambier, but I do not receive submissions from the local M.P. (Mr. Allison, Lib.), Mr. Dunstan said.

That is a surprisingly illogical statement when we have between \$25 000 000 and \$30 000 000 committed to my district. It seems to indicate that the Premier wants every single thing that I do in my district to go through his own office. It implies that the Premier has no confidence in the Ministers to whom I write. There would be several hundred letters that have gone to the Ministers, who have personally asked me to write to them, rather than do what I was initially doing in ignorance when I

first became a member—going to their departments. The Ministers all said, "Write to us personally, and we will handle your questions." I did that, but the Premier does not trust them. He wants everything to go through his own office. This highlights the fact that the Premier is unaware of what I have been doing for my district. The challenge thrown out to the local member through the local press cannot go unanswered.

In connection with this point, I again draw the Premier's attention to the way in which I have represented my district in this House. First, I bring local matters before this House in the form of questions: I asked about 50 parochial questions last session. Secondly, I bring local matters before the House in the form of debate: I made more than 50 speeches last session. Thirdly, I bring local matters before the House in the form of petitions, letters to Ministers personally, and occasionally, despite what the Premier says, submissions to the Premier personally. The Premier's temerity in going on record (it is fairly easy, of course, when he is talking to his own) and saying that the local member does nothing is one other instance of the way in which the Labor Party is going about its smear tactics in the South-East. It is reported in the *South-East Times* and in the *Border Watch*.

I have gleaned from the South-East press a wide variety of issues that I have taken up with Ministers; they are all related to the expenditure of between \$25 000 000 and \$30 000 000, some of which is Federal money. More than \$3 400 000 is committed from the Federal Government to the South-East. First, I draw attention to a broken promise which highlights the Government's attitude toward employment in the South-East. We have a strange dichotomy here. On the one hand, the Government is putting additional departments into the South-East; I applaud this, because it is specifically what I asked the Premier to do. We need a sound, broad-based industry so that tertiary industry will become part of a mixed type of community. Primary, secondary and tertiary industries are the solid base on which the South-East is founded. Modulock was promised as a pre-election promise in 1975, with 40 men to be employed manufacturing transportable housing units, but nothing has been heard of it since.

Mr. Whitten: Probably because you're there.

Mr. ALLISON: Not at all. I have asked questions, but nothing has transpired. I refer now to the expenditure of \$11 000 000 on a new gas turbine unit which was to have been installed initially in Mount Gambier to replace the existing Woods and Forest Department units. There is a problem here. We had more than 60 men employed in the Electricity Trust unit in Mount Gambier, but these men were stood down; actually, they were not stood down immediately—they have been absorbed elsewhere. The jobs that they went into might well have been taken by others. The jobs in the Electricity Trust which they had are no longer there, with the exception of some which have been retained for the Woods and Forests Department's power unit and the maintenance group. It still means that there has been a net loss of 50 jobs in Mount Gambier. The Woods and Forests Department, in its retooling, is doing exactly what private enterprise is doing: it is finding that labour costs are very high, and it is phasing out men in favour of machines. The re-equipping is not creating more jobs, even though it is increasing productivity, so criticising private enterprise is not fair when Government enterprise does the same thing.

There is an interesting point in the transfer of the gas turbine units to Snuggery. They were originally planned for the Casterton road site in Mount Gambier. I wrote a letter earlier this year to the Minister of Mines and Energy asking him whether he would reconsider the site that he had chosen in Mount Gambier on the ground that two gas turbines running together produce pulsating noises, the same as the Dry Creek turbines, and that that causes noise pollution which is undesirable in a closely settled residential area. I also asked that he increase the number of units from two to a number that would supply adequate power for the whole of the South-East in the event of a breakdown in Adelaide.

The Minister acknowledged the letter and said that he would write back within a short time informing me of his decision. He did not do that. Instead, he announced that the three new motors would supply adequate power for the South-East and would be sited at Snuggery to overcome a pollution problem. At the time of writing to him no contract had been let. There was no acknowledgment that the local member had attempted to influence his decision; it was simply a unilateral announcement. I still have the letter on file unreplied to.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why should they pollute Snuggery?

Mr. ALLISON: There is no close settlement; it is as simple as that. The Minister knows that as well as I do. I did not ask the Minister to resite the plant at Snuggery: I asked him to find a desirable site. I assumed that it would go somewhere where there were not many people. That was a Ministerial decision.

The issue of the Mount Gambier cultural centre is one that I took up personally with the Premier in June, 1976. I am pleased that a sum of \$1 800 000 has now been set aside for last year and this year, or is available for construction of that civic centre complex, because it was first proposed in 1948. Obviously a number of Governments have come and gone since that time. The interesting sidelight is not the time that has elapsed since 1948 but the fact that the Premier criticised me for getting the news down to the South-East when the debate was progressing in the House. He said that the local member had nothing to do with it, which was rather surprising since I was a member of the Mount Gambier City Council Cultural Centre Committee which had been negotiating directly with the Government and the Premier since 1970 and to which he initially promised that ultimately we would have a civic centre.

It was in the House last year that I respectfully asked the Premier not to say this once again as a pre-election promise but to get on with it because the years were elapsing, costs were escalating so rapidly that the £200 000 or £300 000 that the original project was to have cost would now be several million dollars and it was rational to have something under way. I am not taking the full responsibility or credit for that, but for the Premier to try to deny any involvement by the local member is an obvious indication that he does not really know the extent to which the local member is involved in South-Eastern politics. I excuse the Premier on the ground of ignorance. Ignorance is no defence before the law, but in the House one can get away with anything.

In relation to the money allocated to the Woods and Forests Department for the purchasing of land and re-equipping the mills, I pointed out, again in this House, that the Public Accounts Committee had indicated the Government for its slowness in re-equipping the mill, which was rapidly becoming non-competitive. Questions asked

in this House elicited from the Minister of Works that money would be spent in each of two succeeding years on acquiring more land for forest plantings. They, once again, were matters brought before the House that were extremely important to the Mount Gambier district and important to the whole of the South-East, and an acknowledgment that the Woods and Forests Department's mill is absolutely essential to Mount Gambier's well being. I thank Sir Thomas Playford, who in 1948 initiated that mill and in 1956 opened it; it was not a socialist initiative.

We have had considerable sums spent on upgrading the Mount Gambier goal, continuing the hospital improvements and assisting in the development of the lakes. Another interesting sideline is that apart from announcing Government initiatives the Premier has also taken great delight in announcing expansions in private enterprise as if his Government were directly involved. I think it was called "Headline catching" yesterday. One headline that I was not pleased to catch a few weeks ago was one saying that \$1 000 000 was being spent on upgrading the cellulose plant at Snuggery. It appeared that the Premier gained some pleasure from making that announcement because he made no adverse comments. He said that it was upgrading the existing facility, thus making cellulose more productive. Mr. Wilkinson, the local senior union representative, said it was pleasing that industry and the unions had been able to work together. It is a sad state of affairs when compulsory unionism is unable to protect jobs, because hidden behind that deal was the fact that immediately 13 people had to be retrenched, or possibly transferred to another company in an effort to find them work. Also, over the next 12 to 15 months 70 more jobs will not be filled when they disappear due to the natural attrition rate. About five people leave that firm each month. Another nine or 10 staff members will have to be retrenched.

That means that, in announcing a million dollar expansion, he was really announcing a retrenching of manpower; 90 fewer jobs for the Millicent-Tantanoola area over the next 15 months means about 500 or 600 fewer people who can be supported by that industry in the area, because for every person who loses a job there are five or six involved in back-up, trade, commerce and tertiary support. I am saddened by that. I am informed that the company has given even more of its orders to an expanding Victorian branch of the firm. Knowing what we do about Victorian decentralisation policies, we can see why that company has obviously found it easier to expand in that State than to expand in South Australia. That is another point that saddens me, because I am quite sure that the decentralisation policies announced by the shadow Minister on this side were very close to the Victorian policies and would be responsible for retaining industry in this State.

Those are three examples in Mount Gambier and the South-East where employment is being lost: the Modulock project has not materialised, the Electricity Trust project has been phased down in favour of a single button pushed in Adelaide automating those three motors at Snuggery, resulting in 50 men being replaced by push button automation, and the Cellulose venture removing 90 jobs from the South-East. Those are the things that sadden one, because it is increasingly obvious (and I pointed this out to the Australian Productivity Promotion Council) that the only way in which we shall get anywhere (and members opposite echoed this sentiment) is for everyone to pull together—industry in the form of management, directorate, trade unions, workers. It is not an issue that will

be resolved straightforwardly; it will certainly not be resolved by groups pulling apart. There is an increasing tendency for decisions to be arrived at on political grounds rather than on people grounds, and I am far more interested in the people of the South-East in these issues.

Another matter that the Premier sought to forget was that I personally approached him about assistance for Heritage Industries, which has received some \$400 000 from the Federal Government. It highlights the pettiness, I believe, of Governments when we have large sums like that spent on local endeavour whether it be Heritage Industries for the infirm or the handicapped or whether it be pre-school and child care centres which are happily given large Federal subsidies, where the South Australian Ministers criticise when they, too, have to make some contributions.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But they have now stopped. The State or local Government built them and now the Federal Government says, "If you want them, carry them on." That is not very good.

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister makes the very point I tried to point out; it appears to be petty, because surely education has to be more than a one-sided thing. We are responsible for the people in our State. We have substantial Federal grants, and surely we can contribute something in the interim when the whole of Australia is being asked to tighten its belt for a short time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do we have to open ours?

Mr. ALLISON: It is strange that we should be confronted with this sort of talk from the State Government when the Labor Government in the United Kingdom is absolutely adamant that the only way it can beat inflation is by the very method I was just saying was accepted. If we are quibbling over \$5 000 or \$10 000 to get a group of people working, it would seem petty when we have received nearly \$200 000 for the initial building; it is a very small percentage.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's talking a lot of frogshit!

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Minister to withdraw that statement as being unparliamentary.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I withdraw that statement.

Mr. ALLISON: *Excretus tauri* is a common expression on both sides of the House; I take no exception to it. Suffice it to say that the Deputy Premier is stirred.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I am stirred, too.

Mr. ALLISON: So is the Federal Government when it sees money that has been handed out being criticised for the sake of a few extra dollars being given.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And the State Government is to pick up the tab.

Mr. ALLISON: It is very small tab. Another contentious issue in the South-East is the fact that we have now two district councils saddled with debts—\$600 000 for Millicent and \$900 000 for the Mount Gambier District Council for saleyards, which could well have been amalgamated on one site between the two cities.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That is what you call wisdom in hindsight. That was the original recommendation. If you could have achieved that, you would have been a genius, but you are not.

Mr. ALLISON: Well, the only thing that comes to mind instantly is that both councils acted with some considerable Government backing.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How would we have resolved it if the councils had not acted at all?

Mr. ALLISON: It would have been within the power of the Government to rationalise it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No, we had no power. We were simply in an advisory capacity. We did not recommend to the councils that they should do it: we asked whether they would. We thought they should.

Mr. ALLISON: I will speak personally.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is not a matter of speaking personally.

Mr. ALLISON: I have to do so. I am not going to indict the Government or the councils; I will say what I think. That is what you are asking.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You should have said it before the event, and not now. You did not say it before the event.

Mr. ALLISON: The Deputy Premier has invited me to say what I think. I will say what I think.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You did not say it before the event but you are saying it now.

Mr. ALLISON: It would have been better constructed on one site.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I agree with you.

Mr. ALLISON: I realise that. I heard the Minister say the same thing in the House yesterday. I agree with the tremendous hindsight he has now.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes; I knew it before but I knew it could not have been achieved.

Mr. ALLISON: Look—you sit on your hindsight.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I sit on more than that, and that is something that you have not got.

Mr. ALLISON: It is better than sitting on your assets.

Mr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, is it in order for me to move the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the Deputy Premier to give his Address in Reply speech now?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. ALLISON: I do not really mind. It is a great personal compliment to me that the Deputy Premier reserves his best speeches as interjections when I am on my feet. It happens time and again. It may be coincidental. I am going through a sort of shopping list to jog the Premier's mind because after the Premier said in Millicent that the local member had done nothing, I cannot possibly—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He was not speaking about you; he was in Millicent.

Mr. ALLISON: If he was not talking about me, he used my name, so he is not even sure who the members are. The Minister knows where the responsibility lies. An interesting announcement made by the Premier about the Young Men's Christian Association when I first approached him on the matter was that nothing could possibly be done for that organization. He said it would be difficult to help it; it would establish a precedent and he was not prepared to do that. Some months later, after several requests to him personally by me, the Director of the Y.M.C.A., the Y.M.C.A. Board and others, we finally elicited some \$15 000, which has been increased, delightfully, to between \$40 000 and \$45 000 for the cost of repair and renovation of the pool. Again, we are grateful. Obviously, it has slipped the Premier's mind that the local member was certainly involved in the background negotiations for that.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about the latest approach?

Mr. ALLISON: The latest approaches to the council seem to be bearing fruit as well. We are not doing too badly. We seem to be setting the pattern. The Government seems to delight in making announcements to local branches of the A.L.P. when the local member has had a considerable amount to do with the matter. I point out another avenue through which we frequently reach out from the South-East to the Government, namely, through the Lower South-East Community Council Development Committee, of which I am also a member and to which I submit suggestions, to which the Government has acceded over the past two years. However, we are all occasionally aggrieved because the council's work is ignored, because the work of committees that are formed to advise the Government is also ignored, and because Government Ministers make unilateral decisions and unilateral announcements without showing common decency by giving the people, other than I, prior advice. There seems to be a little bit of fright that the local member might latch on to it first and make a pre-release. I know so many things that happen in the South-East through so many people who are personally acquainted through so many committees in which I am directly involved through membership that I exercise common decency by not releasing things I know in the false assumption (and I realize now that it is false assumption) that statements will ultimately be made by Government through Chairmen of those committees. That just has not happened.

I am new to politics. I was apolitical for most of my life, and I must admit that I thought that politics was a much different game from what I find it to be. However, I will not stop having faith in people or acting as I do, but I will exercise the plea that somewhere common decency is observed sooner or later and that elected members of Government, such as I, are accorded some respect, because the Government should bear in mind that it, in the long run, is the loser. It is personally insulting the electorate concerned, and that fact has well and truly sunk home.

I do not think there is any need to labour that point. It certainly has been happening in the South-East, and the Government knows that full well. I did not really mind when the Premier axed any further debate on the telex issue this afternoon. I do not know whether Government or private enterprise telex machines are used to transmit messages to the Labor Party candidate in the South-East but I know that, for example, a certain private enterprise telex was used extensively in the South-East for Government business, not always with the permission of the firm concerned, but it had the graciousness not to complain. The firm understood that messages received were passed on. That is what private enterprise is all about and what the true spirit of co-operation is all about. I think the Government can take considerable reassurance from that fact, because the people in the South-East generally are that kind of people.

I was not really surprised when the Premier today decided that that issue should not be debated any further, and I did not really mind, either. Suffice to say that the points raised in the debate were serious and could have ramifications throughout the State. My only complaint is that, if the Government chooses to take this kind of action towards its candidates in the field (people who have received no vote or support from the majority of the public but who are as yet untried), once again common decency should prevail and telex messages should be sent to members of Parliament, particularly members

who have dozens if not hundreds of requests and submissions to Government members and who might still be waiting for replies. As I said this afternoon, I am still waiting for replies to matters that have been released in the press by Ministers without getting replies back to me. They have been released around my office through the local A.L.P., which really has no responsibility to the electorate; I am the one whom the people pay to represent them, whose services they immediately command, and who is responsible to them. There is no question about that. This is the kind of thing I dislike and it is something of which I hope the Government will take heed and desist.

As I have already said, many issues have gone through my office. There are eight pages of State matters and five pages of Federal matters, amounting to more than \$30 000 000 worth of specific grants, and many millions of dollars more in benefits that have accrued through concessions from State and Federal Governments, in some of which I have certainly joined with the rest of my Party in soliciting. Government members have done the same. Surely we can all take some responsibility for at least some of the decisions at which the Government has arrived. The coincidence that so many announcements are made so quickly after I have written letters to Ministers is to me an indication that I have had considerable influence on Government Ministers and Government policies. The grants speak for themselves.

Mr. Becker: He's looking after his constituents.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes. A member must look after his voters. The local people put him in and he is answerable to them, not to the Government. That parochial side of my job is the part to which I attach the most importance. Probably the only unfortunate aspect of being appointed to a shadow portfolio is that there is every temptation to spend too much time on that side of the job and too little time on the more parochial matters. I assure you, that I am preserving a good balance in that regard. With me, the parish comes first.

As I said I would do, I will now return to several points the member for Stuart has raised. He decries the fact that the Liberal Party has recently concentrated on the law and order issue. He says that more rape charges are being reported because the law is better and permits women to lay charges more easily. That is as may be, but he did not quote statistics from a statistical point of view. Instead, he said that the statistics reflected a different point of view. Perhaps by using his logic we can use exactly the same ideas when we consider that there should be a decrease statistically in the crime rate. I say that because I know that the South Australian Police, on whom we depend for the enforcement of law and order and for whom we have said many times we have tremendous respect, are absolutely frustrated at the kid-glove treatment that is handed out to compulsive criminals, to committers of serious crimes, in our courts.

Mr. Whitten: Whom do you blame?

Mr. ALLISON: The honourable member asks whom I would blame. Let us say that the justice that is meted out in our courts is meted out in accordance with a basic philosophy, and it is no secret that the dozens, hundreds and even thousands of cases that come before South Australian courts are placed before the Attorney-General for scrutiny and consideration. The Attorney has said that recently during Question Time in the House. So, surely he has every power to exercise discretion regarding whether or not a case is prosecuted.

Mr. Whitten: What about the penalties?

Mr. ALLISON: The penalties are set by this House. For example, an attempt was made to amend the penalties for child pornography, but the Bill was rejected last session in another place. The penalties for drunken driving are almost as severe as or more severe than the penalty that can be applied if one murders someone. One is more likely to get off with a lighter penalty than if one is on a murder charge. There are tremendous anomalies in the way in which the courts are administered. Basically, however, there is a philosophy that determines the way in which the courts exercise their prerogatives. I know that the police are frustrated, and their frustration can reach the dangerous stage, when they say, "What the hell! Why should we lay a charge when we know the punishment will be far too light?" These men have standards to maintain, and I hope that this Government's philosophy will get through to the courts, and that the courts will be told, "You will have our backing. Legislation will be initiated," because that is really where the matter begins. If members opposite think that I am wrong, they can look at the operation of courts elsewhere.

Finally, I have said previously that, irrespective of what the Premier might have said about this Government's not being interested in compulsory unionism, directives have been issued throughout the South-East through the P.S.A. and the Education Department regarding unionism. Unionists in my district are being encouraged to compel people, if they are ancillary staff in schools, to become members of the union. Canteens such as the one at Plympton High School are having trouble staying open because of the employment of compulsory staff.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I beg your pardon. Plympton High?

Mr. ALLISON: I read this a couple of days ago and I will refer the Minister to the comment I read. The school involved may have been that at North Plympton. I probably have the wrong name, although it is in the correct district. Even small clubs, such as social clubs, that pull an 18-gallon keg of beer, have been told, "You employ a union member to pull that beer or we will blackball you and you will not get any more."

Mr. Langley: That's not correct, and you know it.

Mr. ALLISON: This is correct.

Mr. Langley: In no way. It isn't correct.

Mr. ALLISON: I will say here and now that it was only because of the pressure exerted by those clubs during the last five or six weeks that suddenly the tortoise act was performed: the head was pulled in and the beer supply maintained. There must be an election on this issue; it is certainly an issue in my district. My telephone rang hot, because voluntary barmen in clubs were saying, "What is this? We have been told that we must have compulsory union labour. If we do that, we will be broke."

Mr. McRae: Only if it is over three 18's, not just one 18-gallon keg. It's cheap labour, underselling pubs in your district. That's what it is.

Mr. ALLISON: I sympathise with the hotelier.

Mr. McRae: They're disturbing the stability of the industry in your area. You'd better watch that, Harold.

Mr. ALLISON: If the honourable member wishes to introduce that argument, surely he must realise that the stability of the industry is affected far more by the large clubs that are proliferating throughout the State than it is by the small clubs.

Mr. McRae: That's the very group that the unions enrolled: the large clubs.

Mr. ALLISON: If that is the intention, obviously the letter of the law is more humane than was originally contemplated, when my telephone rang hot. Small clubs were in an absolute panic, asking, "What can you do?" I was upset by that. Be that as it may, if the Government chooses not to call its policy compulsory unionism, one only can conclude that it will be called compulsory unemployment. Even a private contractor who pays his own association, and pays for the maintenance, repair and depreciation of his vehicle, and who does work for a number of other organisations, was told that, if he did any work at all for a district council, he would have to join the union, or else! There is a man who has a diverse industry.

Mr. Langley: But they'll take all the benefits, just the same.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ALLISON: Once again, I ask for reasonableness, not compulsion, which is often injustice to the extreme. West Germany, which the Government used last year as a model, has only 30 per cent union membership, and members opposite held that up in the House last year as the model of democratic socialism.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who's holding it up?

Mr. ALLISON: In this House last year—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): My opening remarks this evening ought to deal with the subject on which the member for Mount Gambier made his opening remarks. He referred to communism and how it was a threat to this country. I believe we ought to take time out now and again to examine this matter. I should say that things such as low wages and bad conditions, unemployment, poverty and prostitution breed communism. That is the sort of thing at which we ought to be looking, not arguing the point in this House about whether the Government is communist or socialist. What a lot of rot! I point out that communism, in its real structure, has taken over countries such as Russia, which, before communism, was riddled by the problems to which I have already referred. It took over in China, where the same thing existed, and it also took over in Cuba and Vietnam.

I believe that the answer to communism is removing the evils that make it. For example, we, as a democratic country, if we are to overcome communism, ought to be paying more attention to improving the conditions obtaining in those countries where communism has taken over. I point out, for example, that the United States of America has done very little regarding the communist threat to South Vietnam. All it has done is set up Air Vice-Marshal Ky in a delicatessen in America. That was its answer to communism. We should never forget that Air Vice-Marshal Ky was a self-professed supporter of Adolf Hitler.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He was a Liberal, too, wasn't he?

Mr. MAX BROWN: He could have been, but he was not very liberal with the working conditions of his people. I know the member for Eyre will be leaving in a moment, but perhaps while he is here we should mention his continual interjections and ravings, when he produces the rules and the constitution of the Australian Labor Party. I notice he has not yet produced the constitution



of the Liberal Party. If the Liberal Party has one, it probably changes so often, with consequent reprinting, that it is never available. From time to time the member for Eyre talks about the rules of the A.L.P. and signing the pledge. I do not deny any of those things. I have been a financial member of a trade union since 1952, and I am still a financial member.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And proud of it.

Mr. MAX BROWN: And proud of it. I have been a financial member of the A.L.P. for a similar period.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And proud of that, too.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. MAX BROWN: I believe that any member of those organisations would be proud to stand by the rules, the constitution, and the policies adopted by majority vote. I am perturbed about the actions of some people who originally were workers and sons of workers and who have sold out the cause. I refer, for example, to Sir John Kerr. I want it placed on record that Sir John Kerr was the son of a boilermaker. He became an industrial lawyer, was an advocate for the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and rose to the position of Chief Justice.

Mr. Whitten: On the workers' backs.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is quite right. It is a pity that such people do not remember where they were born. Sir John Egerton must get an honourable mention. I knew him years ago.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We will not hold that against you.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am sure that the Minister will not. I remember vividly that members of the Opposition in this House and of the Country Party in Queensland branded John Egerton as a raving communist. God help the Communist Party if that should be so.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is another one of their mistakes.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Quite so. The record should be put straight. With other speakers, I express my condolences to wives and families of those former members of Parliament who died during the recess. I want to mention briefly the untimely retirement of the former Governor, Sir Douglas Nicholls. Sir Douglas Nicholls was a great credit to our Aboriginal race. Unfortunately, some people (some white people) and some members of this House keep repeating, for example, that the Aboriginal race is a dirty race. In some instances we could say that our own race is a dirty one, and perhaps we should be looking at that.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Come on, Bill, don't be a bloody scapegoat.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Transport must withdraw that term. It is unparliamentary.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I withdraw it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

Mr. MAX BROWN: In a grievance debate last week I mentioned the unemployment position, and I make no apologies for referring to it again, because I believe it is the most important issue facing this country. The number of people unemployed at present is about 330 000, and with retrenchments in the car industry and, in my own

city, in the steel industry and the shipbuilding industry, I do not know what the figure will be by the end of the year. Without painting the picture too black, it seems that, for example, the figures in Whyalla at the end of the year will be astronomical.

I refer to an item in the *News* on July 20, 1977, headed "Government probe on Whyalla jobs". I have never heard or read such a lot of bunkum as that which came back from Senator Cotton in Canberra on the unemployment position in Whyalla. The article states:

The Federal Government will carry out a special survey of employment problems and job opportunities in Whyalla. That amazes me. The Government in this State has been carrying out such a survey for nearly 12 months. Why should we have another? The article states:

Last month unemployment in Whyalla rose by 10 per cent, and the shipyard is gradually speeding up the retrenchment of workers as it moves towards a close-down by the middle of next year.

I believe, as do many other people in Whyalla, that the matter should be looked at now. We should be looking at what will take its place and how to correct the position. The article continues:

In June, unemployment in Whyalla rose to 1 162—with 527 males registered as unemployed and 635 females. At the same time job vacancies fell to a low of 29—14 for males and 15 for females. There are 783 people registered as receiving unemployment relief.

I point out that those figures are increasing at present at the rate of about 30 a month. The report continues:

The big problem is that with the shipyard scaling down its operations there is no alternative work with subcontractors in the city.

When the shipyard was at its peak it directly employed between 1 600 and 1 800 men and was the instigator and the reason for subcontractors establishing themselves in Whyalla, those subcontractors employed between 600 and 800 men. Perhaps someone can explain where and how an alternative to this position can come about. How do we establish an alternative industry that can employ as many people?

The Leader of the Opposition visited Whyalla and went on record in the local press, as I have already stated, saying that with the shipyard closing the employment situation was terrible. However, when a reporter asked the Leader what he could do about it he said nothing could be done. Yet we have heard the Leader of the Opposition on radio, television, and in the newspapers continually saying that the State Labor Government's policies are wrong, invariably knocking South Australia, and supporting the policies of the Fraser regime. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition should start to reappraise the situation, especially if he thinks that he is going to be the Leader of an alternative Government in this State. Also, I refer to the general situation in the city of Whyalla.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

Mr. MAX BROWN: Obviously, the Opposition does not like what I am saying and does not like our opposition to its policies.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much private conversation. The honourable member for Whyalla has the floor.

Mr. MAX BROWN: A report appeared in the *News* of July 26 headed "B.H.P. sack 29 at shipyard", and I express real regret about the situation there. Part of the article states:



Fourteen Whyalla shipyard plumbers and 15 boiler-makers have been given a month's notice. Plumbers and Gasfitter's Union Secretary, Mr. Ross Nuske, said they had not been offered alternative employment.

This was a stipulation made by B.H.P. in the initial stages regarding the closure of the shipyard. The report continues:

Several drawing office employees have been transferred. The plumbers were given notice on Friday and the boiler-makers yesterday.

Another important comment in that report is as follows:

Three senior staff men have also been given notice. Laying off of labour and transferring to other B.H.P. plants is expected to intensify to a rate of 60 a month during the remainder of the year following the signing of a redundancy agreement by the unions and B.H.P.

I have been associated for years with many of these people, and I point out that many of these tradesmen and staff employees of the shipyard were recruited to Whyalla from all over Australia and, in many instances, from all over the world. Over 60 different nationalities were recruited to work in Whyalla because of the expertise of these people in building ships. The people who were originally put off at the shipyard were, in effect, staff men, men specially trained in the drawing office, or naval architects. These were the men with real expertise in the industry who felt the brunt of initial retrenchments.

About 12 months ago we got an inkling of what was going to happen, because the Whyalla shipbuilding and engineering works failed to meet anything like its quota of apprenticeships. This is important to a decentralised industry, and to people who are depending upon that industry in a decentralised zone, because it deprives young people between the ages of 16 and 18 of the opportunity of obtaining an apprenticeship. Once a lad has lost the opportunity to become an apprentice, he has lost that opportunity for all time. He can never go back and start again. That is the calamity and the real bugbear facing Whyalla at present.

I point out now, and I have also stated this publicly in Whyalla, that I have tried in many instances to assist these people faced with redundancy which, unfortunately, can hit everyone. Staff men from the company are now facing the dole. By staff men, I mean people of long-standing in the shipyard and engineering works who are now facing either the dole or the prospect of shifting from the city of Whyalla altogether. At this time there should be a real study of the needs of the shipyard industry. I have said often that I believe that trade unions have to accept the fact that industrial unrest should be kept to a minimum, that trade unions should use industrial disputes for the real issues of the working class people, and that they should maintain a public respect for the trade union movement. I believe that they must accept amalgamation of unions: in some instances the trade union movement has accepted a basis of amalgamation only to be thwarted by Federal colleagues of Opposition members.

Mr. Olson: Do you think Fraser will let that industry go to the wall?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am convinced that Fraser, Lynch, and their colleagues have about as much interest in having a shipbuilding industry in this country as they have in the unemployment question; they have no interest in those matters or in people at all, and I am convinced that the only thing in which they are interested at present is uranium mining in order to solve their problems.

Mr. McRae: That doesn't solve the problem.

Mr. MAX BROWN: No, it does not. Unfortunately, there are too many awards in the shipbuilding industry. I have said it before, say it now, and will probably say it

again in future. The alternative to the present situation is industrial agreements, which can be signed and then operate for a period of not less than three years. Also, management is as much at fault as is anyone. Generally, it must accept that administration of the yard at Whyalla is far too top-heavy.

Some years ago when I was an employee at the Whyalla works, the company saw fit to bring one fitter and turner in to work all day Saturday and Sunday at penalty rates. At the same time five administrators were present to see that he did his job for those two days, a ratio of one to five. Each of the five administrators was paid overtime, so how can an industry survive economically in such a situation? I believe that shipbuilders must accept that money must be continually ploughed back into the industry, especially at Whyalla. Also, shipowners must accept that ships for Australia must be built in Australia.

Mr. Olson: It wouldn't be a bad idea if they manned them with Australian seamen too.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is correct. A situation similar to that which I have described is not uncommon in most shipyards throughout the world, and why it is not accepted in this country, I do not know. Japan has led the world in shipbuilding for some time, and in its agreement is included a clause that no Japanese shipowner can build a ship outside Japan. We are competing against that sort of situation, so we have to realize that such a clause must be included in our agreements.

It seems at this stage that under Fraser we are not intended to have any shipyards in this country. A recent recommendation of the Joint House Committee of the Federal Government stated that in America, if a shipyard ceased to operate and closed down, it would take about three years to re-open it. Ironically, it is estimated that it would take five years to do the same in this country. That means from a defence point of view that this country would not be truly defended should war occur. No-one is suggesting that we should be at war, but the fact remains that that is the situation. I believe that the solution to the shipbuilding problem at Whyalla would be the placing of a ship order. There is no other solution to the problem. The Hon. Mr. Whyte in another place suggested that windmills should be built there, and others have suggested that nails and other such items should be manufactured there, but that is a lot of rubbish.

I believe that a ship order could be forthcoming, if some sense was applied to the situation. Also, some action along the lines that I have suggested concerning trade unions, shipowners, and shipbuilders, should be pursued. A more positive attitude should be adopted immediately by the Federal Government towards manufacturing industries generally, and it should adopt a more humane attitude towards the unemployed of this country. I refer now to B.H.P.'s alternative to the shipbuilding works—steel. However, I point out that B.H.P. and this country generally have problems in selling steel, because there has been a general down-turn in the sale of steel. I think the *Financial Review* of this week pointed out that B.H.P. shares have shown a fall as a result of the down-turn in steel prices.

Mr. Nankivell: All steel, or Australian steel? Our steel is too dear.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I think it referred to Australian steel. A few months ago I attended a function at the launching of the latest B.H.P. owned ship built in Whyalla, in all the years that I have been in Whyalla, this was the first time that I have seen so many B.H.P. directors in the same place. Each of them spoke to me and I

believe showed great concern at problems the company was facing not only in shipbuilding but also in the steel industry.

Mr. Harrison: And in their own jobs!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Perhaps, I do not know. One of the directors, who had just returned from Brazil, pointed out to me that one of the greatest opposition countries in selling steel was Brazil. He said that the steel-maker employer had no problem about the work force, as throughout the countryside workers lived in dug-outs and owned nothing but a mule. This is the country that provides most opposition to B.H.P. in selling its steel. I wonder whether Opposition members would expect the Australian society and the work force of this country to accept the living standards of the Brazilian work force. During our discussion this executive laughed about Mr. Fraser's reported threat to the French Government whilst he was overseas that he would consider seriously stopping steel sales to France if that country was not willing to accept certain trading conditions with Australia. To the B.H.P. that was laughable, because the amount of steel it sold to France was negligible. The crux of the present problem is that people such as Fraser and Lynch are doing everything possible to get the work force of this country to accept a lower standard of living. I do not know whether the Fraser regime would let things deteriorate to the level applying in Brazil, but it intends to allow the number of unemployed to grow further and further until, somewhere along the line, the work force of this country accepts a lower standard of living than that applying at present. It would be much better if the Federal Government tried to improve the standard of living of countries in trading opposition to us. Any other alternative means a decrease in our living standards. Inflation and unemployment are wellknown bedmates. An editorial, headed "Worth the Sacrifice", appeared in the *News* of July 26. The heading suggests that we should accept a lower living standard to solve the problems of the country. The first part of the editorial states:

Looking behind the latest cost-of-living figures, it is plain that improvement is as yet more potential than real. In other words, even the writer of that editorial is not convinced that Fraser and Lynch have the final answer to inflation. That statement in that editorial means nothing. The second part of the editorial, headed "Challenge", states:

The first requirement is another sensible decision by the Arbitration Commission pegging any pay increases below the full index figure. It will mean a sacrifice, but it will be worth it. The challenge before all Australians now is not to weaken.

If we can hang on for another six months we can beat inflation, and then look forward to an end to the recession that it caused. That surely is worth more than chasing after pay rises worth little more than a packet or two of cigarettes and which are quickly eaten away in a new burst of inflation.

That part of the editorial simply endeavours to blackmail our arbitration system. In the main, the trade union movement accepted quarterly cost-of-living adjustments only after long, hard and bitter consideration. Generally speaking, employers, too, have found them less unpalatable than any alternative. Further, the Arbitration Court continues to accept the idea of these quarterly adjustments. The only ones who are still not accepting them are Fraser and Lynch. The Federal Government and State Governments attempted to curb inflation through a price-wage freeze, but it did not really get off the ground, and I can understand why. I will deal particularly with wages, because I understand that aspect of the matter.

It is well known that the metal trades award is the mother of all awards. Over the years the metal trades award, particularly in the tradesman field, has suffered most. It was used in the arbitration system as the yardstick, and other awards have benefited by it. Metal tradesmen generally are about \$20 a week worse off in real wages than are corresponding workers under other awards. The trade union movement has argued in the arbitration system for wages based on what it costs for a man, his wife, and two children to live at a reasonable standard. Members opposite have paid much attention to over-award payments. Originally, such payments came into being as a result of employers competing for labour.

Over many years the Arbitration Court has refused to adopt a humane attitude toward wage fixation. I can vividly recall claims being made to the court over a long period, and the decisions provided for wages far below those claimed. Also, the unions had to wait for, say, five years to get a case before the court. Not only did they have to wait but also the claim was based on what was a reasonable figure five years before the decision. So, the arbitration system has something to answer for. At present the arbitration system, through quarterly wage adjustments, is showing a much more realistic attitude than it did previously. I believe that, but I still believe that we ought, at this time, to pay attention to the fact that in the wage field there are still anomalies. Unfortunately, it will go down on record that when the Whitlam Government wanted the right to have a wage-price freeze the people of this country refused.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Because of the Liberal Campaign.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, and it was a very vicious Liberal campaign. In the final analysis not only did it confuse the people of this country but it also confused the Liberals themselves. If we look at the situation we find that it was not very long after the Liberal Party got into power that it wanted that right itself, so I wonder whether it did not confuse itself on the whole issue. I do not think we should forget that people must generally accept that the answer in many ways to inflation is price and wage control, not one way or the other. There will be anomalies in the wage field when that comes about, and I am hopeful that whoever brings that into being will realise that those anomalies are there and will do something about them.

I turn now to an important matter—workmen's compensation. We have heard over a long period from members opposite about workmen's compensation in this State outpricing industry. I believe that is absolute tommy rot. I will point out some of the anomalies that existed long before this Government brought down what I believe is a more humane and decent workmen's compensation Bill to cover the workforce of this State. I can recall, under the old Act, workers being run over by trucks (negligence being served up to them in no uncertain manner) and having to spend years endeavouring to overcome their plight because of a work injury they had received. I am appalled by that sort of thing, and I believe that this Government has endeavoured its utmost in the time it has been in power to produce a Workmen's Compensation Act which is humane and proper and which assures proper payments to workmen who have sustained injuries in their work.

I point out to the House that I have had six cases coming to my office in the past fortnight regarding workmen's compensation. I do not deny in raising this matter that the cases I mention tonight are cases under the old Act. I

deplore what I consider to be a lack of action by the legal profession in those cases. In one case, about nine years has elapsed and there is still no settlement. In another case seven years has elapsed, and in yet another six years has elapsed. I believe that that is an absolute affront to the workers involved. I am beginning to think (maybe wrongly, I do not know) that lawyers over the years have misled the workers they have had as clients. I am inclined to believe that they have advised the workers involved not to settle the claim because they in some way were going to get a mammoth financial settlement out of court for their client. It may be that lawyers generally are relying far too much on what they believe can be arrived at as a settlement of a workmen's compensation claim between an employer and a member of a trade union.

I do not know that they ought to be doing this. The nine-year-old claim, if settled on the payment of nine years ago, because of inflation would be peanuts today. I sincerely believe that the workman in that case has been led up the garden path and that something ought to be done about it. I intend to do something about it, because I believe that it ought to be brought to the notice of the Industrial Court.

I do not know what happens in the metropolitan area, but a matter that concerns me is that the commercial television station in Port Pirie has, over a period of months, been televising what is called an "anti-inflation advertisement". I understand that it is being sponsored by an anti-inflation committee. I do not know who comprises that committee, but I suggest it would not have anything to do with the trade union movement or the workers of this country.

I want to go on record as deploring that committee for its use of seven and eight-year-old children in advertisements about inflation. These children are used in this advertisement to recite phrases such as: "We have to work harder" and "We have to accept less wages". Those seven and eight-year-old boys and girls would know nothing about the situation. They have obviously been given a script and told to use it. There is no mention by the children of the 54 per cent increase in G. J. Coles and Company Limited profits or of the \$39 000 000 that it has made this year.

Mr. Becker: How much capital have they got?

Mr. MAX BROWN: G. J. Coles and Company Limited is in fact an instigator of inflation.

Mr. Becker: They would—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson is out of order. The honourable member for Whyalla has the floor.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I point out, despite the rude interruption by the member for Hanson, that there was no mention by these children of the latest intervention by the Federal Government before the Prices Justification Tribunal hearing into the extravagant spending on advertising by Colgate Palmolive Pty. Ltd. and no mention that that situation ought to be looked at.

Mr. Becker: Kill another industry; go on!

Mr. MAX BROWN: There we have a firm such as Colgate Palmolive Pty. Ltd., which has at least a 50 per cent monopoly of the market for detergents, soap powders and soap, wanting to raise the price of its products.

Mr. Becker: Stupid!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson is out of order. I do not want to warn him. This is the second occasion. The honourable member for Whyalla has the floor.

Mr. MAX BROWN: This is the classic example of what inflation is about. It is a pity that the inflationary committee is sponsoring and using seven and eight-year-old children on a television advertisement and that it did not perhaps have a real look at the question of inflation, rather than continually knock and, as an answer to inflation, say that the work force of this country should accept lower wages and work harder. What a load of garbage! They worked harder, for example, at Chryslers and cars were stockpiled to such an extent that they entrenched 700 employees. It is just too stupid.

I cannot let this opportunity slip by without mentioning the absolutely deplorable situation of the Opposition. It was not so long ago that the Opposition decided to get rid of its then Leader, the member for Light. What did members opposite do with him? They banished him over there in the corner, and we can hardly see him.

Mr. Whitten: But he still performs better than Ocker.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is probably correct; I would not deny that for a moment. Also, they got rid of, unfortunately, the member for Torrens. I will deal with him because of all members opposite I believe he has shown a much better understanding of, for example, the trade union movement, the industrial situation, and the award situation, and yet they get rid of him just because he is too old, and the member for Davenport, the know-all, replaces him.

Mr. Whitten: Where did they find him?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I wish they would lose him—the know-all of the industrial situation in this country! He knows absolutely nothing about industrial relationships; he has no idea. I probably have dealt in my time with what would be regarded in the trade union movement as the most vicious employer in this country; I make no bones about that—Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited would be regarded in the trade union movement as the most vicious employer in the country, and yet at no stage of that relationship between me as the trade union leader and the B.H.P. has that company put up as an answer to industrial problems the matters that have been raised by the member for Davenport in this House.

Mr. Dean Brown: Let us get it clear: you say that the B.H.P. company is the most vicious employer in the State?

Mr. MAX BROWN: There is a simple answer to it because those people in that situation know full well that the policies enunciated by the member for Davenport in this House, such as strike-breaking and the breaking of picket lines, will fail as far as industrial relationships are concerned; and yet we have to put up with this mammoth lot of tommyrot from a person who is in a responsible position and should know better. He can laugh if he likes, but that is the cold situation. If he ever became the Minister of Labour and Industry in this State (not that it would ever happen) there is no doubt in my mind that we would go through some of the greatest industrial unrest ever witnessed in this State.

I conclude on this point, which has been dealt with before by my colleagues on this side of the House. As regards the decision by the Opposition to get rid of members like the member for Murray and the member for Gouger, perhaps it could be said that the people in their wisdom will be proved right because those members may have been got rid of through the ballot-box. We do not know and probably never shall know, but I end on this note: I wonder what the member for Glenelg is thinking, because he got out from under somewhere along

the line by a technicality. I do not think he should ever forget that situation as long as he lives, because obviously in some way—financially, physically, or mentally, he has beaten the system. I do not think he should ever forget that. I support the motion.

Mr. BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

On a point of order, I think the motion that the House do now adjourn should not be put but whoever is first speaker in the grievance debate should be called on. If the motion to adjourn the House is put at this stage—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are no speakers at the moment for the debate. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to raise two matters, the first being a matter raised by the member for Stuart today. He stated that we on this side of the House were creating fear in the community about crime, rape, and other matters. There is a just reason for this fear in our society and, if the representation comes from people who express that fear, I believe their representation should be recognised and recorded. I will give just one example that came to me today from the headmaster of a high school, where a young man, at 10 a.m. on Tuesday of this week, was walking to school. He is 19 years of age and has been in this State for two months. He had matriculated in another State, started a university course, came to this State, and decided he would get higher qualifications in his matriculation to do the course of his choice at a university. I say that to show that he had no opportunity in that time to make enemies that were likely to take the action that was taken against him on the main Shepherds Hill Road this week.

Some louts in a motor car pulled up alongside this young man, abused him, and called him all the names they could think of to try to upset him. He decided to take to a side street to get away from them by walking into Sherbourne Road; the louts followed him, attacked him, pulled a knife on him (this was in broad daylight) and he had no other way of escape but to try to break free, which he eventually did, and ran through the Botanic Garden to the school. The police were there within 10 minutes and everyone was thankful that they were there in that time, but the persons were not caught.

In Happy Valley the other weekend, 15 houses were broken into in one night. I have made comments about altering the Registration of Dogs Act so that there is more control from the councils, and I thought while I was door-knocking in any area I would ask why people were keeping larger dogs and why more people were keeping dogs than in the past, because I thought there must be more reason for them doing that than merely companionship.

In most cases where people kept large dogs (without naming the breed, in particular) the answer given was that it was for protection and security, because they were fearful of what was happening in their community, with the incidence of rape, people breaking into houses and stealing and damaging property, and people being molested. With the way in which our society has gone, there has been more crime, as well as more crime of a serious nature. Why does the member for Stuart say that we, as members elected to represent the people, should not make that statement in the House or anywhere else where it is likely to gain publicity?

If the Government is not conscious of the concern in the community, let it say so. If it is conscious of it, it should not hide the fact, but say it will do something about it. The Government is able to give guidance, direction and advice to the community, but it fails to do so. The member for Stuart says that we are scare-mongering, but the kind of thing I have referred to can happen. He thinks that a young person cannot walk to school on a main road in broad daylight and be fearful that he will be molested by a mob of louts. He thinks that it should not be broadcast to the community so that others may be on the lookout and realise that their children might be bashed up or attacked with a knife. He thinks that that should not be mentioned. He thinks that the Government, politicians, and authorities should not worry about it or recognise it, and that we should cast it aside and say that it does not matter. What kind of members do we elect to Parliament? If the member for Unley were on the Opposition side of the House and if this kind of thing were happening in Unley, he would be the first to make representations in the strongest possible terms.

Mr. Langley: I'd use common sense, and that's more than you do.

Mr. EVANS: I have not blamed the Government, but to say that this matter should not be brought to the notice of Parliament, the community and the press is wrong. There is a need for this matter to be brought forward, because our society lives in fear.

Mr. Langley: Hooley!

Mr. Tonkin: He said, "Hooley".

Mr. EVANS: The member for Unley says that it is hooley (not Hughie, who I think is conscionable enough to understand that there is a fear in the community).

Mr. Keneally: Engendered by you people.

Mr. EVANS: When people are fearful of leaving their homes at night without a dog or some warning device to protect them, it is a sad state of affairs. People are paying up to \$1 500 or \$2 000 to install security devices in their homes. They are not doing that for the love of putting money into the hands of some enterprising salesman or because they want their houses to be broken into. They are doing it because they have a fear that their houses will be broken into. When people have to go to that extreme to protect their property, their lives and their families' lives, it is a sorry state of affairs. I do not wish to argue that point with the member for Stuart, other than to point out to him that he was trying to push under the carpet the one thing our society really wants: above all else people want personal security, as well as security of their property, assets and livelihood. We must do anything we can to highlight those situations where our security is being destroyed or undermined, as has happened.

It gives me no great pleasure to point out that last Saturday evening, in a little town like Stirling, two plainclothes constables who were not recognised as such but who walked into a small store were attacked by young people who perhaps wanted some kicks. I commend the police for the attitude they took in getting someone to call for a patrol to attend the scene. An eye witness of the incident said that he commended the young plainclothes constables for all that they did to protect themselves and not retaliate against those who were trying to kick and belt them. I also commend the young constables because, being dressed in plain clothes, they would not have been recognised by their attackers as police officers.

The young constables did not make use of their ability to attack back; rather, they called for help, and held the offenders at bay until help arrived. Those two young men could have been innocent citizens. This Government cannot hide behind the fact that there is a feeling of insecurity in our society, and the one thing that it, as a Government, should accept is the responsibility to give its people security. That is the greatest asset a community can have.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I wish this evening to comment on what the member for Hanson, who is now leaving the Chamber, called the new, revamped policies of the Liberal Party, and particularly on the industrial relations policy that was released last Sunday by the Leader of the Opposition. Although the Leader was given credit in the *Sunday Mail* for it, the member for Davenport has since claimed the responsibility therefor. I was impressed with one of the things that the Leader said last week. I heard this on the radio early in the morning on my way into this place. The Leader quoted Abraham Lincoln, as follows:

You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time.

It seems that the Leader of the Opposition, and his cohort the member for Davenport, are trying to do that with their continual union bashing. Although I cannot deal with all the points contained in their industrial relations policy, I should like to pick out a few of them. The Leader said:

It will prevent the use of industrial muscle.

Then, a report in Monday's *Advertiser* stated: "We will have a law on union strikes, says Libs." Let us see what is happening regarding strikes. I should like to quote a few figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. I will deal also with strikes and loss of production. I do so because this afternoon the member for Mount Gambier quoted a report from the *Border Watch*, and I should like to do the same. The Leader of the Opposition was reported to have said:

A State Liberal Government would recognise the important need and give the responsibility of productivity to a specific Minister. The productivity was the key to the control of inflation and unemployment.

Let us examine what sort of production has been lost in Australia in 1976, the last year for which one can obtain statistics. When I refer to "man days", I am talking about an eight-hour day. In 1976, 300 000 people were unemployed and 68 400 000 man days were lost. When I speak of the man days lost and the 300 000 unemployed last year, I am taking account of the four weeks annual leave and the average sick leave. Sick leave accounted for 20 000 000 man days, about 3½ or four days a year sick leave for a person in industry. Industrial accidents took care of 3 500 000 man days. In 1976, 131 900 000 man days were lost, half of which were caused by Fraser's unemployment policies.

Mr. Becker: How would you know?

Mr. WHITTEN: There are plenty of figures to prove it. During 1976, incredible though it maybe, we lost 132 000 000 man days, but the loss of production as a result of strike action was only 3 800 000. That is what members opposite are so afraid of. They say that strikes are rife. Bjelke-Petersen, that extreme right-wing fascist, says that army units should be brought in to break strikes, and that is what they want to do.

Mr. Becker: That's Millhouse's tactics.

Mr. WHITTEN: The member for Hanson is making disparaging remarks about the member for Mitcham, but I cannot be responsible for what he says. I am talking of that fascist in Queensland. It is obvious to me, and would be obvious even to a person with a limited knowledge of arithmetic, that strikes are not the cause of lost production; it is the deliberately caused policies of the Liberal Party, Fraser in the main.

Mr. Mathwin: He's a comedian.

Mr. WHITTEN: Let us consider secret ballots. The member for Glenelg might wish to come in on this matter. What I say was borne out last night by the member for Florey, who gave a good run-down on how union ballots are conducted. In my organisation, every financial member has a right to vote. He is told by notice that there is to be a ballot and that he can apply for a ballot-paper. What happened in Glenelg when the Liberal Party conducted a ballot for preselection? It was said that it was not democratic. The member for Glenelg said, "I got done, so I want a re-run." Perhaps he is right that it was undemocratic and it was crook, because otherwise he must have been crook in getting in. It is unfortunate that the member for Gouger has gone. Of course, he will be gone after the election, too. In the preselection ballot he said, "I was beaten because it was undemocratic. It wasn't fair that Boundy beat me, and I'm going to run against him." This is the Liberal Party. Members opposite have the hypocrisy to talk about things being undemocratic when their own members say that things are crook.

In the last preselection ballot I did not hear the defeated candidate say he would run or that it was crook. It appears that the member for Mallee, with his re-endorsement, cannot be such a bad bloke, forgetting what was done tonight on Ocker's instructions. Let us look at the preselection ballot for Murray. It was said there, "It's undemocratic, it's crook, I got done." The Leader of the Opposition the other day mentioned a small vote in the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. It was a small vote, but I have not heard members opposite condemning local government elections and the restricted franchise. At least every member in our organisation has a right to vote. Yet we were told that we should go and vote. What happened when we tried to pass the adult franchise Bill? The Opposition tried to stop it; obviously, it does not want people to vote, and it still cannot get people to vote.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They have gerrymandered so many boundaries—

Mr. WHITTEN: I agree with what the Minister has said. The Opposition is adept at the gerrymander, and it expects to keep on gerrymandering even in its own Party. Regarding my own organisation and union, there has been a call for a court-controlled ballot, and inspectors from the Commonwealth Arbitration and Conciliation Commission have been trying to look into things to see what

has happened. However, I point out that not one complaint has been lodged by any member of my union. The candidates in this election both said that they were satisfied, and they made no complaint whatever.

This situation merely shows the interference of the Liberal Party in its efforts to interfere with the internal workings of a trade union, something about which it knows nothing, and it should keep its nose right out of it. All members opposite know about is undemocratic elections in their own Party. The member for Glenelg said, "I was defeated; it is undemocratic; give me a re-run and I may have a chance to get up." I am pleased the honourable member got the chance to get up and will be with us for another three years.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): I rise to make some brief comment in relation to the strange behaviour we saw in this House today by the member for Mitcham. It is a great pity that the honourable member, comfortably at home in bed no doubt, is not likely to be aware of this point I want to make. However, it surprised me somewhat to hear his remarks in relation to the no-confidence motion moved by the Opposition this afternoon. The honourable member made clear that he considered that a no-confidence motion on the matter was not warranted. Nevertheless, the honourable member concluded that, because he was not particularly happy about it, and because he considered that the Opposition was entitled to question the Government on the matter, the only way that he could express his view was to vote in favour of the motion.

It is strange that the Opposition moved this serious motion against the Government calling on the Premier to resign when its own members were not all present for the final vote. We can see how seriously they took the motion. What amused me about the situation was that last week the member for Mitcham used the same form of argument, saying that the no-confidence motion moved by the Opposition was completely unjustified and not worthy of his support and, accordingly, he absented himself from the vote. It was suggested by members on this side that, to be consistent, he ought to do exactly the same thing in relation to the motion moved today.

I suspect that the honourable member is starting to lose his grip because, up to 12 months ago, he was most effectively using his powers in this Parliament to control the Opposition generally, promoting motions and requiring the Opposition most reluctantly to vote with him so that it could not be seen by the community to be supporting the Government; he was in a delightful position. As I say, it seems that the honourable member is losing his touch because, clearly, he is certainly running out of Parties. He has now reached the situation where the dog is starting to wag the tail. It is clear to everyone that the only reason he voted for the Opposition today was to be seen not to be supporting Government, or otherwise taking some step to attack the Government. It is unfortunate that he did it in this way. It is suggested that perhaps Chipp may have given him the message but, on reading of the financial difficulties of Chipp's Party, it seems that we may not hear much from that group in future. It seems to me that it is wrong to use this Parliament to express a point of view and then cast the vote in another way.

Having made what could be considered to be an unkind comment about the member for Mitcham, on another issue I defend him in some respect. I want to defend him not as the member for Mitcham but as a member

of this Parliament. I believe an incident occurred recently that was an attack on a member of Parliament, and all members should give it close scrutiny. I refer to an editorial in the *News* of Wednesday, July 6, headed "A fanciful claim", which, in part, states:

It is not often this newspaper feels forced to publish an editorial to rebut allegations made against us, especially by politicians. But a statement by Mr. Millhouse in 5DN's news session yesterday was so blatantly untrue that he must be answered. He said, in effect, that the two articles on crime and violence published in the *News* on June 20 and 21 were "manufactured" to form a basis for a campaign for the Liberal Party against the Dunstan Government.

The editorial concludes:

If Mr. Millhouse thinks the articles were "manufactured" for some ulterior purpose, he is wrong. And if he continues to make such fanciful statements he can only embarrass the latest party he is running with.

Because I did not hear the 5DN report relating to the member for Mitcham, I thought it must have been a powerful statement for the *News* to take the trouble to run a full editorial attacking his claim, but later I found that all that the member for Mitcham had said was that he considered that the articles about crime and violence published in the *News* were manufactured to form a basis for a campaign for the Liberal Party against the Dunstan Government. I think many people in the community seem to have come to that conclusion. The two campaigns (a) by the *News* and (b) by the Opposition seemed to fit together snugly, but one could only say that perhaps it was a coincidence. However, since then I have read in the *National Review* some of the background by a reporter that I thought threw further light on the matter.

Mr. Becker: Did Bruce Muirden write it?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, it was written by him and, if the honourable member will listen, he will realise that it is an interesting article. It refers to the relationship between 5DN and the *News*, and then states:

What has now bugged the *News* management is a (repeated) news item that the *News* was acting as a stooge for the South Australian Liberal Party. The item was a statement by Robin Millhouse, a former Liberal and now a leading Chippocrat, on a current campaign run in the *News* on community violence. Millhouse thought the campaign was a "beat up", cynically staged to set the ground for a Liberal Laura Norder election plank.

Later it states:

DN news did not give the Millhouse comment on the *News'* campaigning until it had rung the *News* for a comment. There was none, so the item went on at midday. It provoked a lively afternoon. The dog-eat-dog blasphemy brought good guy DN manager Paul Linkson to the phone to receive a blast from *News* Managing Editor Ron Boland. Boland wanted the item canned.

This was on the day before the editorial. The article continues:

DN news editor Des Ryan stood firm, and it appears that Linkson, caught in the middle, backed his own boy and declined to intervene in the steamy politics. The Millhouse item reappeared on evening prime time radio news.

The member for Mitcham made a statement that he was entitled to make. It seemed curious that two campaigns, by the *News* and the Liberal Party, on crime and violence were running together. The *News* sought to have the item taken off the radio station. Why would it take that step if it had nothing to be ashamed of? After that failed, it took the serious step of running a whole editorial the next day denying that this was the case. The least we can say is that it protested too much. It made a major attempt,

first, to can the story and, secondly, to assure the community that it was not acting in a political way. A letter to the *News* by 26 Adelaide lawyers states:

We wish to convey our support for the stand taken by Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.P., relating to the sensational reporting of crime by the *News* and to express our opposition to the current so-called law and order campaign which certain people are seeking to promote.

I have no ambition to defend the member for Mitcham on any matter, but there is a warning to all members in this issue.

Motion carried.

At 10.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 28, at 2 p.m.