

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 29, 1970

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In this morning's *Advertiser* it was reported that Dr. Breuning would undertake a preliminary inquiry to revise the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, with financial feasibility a prime consideration. It was also announced that the Government intended to introduce its measure to establish a State Government insurance office in South Australia. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends undertaking a financial feasibility study in relation to this matter?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The matter dealt with in the Leader's question is not under my direct control, but I shall be happy to find out the information for him and bring it down.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SPEECHES

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I direct my question to the Chief Secretary and seek leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I realize that the Chief Secretary is very busy at the moment, but has he observed the statements made yesterday in this Council by the three honourable members who addressed it on matters that I thought were of some importance? Has the Chief Secretary read those statements? Has he any comment to make?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member is quite right when he says I am busy: every Minister is busy. I rarely have time to read the morning newspaper before evening, other than looking at the headlines on the front page. I have not had time to read this morning's paper yet but I will look with interest at what the honourable member has drawn my attention to.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek further leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I would not want the Chief Secretary to waste his time looking

for any report of the three speeches made in this Chamber yesterday, because there was absolutely no reference in the *Advertiser* to the fact that the Legislative Council existed. Can the Chief Secretary say whether reports on Legislative Council proceedings can be published in the daily press as a result of the media provided by the Government for Ministers?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will be happy to find out; indeed, I will be happy to take it further. I do not mind taking up the matter with the Editor of the *Advertiser* to see whether space can be given to reports of the valuable addresses that are sometimes given in this place.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to report on Dr. Breuning's qualifications to conduct a financial feasibility study into a transportation system that includes capsules and dialled buses?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the progress being made on the new Government Printing Office?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Contract documents to enable the calling of tenders are now virtually complete. It is reasonable to anticipate that a contract will be let for construction of the new printing office building and that construction will be complete by the end of 1972. Demolition of the existing printing office building could proceed upon the transfer of personnel from that building in 1973. I am sure all honourable members will agree when I say we hope that that programme can be kept.

SEAT BELTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: A report in the daily press on July 17 stated that a taxi driver, whose cab had all the fittings for seat belts but not the belts, had said that he had removed them after buying a new taxi. The taxi driver is reported as saying:

Belts are compulsory fittings in new cabs, but most of us rip them out. They are a nuisance.

Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to investigate this matter, with a view to instructing the Metropolitan Taxi-cab Board to insist that seat belts, which

are required by law to be fitted in new vehicles at the time of purchase, be left in those vehicles for use by passengers? May I be informed of the results of the Minister's deliberations?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

PRESS OFFICERS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I have been informed that certain Commonwealth members of Parliament and certain members of the State Opposition have been issued with press releases from the new Ministerial press officers. Will the Chief Secretary, in consultation with his colleagues, consider issuing such releases to all Opposition members?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know; I do not yet have a press secretary.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are doing very well without one.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know to what extent press releases are made available, but I will see what can be done. I shall be happy to give the honourable member a reply when it is available.

SALISBURY TEACHERS COLLEGE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Two or three weeks ago I had the privilege of going on the annual tour of inspection of the area of the Salisbury City Council. During that inspection I had a fairly close look at the new Salisbury Teachers College. We were able to admire some of the fine new buildings that are already in use but we also noticed quite a number of the temporary buildings of the Wor-Wic type which are being used pending the completion of the college. Will the Chief Secretary ascertain from his colleague when the Salisbury Teachers College is due to be completed and in full use?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall seek an answer from my colleague for the honourable member.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The students and the staff at the college are working under great difficulties at present because construction has not yet been completed, and I think they are bearing their burden very cheerfully in the circumstances. In order to allow the present students to plan adequately for their study routine, their life generally at the college, and

their nearby accommodation, will the Chief Secretary inquire whether the library facilities, even in their present limited form, could be made available in the evenings and, secondly, when canteen amenities of the kind usually provided at such colleges will be available?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to refer the question to my colleague.

COPLEY ROADWORKS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Last time I was in Copley concern was expressed by a number of residents about the eastern approach to the town. Since the acceptance of Arkaroola as a tourist resort, plus an intensified mineral search programme to the east of Copley, this road now carries a considerable amount of traffic. This approach to the town has been designed with a very sharp bend, and people there are of the opinion that it would be better to have visitors arrive a little bit faster than on a stretcher. There have been many accidents at this particular approach, and I understand that some thought has been given to it by the Highways Department over an extended period and that there has been an approach to the Commonwealth Railways with a view to having the road resited further along the railway line. However, nothing seems to be taking place, despite the inquiries I have made elsewhere, and I would appreciate an answer from the Minister as to what progress has been made with the resiting or realignment of this road.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will refer the question to the Minister of Roads and Transport and bring back a reply.

DOMICILIARY CARE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Chief Secretary tell me what progress has been made on the structuring and establishment of domiciliary care units in South Australia?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I understand that there has been planning at various hospitals, and I think this is what the Leader has in the back of his mind. I am sure that he, too, would know that such planning is taking place in about half a dozen different hospitals. I do not know what stage this planning has reached, but I will have inquiries made and bring back a reply.

MOTOR ACCESSORY BUSINESS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary representing the Minister of Development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On the motoring page of the *News* of July 17 there was a story concerning a 19-year-old Adelaide youth who had just returned from an American business trip with orders which, he claimed, would establish a multi-million dollar motor accessory business in South Australia. The youth's name was Gordon Filmer, who was quoted in the press on that day as saying that he had designed a transistor ignition system that was already on sale in South Australia. He also claimed that he had orders for millions of another invention of his, namely, a battery charger, which he could market in the United States of America at half the price of the cheapest model now selling there. He believed that these two inventions could be the basis for a multi-million dollar industry here. The press report continues:

With future prospects looking extremely lucrative, Gordon is concerned that the firm stay completely South Australian. We want this industry as a boost to the South Australian economy. This is most important to us.

The same youth appeared last night on the television programme *Newsbeat* and this amazing story was related on the programme. He said that he had a further invention, namely, an electronic reactor. When he was asked regarding the possibility of his staying here or taking his inventions and business generally to the U.S.A., he expressed, I believe, some misgivings that people here did not react to new faces, names or ideas. Because of this unique story of a young South Australian man and because of his obvious patriotism to this State, will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Development to have a member of the Minister's departmental staff discuss with Mr. Filmer his business affairs to see whether there is any further assistance that South Australia can render him?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not in a position to say whether a member of the Department of Development will see Mr. Filmer, but I shall be happy at least to refer the whole subject matter to the Premier and suggest that something be arranged if at all possible.

SWAN REACH AREA SCHOOL

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a

question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My question concerns the Swan Reach Area School adjacent to Nildottie. I was telephoned by the chairman of the school committee this morning. As there seems to be some apprehension in the minds of the people there that the building of the proposed new school, which has been the subject of two inquiries by the Public Works Committee, might not proceed, I should like the assurance of the Minister of Education that there is no foundation for the reports that this school will not be built.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will refer the question to the Minister of Education and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. SIR NORMAN JUDE (Southern) obtained leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1969.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 28. Page 316.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): In rising to make a contribution to the debate on this motion, I should like to commence by congratulating His Excellency the Governor's Deputy on the manner in which he opened yet another session of our State Parliament. He is a gentleman who has given very long and distinguished service to this State, not only as Lieutenant-Governor but also formerly as the Chief Justice of this State. He has always been most conscious of the need to maintain the dignity of office. Whilst he occupied the office of Chief Justice, he earned a reputation that extended beyond the borders of this State. He was always conscious of the need to preserve in our community the rule of law, particularly at times such as the present when, to use his own words at a recent ceremony, a spirit of unrest was abroad in the land.

I should like also to congratulate the Ministers in this Chamber on their appointments to office. They have all, of course, had previous Ministerial experience, in this Chamber or in another place, and we look forward to efficient work in their departments. I welcome for the first time to this Chamber the Hon. Mr. Casey, who comes to us from another place. He seems to have settled

down very well to the work of his department and to have assumed a certain confidence already. I refer to the resignation of our old colleague, the Hon. Mr. Bevan, who served his Party and this Chamber well for many years. We wish him well in his retirement and are somewhat regretful that he felt he should resign prior to this Parliament.

Turning to His Excellency's Speech, we can say that it revealed nothing that was completely new or, perhaps, surprising. In one form or another, we have heard it all before. In fact, there are indications in the Speech that there have been some modifications of previous policies. It is significant that those modifications seem to be in line with attitudes adopted by the Council on past occasions. For instance, in paragraph 9 there is reference to the fact that the Government intends to introduce a Bill to set up a Government insurance office. This is not new, but it is significant to see that in the Speech, it is said there will be no provision for life assurance. That is a modification of previous policy. I understand we shall have the Bill before us shortly, so I do not want to say much about it now, but I must mention one thing about insurance matters generally that I think is important.

It has always seemed to me (I do not know whether the Government has considered this) rather strange that all insurance companies in this State are not compelled to apply for approval as compulsory third party insurers. Many companies, particularly the smaller ones, have not sought such approval, so they do not have to take this kind of insurance risk, which is not regarded as being a profitable form of insurance. This has the effect of placing an unfair burden on those insurance companies which have sought and obtained approval, and therefore must accept the compulsory third party risk. We hear from time to time of certain failures of insurance companies in other States. It may be that this could be brought about by their having to assume responsibilities for this type of insurance, a burden that is not fully and fairly shared by other firms in the field. Perhaps the Government will consider this question.

In paragraph 20 of the Speech there is again a modification in policy because, although that paragraph states that the Government will examine means of bringing all forms of transport under Ministerial control in a Department of Transport so that activity will be properly

co-ordinated, we find no reference there to controls on road transport or the heavy taxation thereof. So, no doubt, another lesson has been learnt from the previous Labor Government's experience in this field.

I approve the statement in paragraph 22, that "the Government is considering the establishment of a State film unit and film studio". I emphasize the word "considering", because it is not a matter into which one should rush without laying sensible and proper foundations. We know that the Commonwealth Government has made available considerable sums of money for the development of this kind of activity. Indeed, the Commonwealth Government itself has a film unit that has not only achieved an excellent reputation here but has also produced films that have won international awards. The personnel selected for setting up any such film unit must be carefully considered, because there is no question that producers and directors of such films are the real key to success. In this State we are fortunate that we have a course in drama at Flinders University; in fact, that is the only university in Australia offering this kind of instruction to undergraduates. South Australia has people who will be able to offer some competent advice to the Government if it decides later to proceed with this matter. Paragraph 31 of the Speech states that the Government intends to introduce adult suffrage and compulsory voting for all council elections. We will need to look carefully at this proposal because I have some grave doubts about it. Sometimes I wonder whether it has been included as a kind of test to see whether this Council will throw it out. I sometimes wonder whether the Government is really sincere in putting forward such a proposal which, as far as I know, has not been implemented elsewhere and has not been recommended by anyone. Council elections have always been based on a household vote.

Paragraph 32 of His Excellency's Speech says that the Government is to renew its proposals for making the age of majority 18 years and, what is more significant, it goes on to say that this new age will apply for all purposes, including voting and contracting. This matter has received much publicity lately. This process started overseas and it seems to have spread to Australia and been taken up by Governments of all political colours. I am not personally opposed to the proposal but it seems strange that it has never been sought by young people, particularly people aged 18 years or 19 years.

I know that teenagers want many things, but I have never heard them say that they really want the right to vote. This seems to be something that the older generation thinks would be good to give to young people. There seems to be a great desire nowadays to be acceptable somehow to young people, to be "with it", as the phrase goes. I understand that this tendency in the older generation is supposed to be based on a kind of inbuilt jealousy, because that generation was unable to have the things that the present younger generation enjoys. So we see the spectacle throughout our society of older people trying somehow to make meaningful contact with young people. We have seen clergymen taking off their collars and joining in teenage dances. I sometimes wonder how genuine the feeling is, because there are divisions in society that are sometimes not easy to bridge. Probably the voting age is the least important of the proposed changes.

Paragraph 32 of the Speech says that the new age of majority is to be "for all purposes". What we will need to consider closely when the legislation reaches us is the contractual capacity of infants, the right to marry (although that does not concern this Parliament), the right to drink liquor, and the right to inherit property (which has received very little mention so far).

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Mr. Beerworth knows something about that.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes; he knows one or two things about that. It will be significant when young people can get their inheritances at 18 instead of 21 years of age. It is said that younger people are better educated nowadays. I am certain that younger people stay at school longer (the statistics show that), but I wonder whether they are really better educated in the true sense of that term. They have certainly taken unto themselves more freedoms, but are they really more sophisticated? Are they not just as susceptible to having something put over them by a vendor of goods as are, say, people of 21 or more years of age? Often, as a result of their very affluence, young people today are less cautious than are their parents, who may not have been as well educated but may be more cautious.

Advertisers of products know only too well how responsive teenagers and young people are to the subtle propaganda they put out to sell goods. Indeed, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has mentioned a recent comment that the Juvenile

Court Magistrate, Mr. Beerworth, made about teenage drinking. He made a very significant point: we always find that, when rights are given to individuals at a particular age, there are always sections that want to anticipate those rights. We always have to have some kind of margin. The speed limit in the metropolitan area is 35 miles an hour, but we are usually allowed a margin of five miles an hour above that without being apprehended or prosecuted. Because the drinking age is 20 years, perhaps not a tremendous amount of effort is spent in stopping people of 18 or 19 years of age from getting liquor. If we establish 18 years (and this matter obviously worries the magistrate) as the age at which people may drink in public and obtain liquor, then the real problem will be: what about the 16-year-olds? They will then be the ones who will be taking unto themselves the anticipatory rights that the 18-year-olds now take. I do not want to prejudge the issues in any way or state attitudes until we actually see what is proposed, but I know that these matters will concern many people in the community.

Paragraph 37 of His Excellency's Speech states that attention is to be given to varying some of the strict rules of the law of contract; people who have no equality in bargaining powers may have a contract rewritten on fairer and more equal terms. Also, there will be a new legal basis for consumer credit transactions and prohibition of misleading advertising. Because the law of contracts has been established for centuries, I suggest that it should not lightly or quickly be changed simply because there are some hard cases that can be quoted. We all know the hackneyed phrase, which is very true, that hard cases make bad laws. No-one wants to shield an unscrupulous trader, no matter what line of business he is in, but often when we try to regulate and control him we also put unnecessary and hampering restrictions on the honest man. Therefore, I think this matter will have to be looked at carefully when the actual proposals come forward.

Paragraph 43 of the Speech is also interesting and important because it states that not only will there be a Bill to modernize the Workmen's Compensation Act to simplify procedures but that other industrial legislation is to be considered for amendment, including, amongst other things, the Industrial Code and the reform of the law relating to and liability arising out of industrial disputes. I emphasize those last words, for they seem to me to carry many implications, and I just wonder what we

might expect as a result. I think it is somewhat significant that this Government has appointed a Minister of Labour and Industry who is to hold no other portfolio. This was and always has been a part-time portfolio in other Governments. I wonder whether it is not some indication of what we might expect in industrial legislation. We may be in for a spate of it.

In recent times in Australia we have experienced a tremendous number of industrial disputes, mainly over wages. In nearly every case the strike weapon has been used by militant unions, which have seen the great advantages they can gain. The transport section of the economy is particularly vulnerable; in fact, I suppose one might call it the soft under-belly. We have seen successful strike action by seamen, wharf labourers, oil refinery employees, tanker drivers, airline pilots, ground staff and air hostesses. All of these people in one way or another are connected with the transport industry, and in this industry they can not only quickly bring employers to heel but also affect the community as a whole.

It is most significant that large increases in wages have been demanded and obtained. In the recent oil refinery strike, a 15 per cent increase in wages was rejected. The men went back to work because the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission agreed to hear their claims. The \$8 a week increase was regarded by the men as being not enough and the argument is to be put up to the commission that certain industries that make big profits have the capacity to pay big wages to their employees. I do not know, and I do not know that any of us knows, whether this capacity to pay exists. These big profits, which certainly get publicity in our newspapers, have to be related to the capital invested in the particular concerns, some of which are very large. Some people invest their life savings in big corporations, and these people have to get their dividends, just as the workers must get their just reward for the labour they put into these enterprises.

If the recently announced profits of a certain oil company are so great, why did the Prices Commissioner recently increase the price of petrol? Either he was wrong in his assessment or he was hoodwinked. The public does not have access to the figures; indeed, they are given to the Prices Commissioner in confidence, so presumably he has the answer. I think we must be cautious in our reactions when we read in the newspapers

of the many millions of dollars of profits made by some of these big firms. If the principle of the capacity of a single industry to pay is accepted by the commission, it will create enormous problems for the skilled worker in industry. The skilled metal tradesman is still a \$56 a week man, and he is the key person in arbitration awards. The air hostesses are now getting much more than this sum, and, as a result of a strike in Canberra, nurses are to get more than this, and an application is now before the State commission seeking an increase of \$25 a week for nurses.

Increases of this magnitude to nurses must be passed on by increased hospital fees, and if this occurs it will greatly and gravely affect the whole national health scheme. However, some hospitals, particularly the type of hospital or nursing home catering for pensioners, cannot pass on these increases because they cannot put up their fees. I foresee that, when increases of this magnitude have to be paid, such hospitals will close, and many pensioners and people of small means will be gravely affected.

I am using this only as an example and I am not making any judgment on the rights or wrongs of the present claims. I merely make the point that if increases of the magnitude being sought are obtained, and without any penal provisions being enforced, what can one do when one wants to get workers to go back to work except to give in to their demands? I make it clear that I am not referring only to nurses. The point I make is that in any future national wage case (and I suppose it will not be long before there will be one) the commission will not be thinking of about a \$2 a week increase in wages, which is about the level of increases on previous occasions: it will perhaps have to make orders for increases of about \$12 a week. If past history is to be a guide, it will not be possible to absorb such a big award in the increased over-award payments now being given.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Is this for unskilled workers?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No, in the national wages case for employees generally. I think we are sitting on the edge of a volcano in this matter because such an award would inflate prices to an unprecedented extent. If primary producers in this country are worried now, they have not even begun to suffer, if I am right.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You're quite right.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I mentioned penal provisions previously. These words are dirty words today; they must not be used nor must they be talked about, but I suggest that it must never be forgotten that we have set up and nurtured over the years in this country a compulsory system of wage fixation. In other words, it is part of our legal system, and I suggest that we cannot have laws of any kind without penalties. Apparently it is all right for penalties to be invoked against employers (and every week one hears of prosecutions launched by unions against employers for some breach or another of some award) whereas there are howls of protest if it is even suggested that a union should be proceeded against for an illegal strike. The Commonwealth Government has apparently quietly acquiesced in such a philosophy or has become apathetic, so industrial chaos is perhaps just around the corner: in fact, some very responsible people in the community say that it is here now; optimists are few in number.

It seems obvious from reports of discussions over the recent disputes that a kind of "Us *versus* them" attitude is being very strongly fostered, and when this happens a real breakdown in communication can disrupt our whole way of life. These changes in wage structures now are not being collectively bargained but collectively bludgeoned from selected large employers of vital labour and do more than upset the carefully balanced wage structures set up over the years by the arbitration tribunals. They affect also an established order in our society in such a way that I do not think they will be tolerated. We cannot pay an air hostess or a tanker driver more than we pay a skilled tradesman without strong moves to re-establish the accepted *status quo*. If this happens it behoves all sections of the community not to behave like spoiled children, scream at each other and show no response to lawful direction or discipline.

It is sometimes customary or traditional in an Address in Reply debate to include a little sermon in one's other remarks. I do not know that I want to do that, and it seems to me that it is appropriate to say something along these lines because I read somewhere recently that one of the big dangers we face in our Western civilization is that of being apathetic. I have mentioned that the Commonwealth Government is apparently becoming apathetic in one respect. The public often allows itself to be pushed around without protest when irresponsible people call for strikes to enforce supposed legitimate

claims. Union members, who do not want to strike, stand silent and do not vote according to their true desires. Employers try to pass the buck either to individuals or eventually to the community, and individuals in the community say, "As long as I am all right, Jack, I don't care much about you."

Eventually this malaise infects us all, so that we care little about our individual and collective responsibilities. If one does not think this is true one might perhaps consider again some of the new ideas we have been hearing about lately, namely, consider yourself and your conscience first, and your country last, or perhaps not at all. From the remarks made by His Excellency at a recent ceremony, which were referred to in part by other honourable members in this debate, I feel sure that Sir Mellis Napier would understand and approve of what I have said. I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and join with other members in expressing regret at the recent illness of the Governor (Sir James Harrison) and in wishing him a speedy and complete recovery. I join also in congratulating His Excellency the Governor's Deputy (Sir Mellis Napier) on the manner in which he performed the opening ceremony. I believe it was the 11th time that Sir Mellis had performed the ceremony. I believe that he first performed this ceremony on July 20, 1944, and the last time was June 25, 1968. It is remarkable when one realizes that Sir Mellis, a gentleman of 88 years of age, has held office for a record total period of more than eight years as Lieutenant-Governor or Governor's Deputy, his longest continuous term being from March, 1960, to April, 1961. When one realizes that there is 60 years between the age of Sir Mellis and the age of the youngest member of Parliament it was evident that it was a remarkable performance, and His Excellency is to be congratulated on the way in which he delivered the Speech.

Naturally, I am very pleased that the A.L.P. Government has been returned to office, an office which, if the people of South Australia had had their way, the Party would never have vacated when it did, by just means or otherwise. Nevertheless, I congratulate it on its return. I congratulate also the Ministry in the Council, that is, Bert Shard (Chief Secretary), Tom Casey (Minister of Agriculture), and Frank Kneebone (Minister of Lands). I

congratulate, too, the retiring Ministers in the Council, namely, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Mr. Hill on the way they applied themselves during their terms in office. This does not mean that I agreed with all they did, because at times I considered that they were somewhat misguided. Nevertheless, they applied themselves very well.

I wish also to refer to the retirement of Stan Bevan, which has meant a great loss to this Council and to the State generally, but of course age catches up with all of us at some time or another, and Stan felt that it was time he retired. He served the Miscellaneous Workers Union as Secretary for many years; he was Past President of the United Trades and Labor Council; delegate to the Australian Council of Trade Unions; Past President of the Australian Labor Party; executive member of the United Trades and Labor Council; executive member of the A.L.P., and finished his career shortly before a time when he could have been a Minister of the Crown again. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. DeGaris on retaining his position as Leader of his Party in this Chamber. He is an ideal Leader of the Opposition here and I trust he will continue in that position for many years to come. I express appreciation to the Leader for his remarks about myself, but I assure him that I am not in the least disappointed with my position as a back bencher. I have the greatest faith and confidence in the three Ministers on the front bench and it goes without saying that they will have my full, loyal and active support.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You will get on!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I thank the Leader for drawing attention to my type of oratory—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I said you had a Yarra bank brand of oratory.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I said it was a Botanic Park brand.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Chief Secretary suggested "Botanic Park brand of oratory" would be a better description. I remind both honourable gentlemen that, in addition to myself, other great statesmen and politicians have used the same brand of oratory, so I have nothing to be ashamed of there. I also assure the Leader that, as far as I am concerned, there has been no mellowing on my part in my political approach to carrying out my duties as I see them in this Council.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: You are not talking so loudly this time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Then I have mellowed to that extent. Brief reference has been made to the retirement of gentlemen in another place—Ron Loveday, Cyril Hutchens, Lin Riches and Lloyd Hughes, who for many years gave this State good service. They were denied some of the honours to which they were justly entitled because of the then prevailing set-up in South Australia concerning electoral boundaries, which the Leader in this Council says was not a gerrymander.

I also refer to the retirement of Sir Glen Pearson and Bert Teusner, who did a remarkable job in their terms of office. Tommy Stott goes from Parliament after an illustrious career. He said he did not have too many friends: I am certain he had no friends when he left, either in the Party he favoured or in the Party he put out of office. He has the distinction of having made a Government and unmade a Government; and he did not have friends. The retirements of John Freebairn, Bryant Giles and Ern Edwards highlighted the discontent that existed for many years in the Liberal and Country League Party. It is difficult enough if a member retires from Parliament either through old age or because his electors want him no longer; it is all the more difficult when a member is thrown out because his fellow members do not like him.

Stan Bevan submitted his resignation but John Freebairn did not submit his. In fact, he was most active in trying to get pre-selection, but he did not get it. Bryant Giles from Gumeracha and Ern Edwards from Eyre did exactly the same thing, too: although the 33 or 34 members of their sub-branches voted, they could not get the necessary 17 votes. We used to say that there was discontent within the L.C.L. Party, but the Opposition denied it. The L.C.L. members themselves threw out their leading members. One of them was even elevated to the position of Under Secretary, yet was discarded in his own electoral district.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That may have been on account of the bad judgment of the Premier.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Premier certainly showed bad judgment about that. He showed bad judgment by going to the people on May 30, which showed that his judgment at no time was any good. Other honourable members have expressed their views on matters about which they are vitally concerned. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris expressed concern because he thought the people of South Australia were under the impression that a gerrymander existed here—and he

went on in an attempt to show that it did not. The Hon. Mr. Hill was concerned about stobie poles and buildings in the park lands not going underground. The Hon. Mr. Rowe was concerned about priorities and succession duties. He seemed to imply that, because the Government desired to raise the wages of State employees to the level of those of Commonwealth employees by giving additional service pay, it was a long way out in its priorities. I understand why he was concerned about succession duties: I must confess that if I were in his position I would be a bit concerned about them myself.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp was concerned about rural conditions, and the Hon. Mr. Springett about water. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins was concerned about the number of seats obtained by the Australian Labor Party compared with the percentage of votes cast, and, as is often the case, he quoted a lower percentage of votes obtained by the A.L.P. than was received by the A.L.P. The Hon. Mr. Hart, claiming that he is a champion of the workers, thought it was time that wages were lowered—and so we go on. The Hon. Mr. Story was concerned about prawns, and expressed himself accordingly, while the Hon. Mr. Geddes had trouble with his conscience yesterday when he spoke.

One of my main concerns is the welfare of that part of the community that does not have too many people prepared to push its claims because it is unable to fight for itself. The major part of the community is well able to advance its own claims and, if it pushes them hard enough, it receives attention. The people I refer to (and I do not apologize for it) are the retarded children. Since I have been in this Chamber, I have consistently spoken on their behalf, particularly on their need for proper education. I am glad that some progress has been made but am still concerned about some of the things happening in this field. I intend to press their claims again today. I am pleased to learn that in education generally the crisis has now passed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The previous Government never paid the bills.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There were many things that that Government did not do, but it did assure us that the crisis in education was over; and I am grateful for that. However, as honourable members know, I am most interested in the education of retarded children, and I pay a tribute at the outset to the officers of the Psychology Branch, at present under Mr. Lasscock, who have done a marvellous job with their limited teaching staff

and with the students in their care. The numbers of teachers and students have increased considerably since the opening of the first occupation centre in 1954, to the extent that there are now 18 occupation centres, with 119 teachers assisting 1,075 students. This increase was made possible only by the dedicated way in which the staff of the Psychology Branch and the teachers applied themselves to the heart-breaking task of training those students. It is not an easy job.

I believe true recognition has not been given to some of the officers who have given service far beyond the call of duty. I refer particularly to Mr. G. Stott, who has been recognized as the supervisor of occupation centres although this position does not officially exist; I suppose he does not receive a salary that is appropriate to his duties. Mr. Stott, who will be retiring next year, has shown great ability and understanding. I appeal to the Minister of Education to remedy this situation, whereby a supervisor receives a salary that is less than the salary of those he supervises. The position of supervisor of occupation centres has been discharged since 1963 by a seconded headteacher; so, I ask the Minister to give an official title to the position before Mr. Stott retires.

I am worried about the delay in establishing occupation day centres in the north-eastern section of the city. At present children travel many miles across the city to attend occupation centres; some children travel from Rostrevor to Kings Park. Although additions are being made to the senior centre for 16-year-olds at Kensington, there is a great need for a senior centre to be established for students in the Elizabeth, Woodville and north-eastern areas. The Education Department knows very well that when the children reach 20 years of age the only thing open to them will be sheltered workshops. I suggest that the department should train the children in the types of work performed in sheltered workshops so that they will be better fitted for the future and so that their settling-in period in the sheltered workshops will not be unduly long.

I have previously raised the question of the lack of sufficient training for teachers in centres for the mentally retarded. Unfortunately, the Education Department has not yet provided facilities for training such teachers, and I again urge the Government to rectify this position.

I am disgusted at the Education Department's policy of denying assistance with taxi-cab fares to parents of mentally retarded

children if those parents own a car and if both can drive. Surely such parents have a big enough burden to bear without the added worry of transporting their children to a centre and getting their other children off to school or work. Since assistance with taxi-cab fares is provided for some parents, I cannot see why it should not be provided for all parents: the present system is similar to a means test. Parents eligible for assistance under the present system pay one-third of the taxi-cab fare and the department pays two-thirds. In Western Australia, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland the full cost of transporting mentally retarded children to centres is borne by the Education Department without any means test, and I suggest that the Education Department here should seriously consider lifting the imposition I have described.

It is the Education Department's policy to see that metropolitan primary schools are within half a mile of each other, with the result that children do not normally have to travel by bus. If the department is unable to provide as many occupation centres (and I realize not as many occupation centres are needed) it should at least bear the cost of transporting retarded children to the centres. Speech therapy services in this State are totally inadequate to provide the necessary services for mentally retarded children. It is regrettable that there is only one therapist available for all the service requirements of the psychology branch. There should be more guidance officers and social workers attached to the department. A speech therapist's salary in this State is much lower than that of teachers. Consequently, it is not very likely that people will be attracted to the position of speech therapist. In addition, there are no training facilities in South Australia for speech therapists, even if the salary was in line with that of other teachers. The Government should seriously consider this matter. The Victorian Education Department has 29 speech therapists who were formerly teachers and who were trained by the department without any loss of pay during the training period. I ask the Government to tackle this problem.

When the Commonwealth Government passed the Handicapped Children's (Assistance) Bill, 1970, it specifically excluded the State Education Departments from capital subsidies on buildings, material and transport, although it made subsidies available to private organizations. This seems to be a direct deterrent to State Governments from entering the field of education of the mentally retarded. The Act

is a distinct disadvantage to South Australia, whose Education Department has accepted this responsibility and given a lead in this direction. I hope that the State Government will do all in its power to see that the Commonwealth Government alters the legislation to remove this injustice. Because the education of handicapped children is a proper function of the State Government, it should not be excluded from Commonwealth Government help. If some private person sets up a special day centre the Commonwealth Government will provide a subsidy towards the capital cost, yet for some reason the State Education Department is specifically excluded from this help.

I suggest that a correspondence course be established for assisting country parents of mentally retarded children. More facilities for such children are available in the city than in the country, and we know how worried country parents must become. Such a course would greatly help both the parents and the children. An experienced teacher of mentally retarded children should be appointed to implement such a course, and he should be available to advise parents and parent groups who seek assistance. I hope the Government will implement my suggestion.

When the first three occupation centres were opened, houses were turned into centres. I am glad to say that proper buildings are now being provided for handicapped children. With more facilities available even greater benefits will result. We find that in the country this type of child is now going to an area type school, and I think this will result in many more children being assisted than was the case in the past.

I now come to the question of hostels for mentally retarded people in the country. I am pleased to say that Mount Gambier now has a hostel which takes in retarded people from outlying districts. I believe that about a fortnight ago the first sod was turned for the establishment of a building at Berri, and one is also under way at Whyalla. So, as I said, progress has been made since 1954, although I think there is still a long way to go. I feel that with a little consideration and understanding on the part of the Government these things will, as they should, come about.

I referred earlier to the Leader's having tried to convince us that there was no gerrymander in this State. As usual, I was bound to take notice of what he said, and I was almost about to believe that a gerrymander did not exist. However, he then produced

figures which, he said, showed that no gerrymander existed here, and he said, "If you want a gerrymander, why don't you go to Queensland and see what happened there under the A.L.P. regime?" Well, we are not talking about Queensland, anyway, and I personally do not care what happens there because, as a State politician, I want to look after the people in this State. The Leader went on to say that the A.L.P. in Queensland got only 35 per cent of the vote and remained in office and, consequently, there must have been a gerrymander there but, so he said, there was no gerrymander in South Australia. Let us look at some of the figures the Leader could have produced if he had wanted to back his argument that there was no gerrymander in South Australia.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Didn't he know that Sir Thomas Playford went to Queensland to fix a gerrymander for the Liberal Party there?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think the Leader knew very well that Sir Thomas Playford did that, but it did not suit his case to tell us that. However, I am dealing with South Australia and the fact that the Leader said there had never been a gerrymander here but that there must have been one in Queensland because, so he claimed, only a 35 per cent vote was obtained by the A.L.P. there. He did not give us any details; he merely believed that the figure of 35 per cent was a correct one. In South Australia in 1938 the Liberal and Country League received 32.12 per cent of the vote, yet it remained in Government. No gerrymander! In 1941 it improved considerably and obtained 36.76 per cent of the vote.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is not democracy, is it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is not a gerrymander, according to the Leader.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Were all districts contested?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The fact remains that this was the percentage of votes the L.C.L. obtained. The Leader took other figures which did not even apply to South Australia. He quoted Commonwealth figures; I do not know why he did not have a look at the Canadian or the English or some other figures. The fact is that we want to know what happened in South Australia. As I said, the L.C.L. Government received 32.12 per cent of the votes in 1938.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Were all the seats contested then?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Leader did not tell us, when he quoted his figure of 35 per cent for Queensland, whether every seat was contested there. I am not suggesting that every seat was contested here: I am merely giving the percentage of votes received by the L.C.L. Even with a 32 per cent vote in 1938, a 35.39 per cent vote in 1953, a 35.81 per cent vote in 1956 and a 35.88 per cent vote in 1959 it clung to office every time. Yet the Leader said, "Have a look at Queensland where there has been a gerrymander." How ridiculous it is to say that there was no gerrymander in South Australia.

In 1938 there was a 67.88 per cent vote against the Liberal Government, in 1941 there was a 63.24 per cent vote against it, and in 1944 there was a 55.63 per cent vote against it. In 1950, 60.84 per cent of the people voted against the Government, yet it still clung to office. In 1953, 64.61 per cent of the people voted against the Government and, in 1959, 64.12 per cent voted against it. In 1962, 66.34 per cent voted against the Government. Yet members of the Liberal Party in this House say that the stigma should not be attached to Sir Thomas Playford for having a gerrymander in South Australia. Who else could it be attached to? Sir Thomas Playford had been in office for some 20 years or so, and if he had wanted to get rid of the stigma of having the term "gerrymander" attached to him he had plenty of time to do so. He clung to office in 1962 with a vote against him of 66.34 per cent, yet the Leader does not want to see attached to Sir Thomas Playford the stigma of leading a State that was gerrymandered. If Sir Thomas Playford could retain office with 33.66 per cent of the votes, what was it if it was not a gerrymander? The Leader said that the A.L.P. retained office in Queensland with only 35 per cent of the votes so there must have been a gerrymander there. What does he think about the position here in 1962?

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: How many A.L.P. votes were recorded in the years you mentioned?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In 1962, the A.L.P. got 52.65 per cent of the votes, compared to 33.66 per cent for the L.C.L., yet the Labor Party could not take office. Sir Thomas Playford could have gone out with a better name for himself had he accepted defeat then instead of crawling to a couple of Independents and getting one to take Ministerial rank and another to take the Chair. He could have done the right and

honourable thing and said, "At least now the people are waking up to the fact that there is a great difference in the number of votes, so I will admit I am beaten." He would have gone out with a better image if he had done that.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Would you have done that in similar circumstances?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We would never have attempted a gerrymander, so it would never have happened to us. All we ask is that we get one vote one value where possible. The Liberal Party did not do anything about the situation, yet it wants to remove the stigma from Sir Thomas Playford. How can it do that when he clung to office in 1962 with a 33.66 per cent vote. In 1968 the vote against the L.C.L. was 57.19 per cent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: As an honest man, are you satisfied that the figures you are giving are accurate?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am absolutely satisfied that the figures I have given show the actual votes cast at the elections I have referred to; they are the actual percentages received by all the Parties. I say that they highlight the fact that the L.C.L. received a measly 33 per cent vote in 1962, which was 2 per cent less than the figure in Queensland that has been suggested represents a gerrymander there. Of course I am satisfied with my figures, because they are taken from Parliamentary Papers and they are accessible to the Leader. However, he was not prepared to produce them recently when he gave us figures in an attempt to tell us that there has never been a gerrymander in South Australia. What a ridiculous statement for the Leader to make. One could expect it from some other people in this Council, but not from the Leader.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What was the result recently when practically all the seats were contested?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In the recent election, 42.86 per cent voted for the L.C.L. At no stage has the L.C.L. received the 50 per cent vote that would entitle it to take office. Let us see what "gerrymander" means in order to see whether it ties up with what the Leader suggested did not exist in South Australia.

"Gerrymander" means to divide a country into electoral districts in such a way as to give a political advantage to the Party in power. The word perpetuates the memory of Governor Gerry of Massachusetts, who resorted to this stratagem in 1812, and is formed by coupling his name with the latter

half of the word "salamander". The story runs that, while a group of politicians were studying an electoral map, one of them, commenting on the unusual shape of one of the constituencies, remarked, "It looks like a 'salamander'", whereupon another rejoined, "You mean a gerrymander!" Gerrymandering apparently has been going on at least since 1812, and we know that it has existed in South Australia for at least the last 30 years, irrespective of the Leader of the Opposition trying to tell us that it did not exist. He also referred to the fact that the A.L.P. at the last election received 51.64 per cent of the first preference votes but that the A.L.P. got 57.45 per cent of the number of seats. It was terrible as far as the Leader was concerned to think that the A.L.P. was able to capture that number of seats with 51.64 per cent of the votes cast.

Let us look at what has happened since 1947 and see why the Leader's crocodile tears were flowing the other day. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins also referred to the tragic position that we got a greater number of seats than our percentage of votes called for! In the 1947 election the percentage of first preference votes for the L.C.L. was 38.92, yet it received 58.97 per cent of the seats. In 1950, it received 39.16 per cent of the first preference votes and got 58.97 per cent of the seats.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How many seats were not contested?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is not a matter of the number of seats contested. The L.C.L.'s percentage of votes would have been lower if that Party had contested Port Adelaide, for instance. Because the Party did not contest Port Adelaide and other seats the figure was boosted to 39 per cent. The Liberals would still have got 58.97 of the seats had that Party contested Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide, etc., but it wanted the percentage to be as high as possible and it finished up with 39.16 of the votes and 58.97 of the seats. In 1953, the L.C.L. got 35.39 of the first preference votes and 53.85 of the seats, whereas the A.L.P. received 49.47 of the votes and only 35.9 of the seats. In 1956, the L.C.L. got 35.81 per cent of the first preference votes and 53.85 per cent of the seats. In 1959, the L.C.L. received 35.88 per cent of first preference votes and 51.28 per cent of the seats. In 1962, the great year when there was no gerrymander in South Australia, the Liberals got 33.66 of the votes and finished up with 46.15 of the seats. The Party still formed a Government and still clung to office when

it should have been out on its neck, according to the people who voted in the State.

In 1965, the Liberals received 34.93 of first preference votes and 43.59 of the seats. In 1968, the Liberals received 42.81 per cent of first preference votes and 48.72 of the seats, whereas the Labor Party received 50.78 per cent of the votes and 48.72 of the seats. In 1970, the A.L.P. received 51.64 of first preference votes and 57.45 of the seats, whereas the L.C.L. received 43.76 of the votes and 42.55 of the seats; so the L.C.L. has not very much to complain about.

If one goes further and has a look at the position regarding the Legislative Council, at the last election the L.C.L.'s percentage of first preference votes was 42.3, compared to the A.L.P.'s percentage of 51.9 of the votes cast. The Labor Party finished up with 20 per cent and the L.C.L. finished up with 80 per cent of the Council seats! Now the Leader, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and other honourable members have the audacity to say, "That is a terrible set-up, because we have in the House of Assembly only 42.55 per cent of the seats" when in fact they had 43.76 per cent of the votes cast. I remind honourable members that, even though this position exists, it was not our Bill that cut up the districts on the last occasion: it was an L.C.L. Bill, so they cannot throw it back on us and say, "There is now a gerrymander in this State whereby you can get 58 per cent of the seats on 51 per cent of the votes cast." Of course there has been a gerrymander in this State and of course Sir Thomas Playford saw that he kept it going as long as he could. The Leader also said it was a pity that a certain stigma had to be attached to Sir Thomas when he left office and that it was a terrible thing that Sir Thomas's image had to be destroyed, but his own members were waking up to what went on under Sir Thomas Playford's rule, and they set out to destroy his image. What image is it that they are trying to destroy? Is it the big bad man who took the Adelaide Electric Supply Company and made it into a State-owned utility? Is that the image? Or is it the friendly man who always had his door open to anyone who wished to see him? If anyone did get in to see him the only one who did the talking was Sir Thomas himself and, if he was in an expansive mood and knew what the caller wanted and felt that he could grant it, he would say, "I can fix that up," or if he were in a different mood he would say, "It has been good of you to come and see me today. You have given me an opportunity to tell you of

my worries. It is not a one-man Government. I must put this matter to the Cabinet." We would know then that he would not grant the request. Or is it the image of the man who came to office and held it for as long as possible?

When we suggested that there was a division in the ranks, the Leader hotly denied this, but within a week or two of the elections we found discontent among members of his Party. We also found the usual turnabout taken by the Leader who, soon after the elections, was quoted as saying, "It appears that the A.L.P. has a mandate to put its policy into operation, so we will have to do something about it." Then we found last Thursday a press heading stating "DeGaris denies a mandate." What does a Government have to do to get a mandate? I believe the Hon. Mr. DeGaris denies that there is a mandate from the people, when we have won an election and the number of necessary seats. Yet we are told by the Leader that we do not have a mandate, that the people did not know what they were voting for. The same thing applied to what Mr. Hall, when Premier, said in another place when a resolution which did not suit him was carried. He said "To the dickens with the resolution; it does not mean a thing. I am not going to take any notice of it." And, of course, he did not take any notice of it; but the people took notice of what the Premier then did and they certainly gave him short shrift at the last election.

The present Government now has a mandate, and I suggest that the honourable members of this Chamber should recognize that fact. We have had a mandate from the people year in and year out, as previous figures have indicated, but this time we also have the numbers in Parliament. Honourable members in this Council should appreciate what the people want and what the people voted for; they should now get it.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: And we should act as a House of Review?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, we should do that. The Leader of the Opposition was most anxious to impress upon us that we are purely a House of Review, come what may, no matter which Government is in power. He said it made no difference to this Council as far as the L.C.L. members here were concerned. Let us look at some of the figures he quoted for the years 1965-67, when this Council amended 66 Bills, an average of 22 Bills a year. At that time, we had a Labor Government. Three years prior to that, the average number of Bills amended in a year was only

14; and over the six-year period prior to 1965 the annual average was 10½ Bills. Perhaps with this average of 22 Bills a year it did not matter two hoots one way or the other to the L.C.L. members, but it meant a lot to our Government. It meant that people in the Public Service who were entitled to four weeks annual leave were denied what was due to them by the actions of the present Opposition.

Some of our financial measures were also denied us by the Opposition in this Chamber; yet, because they point to certain things that they say were not in the present Government's policy speech, they say the Government has no mandate for those things. However, in the 1968 policy speech there was not one word by the previous Premier about taxation; yet, in that Government's very first Budget, it introduced a 10 per cent average increase in taxation, because it was dictated to by North Terrace. That is why it accepted a 10 per cent increase in taxation. Honourable members in this Council said, "We do not want gift duties" but, because they were dictated to from North Terrace, they had to comply.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That Government introduced seven new taxes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, which affected the poor people, and there was no mention of those taxes in the policy speech. Yet the present Leader of the Opposition here and other honourable members had the audacity to say that certain things had not appeared in the policy speech of this Government; they had not been spelled out, so there was no mandate.

What is wrong with those honourable members? Why are they not fair dinkum about it? The Leader of the Opposition says, "On our side we are individuals; we are not a Party." Why then does he accept the plums that go with the office of Leader of the Opposition? If he was fair dinkum, he would hand those plums back to the Government and say, "We are truly independent; we act individually and do not gang up against the Government." I regret having to say these things, but it ill becomes the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber to give the impression outside, "We are individualists; we are not controlled by anybody outside the Chamber." I am proud to say that we on our side follow the policy of the A.L.P.; we hear what the people want and arrive at our decisions democratically. We have our ear to the ground and say what our policy is. We do not go through the back door and say, "The Party pays for our

advertisements and canvasses but we come into this Council as independents." What a lot of bosh!

The Opposition says that this happens. If it does happen, I suggest that, in view of the shortage of accommodation in this building as offices for new members, some of the L.C.L. Party room be handed back to the officer in charge of accommodation here, because the L.C.L. members say, "We do not need a Party room; we can work individually." The officer in charge of accommodation would appreciate the handing back of some of the L.C.L. Party room space. That space could be used for something else.

Why was the Government defeated at the last election? It has been defeated numerically for many years, but this time it did not get the required number of seats. The ex-Attorney-General could not understand why his Party did not gain Government. He said, "We were honest with the people; we altered the boundaries." Was he implying that his Party had been dishonest for the past 30 years and, because it was being honest on this occasion, it should be accepted at its face value? What did the previous Premier do from the time he took office? He merely preached politics and treated the people with contempt. During the election campaign he came out with his comic strip and his T-shirt; he treated it all as a comic, and the people would not accept it. It is no surprise to anybody in this Council that the Government lost office on May 30.

The ex-Premier left no stone unturned in his propaganda speeches. I give him no credit whatsoever for the speech he made at the opening of the Kangaroo Creek dam, which was a State project undertaken during the term of office of two different Governments. It was opened by the Premier in front of a number of people of different political shades, and he should never have brought politics into it then; but he took the opportunity of making a political speech at that ceremony.

What did we find when earlier this year the Governor, Sir James Harrison, opened Parliament? A Governor's Speech is written by the Government of the day. In the Speech that the Governor then delivered, the Government should have done the right thing and not used His Excellency for propaganda purposes. The usual phrase "My Government" was not used in that Speech. The implication was that the ideas contained in it were the ideas of His Excellency. That was one of the lowest things that happened. Although

Sir James Harrison delivered his Speech excellently, I give that Government no credit for the way in which it drew it up.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The Government tried to use him.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It did not try—it did use him for political purposes. The Hon. Mr. Rowe spoke at some length about the difference between the two Parties being one of priorities. Of course it is one of priorities, because we look after the people and the Opposition looks after the broad acres. We make no apology for bringing our State Government employees into line with those of other States. In the very first decision handed down by the Arbitration Commission, the judge said that, if a person cannot afford to pay proper wages, he should not be in business.

The Government should not be in business if it makes the employees pay for the running of the State. State Government employees are just as important as Commonwealth employees and Victorian employees: they are just as entitled to service pay as are others. How ridiculous it would be for Commonwealth employees to be doing exactly the same type of work as State Government employees and for one type of employee to be receiving \$6 a week more than the other type! Are we expected to say to State Government employees, "No; you must always be on a lower standard."

I am pleased to see in His Excellency's Speech that the Government intends to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. During the term of office of the previous Labor Government this Act was brought nearly into line with workmen's compensation legislation of other States. Sir Thomas Playford said on more than one occasion, "It will be over my dead body that you will get compensation for an injury that happens on an employee's way to or from work", yet such a provision applied in every other State in Australia. I regret that in the years since the previous Labor Government was in office the Workmen's Compensation Act has fallen behind similar legislation in other States. Therefore, I look forward to the introduction of the promised legislation. Because the Industrial Code has been out of date for many years, many amendments are necessary to bring it into line with current thinking. I am pleased that the Government will attend to this matter.

The Hon. Mr. Potter has said today that there is industrial strife in this country. Of course there is! I can assure the honourable member that 75 per cent of strikes would

never happen if the employers were prepared to get around the table and discuss the matter. What is the first thing a union does when it wants to improve workers' conditions in a factory? It attempts to discuss the matter with the employer, but he absolutely refuses to do this. So, the only way we can put any pressure on the employer is to withdraw our labour. That is the only thing a worker has to sell. If the employer will not talk, what is the worker to do? Should he say, "I accept your silence" or should he take the ultimate step? The only time many employers will negotiate is after a strike has been called. When they do decide to negotiate we find that a reasonable settlement can be arrived at. Such a settlement could have been arrived at without any recourse to strike action but, because the employer refused to negotiate, disruption was caused. Of course, the unions are blamed when they pull the men out. If the employer is in difficulties and puts his cards on the table, I am sure a reasonable settlement can be arrived at.

The Hon. Mr. Potter said that we have an arbitration system that sets wages and conditions. However, all that system does is to set the minimum wages. If the honourable member is fair dinkum and considers this matter carefully, he will see that an arbitration system should be set up to fix maximum prices. If maximum prices and minimum wages are set, it is logical that there will not be so much pressure for wage increases. We were never better off than when there was complete price control throughout the Commonwealth and when it was difficult to get wage increases, because a reasonable amount was granted to both sides. However, the Commonwealth Government lifted price control while it continued to keep control over wages through the arbitration system. Is that good enough? No! If it is good enough for the employer to sell at the highest price possible, then it is good enough for the employee, too. Before we say that the system is perfect, let us consider the employee's side of the question and criticize the employer for his attitude when necessary. Let us say to him, "Pull your head in and come to the party, and you will find your production will continue while negotiations take place." I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion on their speeches. I support the motion.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I, too, support the motion. I join with other honourable members in expressing regret at

the ill-health of His Excellency the Governor and I wish him a speedy recovery. I hope that both he and Lady Harrison have a further fruitful period of office. I join, too, in congratulating Sir Mellis Napier on his opening Parliament again and on the services he has rendered to South Australia. I congratulate the Ministers of the new Government on their appointments, and I welcome the Hon. Mr. Casey to this Council. I appreciate the opportunity to refer to the Hon. Stan Bevan, who retired at the end of the last Parliament. It is unnecessary for me to go into the detail of the cause of his retirement, because it is well known to honourable members.

I record my appreciation of the manner in which the Hon. Mr. Bevan conducted himself during his term of office, of the help he gave this Council in framing legislation, and of the consideration he gave to Opposition members. He at all times did his best to give legislation fair and detailed consideration. I always respected his opinion because I, with other honourable members, realized that he always did his homework thoroughly. I wish him and his wife every happiness in his retirement. I wish those House of Assembly members who have retired good health and happiness in the future.

I did not intend to speak on this motion, but I believe that certain things were said this afternoon that need answering. The Hon. Mr. Banfield's speech was not one of his most amiable. I serve on the Public Works Committee with the honourable member, and I appreciate his approach to the problems dealt with by that committee. However, I believe that this afternoon he went much further in the form of debate than is usual with members in this Council and, I would say, much further than is desirable in the interests of good debate, in that he indulged in personal remarks and personal attacks on members of this place who have already spoken and do not have the right of reply.

In this respect, I refer to the attack on the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. I had expected that this might occur, so I took particular care to read the Leader's speech in detail. I believe that the personal reflections against the Leader this afternoon were quite uncalled for, for during his speech the Leader did not attack the Hon. Mr. Banfield or members of the A.L.P., nor did he attack the A.L.P. as such. What he did criticize was the placing of a label on Sir Thomas Playford, and in that criticism he included not only members of the A.L.P. but also members of the L.C.L. itself.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He specifically attacked us.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: He did not suggest that members of the A.L.P. were unduly unfair in attempting to criticize the Leader of an Opposition Party. In fact, he pointed out that this was a part of politics. However, he did specifically cast reflections on those members within the L.C.L. who had jumped on the band waggon for personal reasons.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If he had confined his criticism to his own members, he would not have got any criticism from us.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: His reference to the A.L.P. was, I believe, based on a very fair formula, one that was adopted by Hetherington and Reid in working out percentage figures to cover the State when some seats were uncontested by the major Parties and an overall picture could not be gained otherwise. In this formula, the figures for the Commonwealth election which had been held closest to the State election for the area in question were used. The Hon. Mr. Banfield this afternoon had a completely new attack in that the figures he quoted were figures gained by the L.C.L. He completely ignored the fact that many seats in those years to which he referred were uncontested and that in 1938 there were a number of Independents. He completely ignored the full picture.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Are you suggesting he was not telling the truth?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I do not accuse him of not telling the truth, but he did not tell all the truth, and this makes a tremendous difference in trying to present a clear picture of what actually does happen. I believe that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris honestly compiled his figures under a formula which is as close as can be found to giving a true result or a clear picture, and at no time did he attack the A.L.P. as a Party: he merely defended the name of Sir Thomas Playford and refuted the suggestion that that person was responsible for a gerrymander. The Leader admitted quite freely that there was a country loading in the distribution of electorates. However, that is an entirely different thing from a gerrymander, a term which relates specifically to rigged boundaries.

I join with the Leader and support him in his defence of Sir Thomas Playford. The latter has now retired from politics and he does not take an active part in politics or publicly comment on or criticize public figures within politics. Therefore, I believe that, in

recognition of the very great service that he has given to this State, we as members of Parliament in public life should do likewise. Sir Thomas Playford has probably contributed more to South Australia's welfare than has any other person living, and I must include in this our own President, who was always a loyal supporter of Sir Thomas. Without question, each in his own way contributed to the welfare of South Australia; sometimes one perhaps acted as a foil to the other, perhaps in other cases one complemented the other. However, Sir Thomas Playford is a man who will be remembered in this State for many years to come, for he is honoured not only by those who supported him politically but also by many who opposed him. He has been honoured in his own lifetime. I believe that the type of personal attack I have referred to is wrong, and I personally am glad that the Leader took this matter up.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Labor Party never criticized Sir Thomas Playford to any extent.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The Leader did not imply that it did. The Leader merely said that the Labor Party used the word "gerrymander" and managed over a period of years to make this label stick. That was the Leader's only point, and I believe that he made it very well. The type of personal attack we heard this afternoon is typical of the continuing pattern of attack on people in public life. I believe that ethically Parliament is losing respect in the community because of this type of attack, for we see a continuation of the attack not only on personalities but also on the institution of Parliament itself.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your Party started it; your Leader started this.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The moment Parliament opened, we saw this sort of thing in the appointment of Parliamentary committees. According to the press, the Premier made a statement about the Legislative Council with relation to the appointment of members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and he told the Leader of the Opposition in the other House that if he could get an understanding from the members in the Legislative Council he would readily agree to the appointment of a member from the Opposition benches in the House of Assembly to that committee, but that because of the obstructive attitude of the members in this Council he would not agree to it otherwise.

I point out that there was no obstruction in this Council, for no member of this place had been approached, and in fact it was a rule within the Labor Party itself which prevented the Hon. Mr. Banfield from being appointed to the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's not true.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why don't you get your facts right? It is not a rule at all: it is an Act of Parliament that you must be referring to.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: To my knowledge—and I stand to be corrected on this—Parliament will allow a member to be on two paid committees.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not so.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Then I stand corrected on that. However, it does not alter the fact that the Premier's statement was incorrect: there were no obstructive tactics by this Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And your statement is just as incorrect.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This Council was quite prepared to see that the A.L.P. had representation on this committee. The statement made by the Premier was completely false, and the Chief Secretary was good enough to state this in this Council in answer to a question.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The person who stopped us from having representation on this committee was Sir Thomas Playford, who pointed out in 1965 how wrong it was that this matter should be fixed by Statute.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I have already stated that I stand corrected on the matter of a member being eligible to serve on two paid committees. However, my statement that the Premier was attacking this Council without any foundation still stands. It is common tactics to attack the Council on every occasion possible. I congratulate the Leader on standing up for the rights of the Council and on the statements he has made. Obviously these statements are starting to hit home, because of the replies we have had since.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Didn't you want them to be replied to?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I can ask for nothing more than that full attention be given to the Council, because the more people study our Parliamentary system the better they will understand it. This is becoming obvious as is evident by the statements of people who write in the press that they are becoming

aware that there is more to the Constitution than the parrot cry of "one vote one value" and other such statements that have often been accepted without question.

It is also obvious that the public are at least beginning to ask questions and show interest in the true purpose of the two-House system. For this reason I believe that the attacks that have been made and the tactics that have been adopted are alerting the public to the dangers that exist if the two-House system is unduly interfered with. We also heard the expression that this is a hostile Council. However, I strongly disagree with that statement because, in spite of what has been said here this afternoon, this is not a hostile Council, but a House of Review.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And initiation.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, within the portfolios of the Ministers in the Council. I remember the three years of Labor Government from 1965 to 1968 clearly, the many Bills that we debated in that period and the amount of work that we did. Most of the amendments made by the Council were accepted by the Government, and in some cases were welcomed by it. I can remember discussing with the Chief Secretary some points in a Bill when he readily agreed that an amendment was necessary. I can also remember discussing with him who should move the amendment, either he or I. I discussed with the then Minister of Labour and Industry faults that I had found in Bills, and by negotiation the Bills were amended. If much of the legislation introduced in the Council in that period had got on to the Statute Book in its original form it would have caused confusion in the community. One Bill in particular was that to license electricians; the most ridiculous provisions were incorporated in that legislation, some so ludicrous that it was impossible to imagine how they got there in the first place.

Many of these Bills were amended in the Council not only with the co-operation but also with the consent and goodwill of the Government of the day. It was only on a few Bills where there was a direct clash in ideology that we had a difference of opinion. Mr. Banfield this afternoon attacked the L.C.L. and Mr. Hall on the matter of taxation levied during the last Parliament. It is a fact that taxation was increased for a very serious purpose, because when the Government came into office it faced a very heavy deficit. In fact, how bad the deficit was could not be known until the end of the financial year. The Hon. Mr. Banfield suggested today that

the Legislative Council accepted the legislation, but I point out to him that in the two main Bills (the Stamp Duty Bill and the Gift Duty Bill) the Council inserted 47 amendments.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But you threw out our main Bill because you said it was not mentioned in the policy speech.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: During the term of our Government we had conferences between the two Houses on the legislation on which we disagreed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You split one Bill in half and made it into two Bills.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I have already mentioned the figures the Hon. Mr. Banfield used this afternoon in his attack on the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and I could quote at some length in rebuttal because he has taken a very one-sided view and has not done a balanced exercise on this matter for obvious political reasons. I am not sure how valuable this is to the average member of the public but I am personally concerned about the accusations that have been levelled against the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. To show the peculiar reasoning that the Hon. Mr. Banfield used, he said that the L.C.L. did not contest a number of seats in order to get a higher percentage of the votes. This is as odd a piece of reasoning as I have heard.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That one slipped by.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The L.C.L. percentage would have been lower if it had lost 25,000 votes at Port Adelaide.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The total percentage would have increased with the number of seats contested; that is plain arithmetic. The total number of votes in the State must increase with the number of seats contested. If the rest of the Hon. Mr. Banfield's arithmetic was done on the same basis, it is no wonder that we have this confusing and contradictory set of figures that he gave us.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are off the track. Your percentage must be higher if you do not contest Port Adelaide.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Some honourable members are confused about this matter. Certainly if some seats are contested the marginal percentage would possibly be lower, but not the overall State percentage, which is on the number of votes gained within the State against the total number of voters.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are wrong again.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I shall be pleased to talk to the Chief Secretary later about this.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think it would be better if we listened to the speaker and avoided these conversations.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I do not intend to go through and comment on all the speeches that have been made in this Address in Reply debate. Many of them have contributed considerably to the knowledge of honourable members. If I was to single out any other speech besides that of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, it would be that of the Hon. Mr. Kemp, delivered at a time when our rural industries and other industries dependent on them are facing a grey future. I believe the analytical summary of agriculture in all its forms throughout the world by the Hon. Mr. Kemp is a textbook for many people who have those problems at heart and desire a reference.

His Excellency's Speech was prepared by the Government and I do not intend to deal with its contents in detail because we shall have that opportunity later when those matters come before the Council in the form of legislation. In our role as members of a House of Review, we cannot comment fully on legislation until we see it before us, because any matter that is vaguely mentioned in an election speech can be different from the detailed legislation placed before Parliament. I share with other honourable members some confusion about this present session of Parliament, in view of certain statements made by the Premier in his election speeches. For instance, on one occasion he promised certain increases.

In the issue of the *News* the following day, in answer to a question about the raising of revenue, he stated that \$4,500,000 extra would be raised from succession duties. Again, at the end of the farmers' march last Wednesday, in a speech at Elder Park, the Premier stated that remissions would be made to primary producing properties in the form of successions of up to \$200,000. This is a most confusing picture, because we know full well that it is impossible to raise extra revenue and at the same time to make substantial remissions. We have also had conflicting statements about the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. We must await the final result of that. We have heard nothing at all about the Chowilla and Dartmouth dams problem.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: There are many other things contained in this Speech that were in the Premier's election speech and were not specific. We have heard something

said today about a mandate—whatever that may be.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will find out.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Also, other things have happened since the Government was elected that are not mentioned in the Speech. If it necessarily follows that a Government has a mandate for everything it states, however vaguely, in a policy speech, does it have the right to do anything that is not contained in the policy speech? This is a theoretical argument. Responsible members have a duty to withhold their judgment until such time as the legislation comes to this Council in its final form. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I rise to support the motion so ably moved by our new Minister in this Council (Hon. Mr. Casey), the Minister of Agriculture. I join other honourable members in expressing concern that the Governor's ill-health precluded him from opening this session of Parliament. I wish him a speedy and thorough recovery. A very famous South Australian, Sir Mellis Napier, who at all times carries out his duties in a noble manner, deputized for the Governor. I do not desire to enter into the controversy over personalities and Party politics at this stage, except to say that I believe the attack just made on Sir Thomas Playford, if it was not so disgusting, would be laughable, because that famous politician would make those who attack him appear if he were present very small men.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We attacked him on one point only. Do not be misled about that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The honourable gentleman is now out of politics, but I believe Sir Thomas Playford served this State, in war and in peace, in a manner difficult to emulate. I am sorry his name has been dragged through the dirty linen of politics as it is by some people today, with the idea of personal advancement.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your Leader started that; he had to be replied to.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: There are several controversial issues concerning the welfare of this State that should be dealt with by this Parliament rather than we should have a resume of how one Party beat the other or how it intends to mislead the population at the next election. Today, we have real worry with us. The Minister of Agriculture has my

sympathy because of the great importance of his portfolio at this time. He has taken over in this Council from a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard—Hon. Stan Bevan. Stan served this State and his Party well. He was most co-operative at all times with members of both Parties. I found that, as a Minister, he did not hesitate to give an answer or have a problem investigated. I wish him and Mrs. Bevan happiness in retirement.

The Minister of Agriculture is new to his office and is faced with one of the biggest problems the primary industry has known. It is true, of course, that things were almost as bad in 1928 when the whole State was involved. The present position was brought about by a number of factors—first of all, the drop in wool prices followed by the chaos in the wheat industry. In 1968-69 a record area of 26,800,000 acres was planted. The record sowing, coupled with a boom season produced 543,900,000 bushels and presented the industry with a very real problem, particularly as sales were declining. As a result, quotas became necessary, and it was unfortunate that people who had heeded earlier warnings to curtail acreages were the worst affected because they then qualified for a quota that was smaller than the quota they would otherwise have received. This is one of the anomalies in the quota system.

Experts who advise in droughts often accuse landholders of overstocking; of course, in a drought they would be overstocked even if they had only 10 sheep on a property. Many banks were still lending large sums of money right up to the time when it was realized more storage space was needed. Then, everyone wanted his pound of flesh. The Minister of Agriculture has set up a three-man committee to investigate anomalies in the quota system. The Hon. Mr. Loveday and Mr. Quirke the only members I know are very suitable, and I compliment the Minister on his choice of appointees. The members of the committee can be sure of a retainer on Mandrake's staff if they come up with anything of consequence.

All the world's granaries appear to be full, but this does not mean that we should curb production to a point where we might shortly be in trouble in feeding the world. Most of the problem lies with the international monetary system rather than with over-production. Provided it can be stored until it is needed, wheat is as good as gold. The

present season will soon level out Australia's over-production and South Australia's problem of over-quota wheat.

One of the problems facing the grower is that of storage facilities. It is estimated that in 1970-71 Australian storages will hold 500,000,000 bushels from previous seasons. At the end of the year we can expect that between 300,000,000 and 310,000,000 bushels will still be unsold. With a bushel of wheat costing 28c to carry for three years, the cost burden the industry must face is about \$84,000,000 for 300,000,000 bushels for three years. The burden associated with storing this grain cannot be placed on the grower any longer. This is one way in which the Government can contribute towards helping farmers. I do not think farmers should be paid for their over-quota wheat. I believe that quotas were necessary to stabilize the industry, but I do not think we should curtail farmers' operations to the point where the nation will be very sorry.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You should try to make liquor out of the unsold wheat.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The decline in the wool market is perhaps a more important contributory factor than the modern methods of wheat production. People turned their hand to growing wheat who had never previously done so. People were lured to wheat growing by the industry's stabilization plans and by orderly marketing, which enabled it to pay a first advance of \$1.10 even when wool prices were falling to bedrock. Personally, I do not have much faith in any of the many schemes afoot to arrest the fall in wool prices. We have a plan that will eliminate the sale of lots of one, two and three bales. It is hoped that this plan will to some extent do away with handling charges. However, I am not too sure who will receive the resulting benefit. Previously, any benefit of this kind has not been passed on to the grower.

I notice in today's *News* that there may be another 4 per cent increase in the freight charges on wool. Just how they will chisel this increase out of the industry I do not know, because wool is being produced uneconomically in many areas now. I believe that the Government and industry leaders are doing their best to arrive at some scheme that will assist the production and sale of wool. It is essential that a plan should be submitted that will bridge the gap between the grower and the consumer. Sufficient wool to make a suit will net a grower between 30c and 40c at present, yet

the suit costs the consumer between \$60 and \$100. Until we can bridge this gap, the demand for wool is not likely to increase.

It is all very well for experts to say that it is not necessary for the demand to increase because we can sell all of the wool. Well, of course, we can sell any commodity if we put it at a low enough price. In some cases when a commodity falls to a bedrock price it serves the purpose of widening the market and sometimes does that commodity good. We go through a slight depression and more buyers can come in and more consumers can make use of that product. However, wool is at a bedrock price now, without there being any indication that the consumer will thereby gain any benefit, and until this state of affairs is arrested I believe we are wide open to the competition that is coming from synthetics which, it could be said, can cut their cloth to suit their purpose.

I believe that one of the ways to arrest this state of affairs—and I put this suggestion to the Minister—is for the parties concerned to study very closely the possibility of processing more wool in Australia. For as long as I can remember, our leaders of organizations, after having gone overseas, have come home and belaboured us with a story given them by the wool buyers, the manufacturers of the cloth, and we have very largely consented to try every method that they have put forward.

We have been told that wool is on the decline because of our classing and because of the standard of preparation. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in trying to improve classing, millions of dollars on improved breeding, and millions of dollars more on scientific approaches. Perhaps some benefit has come from these efforts, but they have not overcome the problem. I believe we could manufacture cloth in this country. I know that we have some woollen mills in Australia.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: We do manufacture some.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That is so. However, the manufacturers here are faced with a heavy embargo from the importing countries, which can quite easily impose this embargo because they have free access to the whole of our clip. Once a sheep is shorn, the control of the commodity passes completely out of the grower's hands. This was indicated quite recently by one of the largest wool buyers in the world, a Japanese, who said that wool represented only 2 per cent of his company's business and that it was not of any great importance if every sheep in Australia

jumped over the brink. These people are having all the say and all the control over our product.

One way to arrest the situation is to process wool in Australia. This is so for two reasons: not only would it provide work, but also, from the freight angle. We could export the whole of the clip for a fraction of the cost, instead of having to ship it in greasy form to all parts of the world to have it processed. I say that we must make some attempt somewhere. Subsidies will be asked for and these will give some immediate relief and perhaps stop a number of people from leaving the industry entirely. However, these are temporary prop-up moves, and direct subsidies will not be the complete answer. If we are to approach the Commonwealth Government for assistance, it should be for assistance to manufacture cloth in Australia through some grower-controlled co-operative. This is where the Commonwealth subsidy should be placed.

Because of its climate, Australia itself is not a great wool-consuming country, and many other countries in the world have a greater need for wool. However, even within Australia there are people who are very interested to wear wool yet cannot buy it. Even though the producer is not getting enough for it, the cost to the consumer is high, and somewhere along the line this cost must be reduced. Wool is one of the best commodities in the world; in fact, it has no equal, and I believe we should do our best to see that it is used as much as possible. Every Government and every leader of the industry should be concerned about this, for it is one of our greatest income earners, despite the mineral boom and the mines that we read about. We are not fully extending our knowledge necessary for the promotion of wool. Also, some members within our own organizations do not help very much. It is not much use people going back over the same old ground and howling about things the way the Hon. Mr. Banfield did today. One gets sick of this.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is the spice of Parliament.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Sour spice!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The truth hurts.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: This sort of thing becomes very boring. The point I make is that I think we need a bit of a lift within our own organizations. I can only say that I think perhaps the wool industry would be better off today if it had a gentleman like the

very controversial. Mr. Hawke employed to assist it. We might then get to the point where we could stop Greek ships being loaded until more Communists were gaoled, or something like that. I consider that our organizations need more skilled staff than they have at present. I do not want to detract in any way from the very splendid men who have represented us throughout the industry, but I am sure that the growers will have to contribute more and possibly employ a person like Mr. Hawke.

I have given my ideas about the wool industry and what can be done to assist it. However, primary industry must have some help immediately, and this help can come from the State Government in the form of relief in such things as succession duties, land tax, and council and water rates. I am sure that the State Government will have to approach all of these things in a sane manner in order to give immediate assistance, because some people at present have nowhere to turn and will have to give up their holdings unless they are assisted in some way. Low-interest loans have been talked about for the last two or three years, but nothing has been done.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Interest rates have increased, haven't they?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes, and of course the equity has gone from the land so that the borrowing power is down to about 30 per cent of what it was three or four years ago, and the cost of production and everything else has increased. Council rates have increased by 400 per cent or 500 per cent in some cases. Land rentals, although reduced during the time of the last Parliament (in some cases up to 50 per cent), are still too high in relation to the productivity of the land. Land tax must also be reviewed because people are paying well above their ability to produce. Much has been said about succession duties. I should be pleased to see them abolished.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone gave an interesting run-down on the dog scalp bonus and quoted alarming figures. We have known for a long time in the North that the dingo population was growing and that something should be done about it. In 1950, a campaign began among the Stockowners Association, the Vermin Board Association and pastoralists generally to have the bounty increased. I think it was about 1948 when pressure was exerted and about 1950 when the scalp bonus was increased to \$2. This served its purpose for some time and, shortly after the first increase in the bonus, about 6,800 scalps were taken. Except for

pastoralists, people generally can find better employment than killing dogs.

Pastoralists consider that until the scalp bonus is again increased the dingo population will continue to grow to a point where even cattlemen will be affected. This has been brought about for two reasons: wild dogs have multiplied, and there is a fiercer type of dog in the dingo population. With the advent of modern transport natives can go from one waterhole to another quickly and easily by truck. The missions pick up a load of Aborigines and take them to another waterhole, although there might not be sufficient room for all of their dogs. As a result dogs are left behind at camping grounds, and they sooner or later mingle with the wild dog population. Not only has this meant that there has been an increase in the dingo population but also that the dogs are of different breeds, some of which have been known to pull down calves, and this has caused considerable concern. Since 1960, various attempts have been made to increase the scalp bonus, and this was eventually done to \$6. Although many things have been said about the farming of dingoes, I do not believe that this has contributed to the number of dogs caught.

The fact is that there was good money in trapping, poisoning and scalping dogs at \$6 a scalp, and 19,490 scalps were paid for within a few months. By the end of the financial year there was a deficit in the fund of some thousand dollars to be met from general revenue. Perhaps the Minister has no option but to reduce the scalp bonus from \$6 a head to \$4 a head for adult dogs and to \$1 for pups. I am not questioning this because I know that budgeting is essential and, apparently, the Minister will have trouble in maintaining the bonus at \$6 a head. However, I question the wisdom of paying \$4 for dogs and \$1 for pups because I know that doggers will not be tripped up by this: it is not hard to stretch a dog's scalp for one thing; another thing is the question of who will say whether or not it is a pup; and at what stage does it cease to be a pup and be worth \$4?

I doubt the wisdom of a reduction to \$1 for a pup. Much has been said about people breeding dingoes for profit, and I noticed that the Minister of Works was quoted in the press recently as saying that dogs were being bred in the North. I might tell him that it would not be very wise to say something like that in the Marree Hotel, because there is no truth in any statement that any responsible person

is breeding dogs. Some Aborigines tie dogs up at certain times and set traps around them, but they do not set the traps until they are sure that the dogs can breed more pups. They catch dingoes this way, although the number is minimal and has no bearing on the 19,000 scalps.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I don't think the Minister said that this was widespread, did he?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I do not think so, but some people have the wrong idea because it appeared in the press that the Minister stated that dog farming was taking place in the Far North.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think he referred to something like that in answer to a question.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The scalp bonus should be kept as high as possible. I cannot tell the Government how much money it should allot to the dingo scalp bonus, but I warn the Government that the dingo population is increasing in alarming numbers and I hope that the Minister of Lands will do his best to ensure that the present bonus does not drop below \$4. I also entreat the Minister to pay \$4 on all scalps and, at the earliest possible time, to increase this amount to \$6 again.

Perhaps one of the greatest safeguards to the sheep industry is the present buffer fence; and the Minister of Lands will have to do his best to see that it is kept in the best of repair at all times. Some of the fence itself dates back as far as 1896, and much of it was built privately. Eventually, it was taken over in, I think, 1946, when the Act was passed and it was estimated that a buffer fence would serve the purpose best. With this in view, the northern part of the fence was upgraded. The outside fence is now some 13,500 miles long and stretches from the New South Wales border to within 90 miles of the Western Australian border. It runs south of the salt lakes and hooks up with the Great Australian Bight.

This fence, having been erected for so long, is beginning to show signs of wear. Although the landholders who are responsible for it are subsidized to the extent of \$35 a mile, they are finding it increasingly hard to keep it in repair. Recently, a move was made to shorten the length of the fence by taking a line from the corner of the fence straight through to the New South Wales border, which would shorten the distance by well over 100 miles—in fact, 122 miles. So far, this suggestion has not met with approval. My point is—and I hope the Minister of Lands will read my speech—that

this buffer fence must at all times be kept in the best possible repair. It is paid for by people who hold only 20 per cent of the State's stock, but it provides protection for the whole sheep population of South Australia. Because of its age, it needs constant vigil. Miners too are causing damage to the fence because in some of the mining areas they find it cheaper to put a bulldozer through the fence than to travel to a proper gate. A hole having been made in the fence, by the time the pastoralist concerned has found it the kangaroos have found it, too, and use it as a gateway. Odd dingoes have come through and kangaroos continue to push holes in the fence for some time after its repair through that gap. I hope this point will be considered in the forthcoming mining legislation.

I want now to turn to schooling, which was mentioned in the Governor's Deputy's Speech. I appreciate that the need for schools has increased and, all in all, any Minister of Education is facing a mammoth task in trying to keep abreast of the State's school needs. It is an almost impossible problem to solve, but in the country areas there are many children unable to enjoy the school facilities at present available to children in the more populated areas. I realize it is impossible to provide full education facilities at every small centre; on the other hand, it is the responsibility of any Government to ensure that every child in the State has an opportunity of being educated to a standard that will fit it to compete in today's competitive labour market.

In rural areas the opportunities for a child to take over his father's property are diminishing. Because of the economics of primary industry, because of succession duties and many other things, the likelihood of a child working on his father's property is decreasing, and he could be faced with competing on an open labour market without the necessary education. Every child needs equal schooling facilities. Also, better school transport must be provided. School transport must be upgraded and professional drivers should be employed. This would be much cheaper and more satisfactory than the eternal struggle to find facilities for those children in every small centre.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That would depend on the distance to be travelled.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes, but we can travel greater distances today with present-day transport than was envisaged some years ago.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What would be the maximum distance possible?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It could be up to 100 miles a day for primary schoolchildren given proper travel facilities. For secondary schoolchildren it could be further. We have a lass in my area who has just returned from using an oversea scholarship. She travelled 80 miles a day, but she did most of this on a bitumen road.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Where was this?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: She lives at a place not far from Cootra, and she goes to Wudinna school. More money must be channelled into proper transport, and more transport is needed. In some places parents are subsidizing buses to the extent of \$11 a month. They find it hard to do this, especially when the children are still not receiving the schooling necessary to take them to Leaving standard. The Government intends to do something about the Mining Act. I hope it will not be long in bringing down the amending legislation necessary to correct the anomalies in that Act and that it will ensure that the small miner, who has contributed so much to the mining industry in South Australia, is well cared for. I hope that the big companies do not swallow up all the plums, to the detriment of the fossicker.

I have spoken several times about the need to up-grade South Australian country roads. The main north road through Kingoonya to Alice Springs is often in a shocking condition. The Western Australian, South Australian and Commonwealth Governments are considering bituminizing the east-west road, which carries much traffic. However, it is not at present intended to seal the north-south road. I have pleaded that it be up-graded and realigned, and I think the Highways Department is doing its best on the planning side but planning, of course, will not provide the money. Here again it is hoped that some Commonwealth finance can be added to State funds to enable this work to be carried out. In the meantime, places like Coober Pedy deserve to have their main streets bituminized. It is not the fault of the residents of such towns that so much traffic passes down their main streets. I understand that the Ceduna-Penong road will be finished soon.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: By the end of October.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Which year?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This year.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I do not think so; however, I hope the Chief Secretary is correct. They will have to make much better progress than they are making at present if the road is to be finished by that date. The last time I was in Coober Pedy I could not see a person walking on the other side of the street, because of the dust. Some business premises in Coober Pedy are a credit to their proprietors, who are entitled to some amenities. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to bituminize the town's main street.

Much has been said about water without much being done about it. Progress is being made on the Poldo-Kimba main; each time we ask about it we find that it has progressed a few chains. The Kimba people are still relying on water carried to them by tanker, and there are severe restrictions in the township. Unless it soon rains there will be a plea to the Government for assistance for stock water. Previously, stock water has been carted by train at a cost of \$11 a thousand gallons and water has been carted to the township at \$13 a thousand gallons. Although the people were grateful for that service, it is not the answer to the problem. I do hope the Government will try to speed up progress on the main. It seems ridiculous that \$250,000 can be spent in some years for water carting and yet the whole pipeline is estimated at just over \$2,000,000.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What progress was made on the main in the last two years?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: About 11 miles—not enough.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: We can do better than that.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I will be pleased if you do. More research is needed into this State's overall water position. True, on the West Coast new basins are being discovered by further drilling. In the Far North it is thought there are great water basins that have never been tapped. I believe that people should be given some incentive to supply their own needs and to conserve water wherever possible. Various organizations have made submissions for a different approach to water rating. It is high time that water was paid for by volume. Of course, such a method would affect the metropolitan area to the point where some adjustment would be necessary: a base charge would be necessary. We want to see a fair rating system. If people had to pay for water by volume there is no doubt that they would use less.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They would pay much more for it.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That would depend on the base rate.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The average householder would pay much more for it, even if he used less.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That would depend on the base rate. The average householder would certainly use less, and that would be very beneficial overall.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You would squeal about water rates if that system were introduced.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: A different rate would have to be set for the metropolitan area. Many country people would be suited by paying by volume, because they would not have to pay for water they did not have to use.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: In a drought you would not use any for stock.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The system I am suggesting would conserve water in this dry State. It is good to see that the new Attorney-General has condemned the amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act that were made during the last Parliament. Had he been a member of Parliament at that time he would have fought on my side. If he is genuine, the ball is at his feet: he is in the box seat to alter that law and to remedy the damage done by it. I support the motion.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.36 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 30, at 2.15 p.m.