

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 26, 1972

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

## QUESTIONS

## SOFTWOOD PLANTINGS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Forests.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yesterday the Minister replied to a question I directed to him concerning the new five-year agreement for financial assistance to the States for increasing softwood plantings. In his reply, the Minister said:

I am pleased that South Australia has obtained the agreement it set out to obtain in the first place.

The meeting of the Forestry Council was held in June, 1971, but it was not until November that the Minister issued a press statement claiming that the Commonwealth had singled out South Australia for harsh treatment. Can the Minister explain the delay from June to November in issuing the press statement; secondly, would he inform the Council if he, as the South Australian representative, disagreed with the Australian Forestry Council in the five-year agreement reached at that time?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This matter has been raised on several occasions, and I gave a detailed statement to the press in the South-East to clear up the matter. I am sure the Leader has read that statement. However, for the benefit of members in this Chamber I shall explain quite briefly what happened. At the Forestry Council meeting, as the Leader indicated, an agreement was reached on a cut-back on the plantings of the previous five years. The Commonwealth representatives indicated at that stage that they wanted this cut-back because the whole softwoods programme had been assessed up to the year 2000, and the Commonwealth officials claimed that it was not necessary to provide the financial contingencies previously arranged. Every State agreed to a minor cut-back, we in South Australia agreeing to the scheme as proposed. I thought everything was cut and dried. Unfortunately, a meeting of conservators was held with Commonwealth officers. The Commonwealth officers initiated this new scheme, which would cut South Aus-

tralia back by about 67 per cent on what had been agreed at council. As far as I was concerned, this was a departure from what had been decided at the council meeting and I voiced my strong opposition to it in no uncertain fashion. It was only on the representation that I made to the Minister for National Development, Sir Reginald Swartz, that the whole matter was resolved. I am happy that the Commonwealth in its wisdom saw the need for South Australia to be put back, because what it meant was that the Commonwealth was going to reduce this State's allocation by about 67 per cent. I will not say that that figure is absolutely accurate because it is some time since I have looked at this proposition. I knew that what the Commonwealth officials suggested they should take away from South Australia would be given to the other States. That is why I took strong exception to this. I am pleased to say that this matter, I believe, has gone through the House of Representatives in Canberra and I understand it is now before the Senate. It is unfortunate that the agreement did not pass at the last sitting but I understand the Senate hopes it will go through in this next session.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a further statement before asking a question of the Minister of Forests.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the Minister for his reply; I now understand why the Minister did not issue any press statement until five months after the Australian Forestry Council meeting. However, the Minister still has not quite answered my second question: did he disagree with the original decision made at the council meeting in June? From the comments he made, I assumed that he did not disagree. Am I correct in that assumption?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It was all explained in the press statement that I issued to papers in the South-East. For the benefit of the Leader and other honourable members I point out that when this matter was first raised at the Australian Forestry Council I did not agree with the Commonwealth Government's suggestion that all States should reduce their plantations. I make that quite clear, and that is in the minutes of the council's meeting. I took the attitude that we should be increasing our plantations throughout the whole of Australia in the interests of the softwood industry generally. The reason why the Commonwealth suggested a reduction in the overall plantations was the New Zealand and Australian free trade agreement. However, I

was not prepared to sell the Australian softwood industry down the drain at the expense of the agreement, and I made that quite specific. In view of the Commonwealth's stand that the money would not be forthcoming, all States had to agree to take cuts somewhere along the line, but South Australia, because of the lack of land available for plantations, was prepared to accept a small reduction to the previous 5-year agreement. However, I did it reluctantly, in view of the overall Australian reduction.

I also point out that it is the normal thing for the Commonwealth Minister to issue press statements immediately after all council meetings, whether forestry or agricultural. I did not agree with the Commonwealth's proposal in the initial stage to cut back on plantations, for the reasons I have given.

#### PETROL SUPPLIES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Increasing concern has been expressed to me about the potential danger occurring for people storing petrol in their back yards in an attempt to alleviate the effects of the present petrol shortage.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Where do they get it?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: From the normal outlets. I can understand why people are doing this, but many dangers are involved and I am certain that many people are using containers that are not satisfactory for the storage of such fuels. Will the Chief Secretary, either through Cabinet or through the Government, issue a general warning about the dangers, both of explosion and to children, involved in the storage of petrol so that people can at least be fully aware of those dangers?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know whether my department has power to act in this respect but I fully agree with the honourable member that the public should be made aware of the dangers of storing petrol loosely, if I can put it in that way. I will take the matter up with my colleagues and see whether the appropriate Minister can make a statement along the lines suggested.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Constituents from the Far North have asked me to do what I can to warn the general public who, despite the fear of petrol becoming in short supply in Far Northern towns, are still travelling north, and perhaps sometimes south. The position is becoming critical for fuel supplies. Would the Chief Secretary like to make a public press statement warning people that they should inquire at one town before moving on to the next whether it will be possible to refuel there? Perhaps this could be done through the Police Department, which in the outback services these various requirements. I know that in some areas such as Broken Hill no further supplies of petrol are available. Oodnadatta has some emergency fuel which, it has been suggested, would be best rationed by the police. Indeed, the situation has caused some concern. Would the Chief Secretary like to talk with me on the matter? In any case, will he alert people that they are taking great risks in travelling from town to town without inquiring about petrol supplies?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be delighted to discuss the matter with the honourable member. Regarding his suggestion that people should be alerted about the danger to which he referred, it is a question of whether I should do it as Chief Secretary or whether the Premier should do it as the Minister in charge of tourism. I assure the honourable member that I will discuss the whole question with the Premier and see whether something can be done to advise the public, which really should not need to be advised about such problems in the North.

#### VETERINARY SCHOOL

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Unfortunately, South Australia was not allocated the fourth veterinary school in Australia. I believe that at present the Western Australian division of the Australian Veterinary Association has expressed fears that Western Australia may lose the veterinary school that has been allotted it at the new Murdoch University, if the establishment of that school is deferred beyond the 1973-75 triennium. Commenting on reports that the school may be deferred because of difficulty in obtaining finance, the State Secretary of the association, Dr. G. M. Robertson, said that the association would be most disappointed if the establishment of

the school was deferred. He said that the need for a fourth veterinary school in Australia had been clearly established in Dr. R. N. Farquhar's report to the Australian Universities Commission in 1968. The fourth veterinary school in Australia, as we all know, was eagerly sought by this State and by the New England University. It is thought in Western Australia that the State Government there is taking a serious gamble in assuming that the New England University and the South Australian authorities will not make further representations that the location of the fourth veterinary school be changed if the matter is deferred indefinitely in Western Australia. If the veterinary school project in Western Australia is deferred beyond a reasonable time, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the South Australian Government will take up the matter, with a view to the school being established in this State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be delighted to do what the honourable member has suggested. I had not heard that the veterinary school project in Western Australia could be deferred. I agree that it is essential that we have a veterinary school in South Australia. The honourable member can rest assured that, if there is any truth in what he says regarding the fourth school not being established in Western Australia, representations will be made to see whether South Australia can be allocated that school.

TEXTBOOKS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to my question of July 18 on primary school textbooks?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Education has informed me that when the free book scheme was introduced possible methods of supply were outlined, together with their advantages and defects. A decision was made to use the bulk-supply scheme, with a restricted choice, on the grounds that the economic gain far outweighed the possible educational gain of freedom of choice. The considerable economic gain is instanced by the following costs of some books supplied for reading in 1972. The choice of figures is random.

	Retail	Bulk supply
	\$	\$
<i>Play Book III . . . .</i>	.88	.44
<i>Time for Reading . .</i>	.80	.40
	1.35	.73
<i>Scholastic Core</i>		
<i>Libraries . . . .</i>	100.00	70.00
<i>Wide Range Readers</i>		
<i>Blue Book . . . .</i>	1.25	.74

If freedom of choice is given to schools, it is clear that one of two things will happen—either the supply of books to schools will be on a smaller scale than at present or costs will considerably increase. It is not intended to alter the arrangements at present.

PORT MacDONNELL BREAKWATER

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Marine, a reply to my question of July 20 on the Port MacDonnell breakwater?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague, the Minister of Marine, has informed me that the sample rocks of varying size and shape that were placed on the reef at Port MacDonnell at extreme low water last summer will not be inspected again until after the end of winter, probably in October or November. The whole idea of the experiment is to determine the optimum size and shape of breakwater rocks, and it is of little use carrying out an inspection until after the samples have had a worthwhile test.

STOCK TRANSPORTATION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Shortly after the Council rose at the end of the last session, I was informed that there had been trouble in the transportation of stock through South Australia to Western Australia, Bathurst burr and horehound having been found on stock in Kalgoorlie, Western Australia. The complaint was referred to me, possibly because I am sometimes involved in the transfer of stock to that State. I was able to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the stock referred to had been transported from Tasmania (where, I am reliably informed, neither of those weeds exists), that the stock were unloaded at Port Pirie and that, while at Port Pirie, the stock got out of the yards and picked up the offending weeds. I understand that the so-called yards in which the stock were spelled are the responsibility of the Commonwealth Railways, and that the State Railways Department has suffered no discredit. Nevertheless, South Australia's good name is affected because those weeds were picked up in this State and transferred to Western Australia. Also, a further difficulty in relation to the transfer of stock possibly exists. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask his colleague to use his good offices with the Commonwealth Railways to

ensure that these yards, which are in a shocking condition, are rebuilt so that when stock are spelled in South Australia they cannot escape and pick up undesirable weeds that could be transported to another State?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague and bring back a reply for the honourable member as soon as it is available.

#### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (HOMOSEXUALITY)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1971, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 25. Page 158.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so I start, first, as other honourable members have done, by paying my respects to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, on the opening of his first Parliamentary session. Sir Mark is a highly respected and wellknown member of the South Australian community who has brought much glory to the scientific world and to this State particularly. To him and Lady Oliphant I offer my respects. Obviously, the very reason which enables us to congratulate Sir Mark Oliphant leads us once again to offer our sympathy to Lady Harrison in her bereavement, and to express again the loss this State sustained when Sir James died so suddenly and in such an untimely way.

It would not be amiss, of course, at this point to name one other bereavement with which we, as a State, have some link. I am referring to the loss sustained recently by the Royal Household in the death of the Duke of Windsor who was, for a short time, the Sovereign to whom we owed allegiance. Then four names were read out by His Excellency in his Speech of members whose families have been bereaved, names of four men who, during their time, served in the Houses of this Parliament. I refer to Lindsay Gordon Riches, Percival Hillam Quirke, William Walsh Robinson, and George Baron Bockelberg. In each case His Excellency referred to the number of years the member had served in Parliament, and

between them they had given 92 years of service to this State in the Houses of this Parliament. To the relatives of these four men one offers sympathy and condolences and the respect that is merited by those who are left behind when their loved ones have given so much service to the community.

Obviously in this third session much work will be covered, and the plans for legislation, as suggested and outlined in the Governor's Speech, ensure that we will be kept busy. The Governor went on to refer to certain primary producers and primary produce. I should like to refer to them for a moment as well. The vagaries of the weather have once again hit the primary producer and caused him considerable anxiety. His plight is not a happy one, and it is not always appreciated by those of us who live in the cities and metropolitan areas. One thing is quite certain. I used to think this when I lived in a rural area in another country, and I think it still as I live in a country town in this State: the stresses and strains of rural life require a sturdy breed of man. It would seem that every time he makes a step forward there is something waiting around the corner to push him back again. He is not without his problems and costs, his transport costs are burdensome, and other costs such as the purchase of seed, fertilizer, machinery and other necessities press heavily upon him. His labour costs rise just as much as those of any other employer of labour, but the difference is that he has considerable difficulty in passing them on, because he has no one to whom to pass them.

At the same time, the returns for the sale of his herds and flocks and his produce in the various markets are at the present moment making very uncertain returns for him. He, more than anyone, is left completely insecure from the actions of oversea countries, such as Great Britain, with her almost imminent entry into the Common Market. I think it is worth recalling that the subsidies such as he does receive are not in the form of patronage. These subsidies are vital transfusions into a body which receives repeated grievous injuries. Truly, the whole community suffers when the primary producer fails, and he does not fail because of his own actions. Strike action is a measure not at his disposal, nor is the word in his vocabulary. His plight, when he is in trouble, is generally appreciated by the people in the city only when the primary producer has reached a stage of well-nigh crippleddom.

His Excellency went on to speak of environmental protection. This is a subject about which

much must continue to be said, but at the same time it is quite important that the whole subject should be kept in proper perspective. Environmental protection is not just a case of ensuring that trees are not uprooted needlessly; it is not a case of ensuring protection of the highways from litter and defacement; it is not a case of ensuring control of effluent from factories, houses, and transport. Neither is it a case of ensuring planning and siting of houses for aesthetic effect when new areas are being developed.

All these things are vital, and they are all recognized world wide. I emphasize that, because gone are the days when any country existed in complete isolation. We may be many thousands of miles from the centre of Europe, but what we do and what we say here have an effect in other parts of the world. I quote someone else when I say that the world is now a global village and environmental protection is a world-wide problem which ultimately comes back to the need to deal with the problem not, as I said, dealing with trees, and so forth, but the basic problem of environmental problems is population control.

In the short term the need to look after our physical environment, including trees, roads, effluent, and so forth, is very important, but in the long term the main issue is people. The bigger the population, the quicker its growth can increase, the greater the demand for living space, the greater the demand for roads, transport, factories, industries, goods, containers, wrapping, air space, and all the things that make up modern society and society's way of life. If there were no population explosion and expansion, if there were no extension of environmental protection, then the problem would not be so difficult. But environmental protection, population growth, and family limitation must be correlated really as parts of the same problem.

Very few people in the world do not readily accept and appreciate the principles of environmental protection as it applies to our ecological surroundings, but the other two parts (population growth and birth control) are subjects which arouse deep emotions and, not infrequently, deep prejudices. When the advisability of the rate of growth of the population to which this country as a whole should aim is discussed, strong feelings are expressed. Views vary: there are some who say there should be no limitation; there are others who say that we should stop just where we are. India, Pakistan, China and certain other Asian countries (and certain European countries, for that

matter) have had experience of a full population explosion. We in this State as well as in the Commonwealth of Australia are not faced with the numerical problems of some of these other vast nations. We have space as such, but nevertheless we have to consider and recognize that our environment must be involved and damaged if our population just grows like Topsy, without control.

We should never ignore the fact that post-war migration has, of itself, increased the overall population of Australia by about one-fifth. Post-war migration has been a vital component in the nation's development. Housing, schools, factories, food, growth and processes, and the other diverse requirements of modern society have had to increase accordingly to cope with this one-fifth increase in population. The indiscriminate erosion of and into our environment, with one-fifth more people, has already spelt trouble for this generation. It has also made it urgent for us to take steps, and to continue taking steps, to plan and consider in the interests of those who shall yet inherit the world. If we do not do this, their plight will be a sorry one indeed. The question of how many people this country and this State can and should support is debatable, but one thing is certain: there is an optimum. May I ask what is the view of the Government in this State about the ideal optimum for the population of South Australia, and by when will that optimum be reached? Thinking in terms of standards of living and the requirements to meet those standards, long-term planning is vital. We cannot go on heedlessly increasing our numbers and, what is more, ultimately we dare not. Are our means of providing food, shelter, clothing and work for our people even today fully adequate and effective?

Even if they are, how much greater this problem will be in years to come and how much more disastrous the effect will be on our environment if we let the increases go on unchecked and uncontrolled. Have we got to plan to live like battery hens in the future? Are we going to drift into that state? More important, do we want to let the world develop in such a way that our children will have to live in such a state? The vital factor in the planning of environmental protection must in the ultimate depend on our birth rate and our migration policy. If we are to maintain our standard of living, we cannot ignore the vital factors of birth rate and expansion, and even protestors who demonstrate in the name of the underprivileged and overcrowded

people of the world are conspicuous by their silence when any question of a reduction in their own living standards is raised. If we are to maintain our own standards of living, we cannot ignore the vital factor of the birth rate.

No Government can afford to ignore the question of a desirable rate of population growth. Increasingly throughout the world people are involving themselves in this problem. Communities are seeking a positive lead from their Governments, and of course one must face the fact that family planning and contraceptives are the two keynotes of population control. Unplanned haphazard pregnancies within wedlock tip the balance against a well-adjusted happy group and turn it into an overburdened and restless crowd. The increase extra-maritally compounds the problem. It is vital that Governments dealing with the matter of environmental protection should recognize that basically they are dealing with a population problem. It is equally vital that everyone who talks about environmental protection shall recognize that the solution starts at his own level and at the level of his fellow citizens. Here, of course, one could go further into the matter of the supply of free contraceptives, extended family planning centres and clinics, and other factors. I am prepared to go further into these points when an occasion presents itself in the future, but today I should like to leave the thought with honourable members that environmental control and population growth are inseparable problems.

His Excellency referred to safety, both on the roads and in industry. I should like to endorse the words used by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday when, in referring to road safety, he said, "Speed and alcohol are the two main contributors to death and injury on the road." I remind honourable members of the problem of safety in that most dangerous of all work places—the kitchen and the home. I am glad to see that a matter that I, amongst others, have raised regularly since I have been in this Council, about flammable clothing (and especially night attire for children) is far from being dead. It is still news. It was raised and discussed at the recent conference of the State Ministers of Labour and Industry, and I am sure that all honourable members will agree that, pending a satisfactory solution as a result of tests for safe synthetics—indeed, at all times, whether or not there is a safe synthetic—in a country like Australia, every emphasis should be placed on the value of wool, both as a first-class fibre and as a fire-resisting substance.

I turn now for a few moments to deal with hospitals. A few years ago, strong feelings were expressed in this Parliament about Modbury Hospital and the Flinders medical unit, as to which should receive priority. Each institution was needed in its respective area because of increasing population around the hospitals. The Flinders medical unit would provide much-needed increased medical manpower, a situation which would not apply quite so much to Modbury. It was true then and it is true now that, when the Flinders medical unit is finished, it will make an enormous contribution to South Australia's medical manpower. Both Modbury Hospital and the medical unit are under way, and we are glad of it. As regards Modbury Hospital, I quote from His Excellency's Speech, as follows:

It will have an initial capacity of 220 beds together with outpatient and casualty services. It is expected that facilities will be opened gradually as staff is recruited.

Can the Chief Secretary say how gradually the facilities will be opened? How soon does he expect that adequate staff will be available? I hope that, after the hospital has been completed, sections of it will not remain empty because of lack of staff.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The hospital will open with 112 beds, and that is a pretty good effort. However, someone else, who ought to have known better but did not want to know better, said that the hospital would open with only 20 beds. I repeat that the hospital will open with 112 beds by April of next year.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Can the Chief Secretary say what is the overall position regarding staffing in the State's hospitals and how many hospitals have empty beds and wards because of the lack of staff? Perhaps the Chief Secretary can give us an equally clear and helpful answer to those questions.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You may have talked me into speaking during this debate, whereas I had not intended to do so.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I am sure that all honourable members will be pleased that the school building programme is going ahead, but naturally no-one will be satisfied until all the Education Department's needs are fully met; of course, such needs will never be fully met, because there is always something to catch up with. I strongly emphasize the need for more staff and buildings for pre-schools. Can the responsible Minister say what proportion of the available funds is being devoted to upgrading adult education centres?

Bearing in mind the nature of those centres, could their needs not be adequately provided

for in so-called wooden temporary structures? If that was done, priority in allocating funds could be given to the needs of pre-schools. In my opinion, pre-schools, primary schools and secondary schools should come before adult education centres in the list of priorities. I hold the work of adult education centres in the highest regard but I believe that, if there is not enough money and staff to go around, the children should be put first every time.

I wish to refer now to the proposed development of Murray New Town. In Britain for a number of years I lived near an area where a new town was developed. When I first knew the place it was a tiny country town called Bracknell. There were about 800 people in this town before it was developed, and the population had been static for many years. It was then decided that Bracknell should be the site of a new town, taking the overflow from London and having new industries. The growing town was first called Bracknell New Town, but it is now called Bracknell. The new town has been built completely around the old town; so, it has developed on the traditions and experience of the original Bracknell and the old town has not been swamped by the new one. Because absorption has been good, we have not seen a soulless jungle growing up that is isolated from everything else. I hope that when Murray New Town is established some of the history of Murray Bridge will be incorporated in it.

I was pleased to hear that steps were being taken to make teachers colleges autonomous. This development is in the interests of breadth of thought and vision in teacher training and it will do away with stereotyped development by rule of thumb, which occurs if control is too centralized. Modern planning involves teaching children to think, and surely the first step should be to enable student teachers to think for themselves.

So, in His Excellency's Speech there is much promise of exciting things for the future. South Australia is not one of the so-called large States, but that does not make it impossible for it to be in the forefront in connection with quality and standards. It means that we need a balance between adopting advanced ideas and a sound economic base. The Government certainly has plenty of the former, but the big question is this: how far is it ensuring that the State has the latter? I trust that the Government is taking steps in that direction. I support the motion.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I join with other honourable members in extending

my congratulations to His Excellency Sir Mark Oliphant on his appointment as Governor of this State. I am sure that Sir Mark will fill the position with the same degree of dignity as his predecessors did and with distinction to himself and benefit to the State. I wish to refer to the untimely death of the previous Governor, Sir James Harrison, who had endeared himself to the people of South Australia during his occupancy of the highest office in this State. Other honourable members have referred at length to the part played in the development of this State by those members of Parliament who have passed on during the last 12 months. I knew and respected all those members. I, too, extend my sympathy to their families.

It can be said that the standing of a Government is reflected in the quality of life about it. In other words, any Government is responsible for the quality of life in the State it governs. On that basis, I think it is fair to say that the credibility of the present Government is lower than the credibility of any Government in past history. This has been brought about by its own actions: the present Government is responsible for the situation now existing in this State.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This is a House of "Revue", so keep laughing!

The Hon. L. R. HART: If one were asked to enumerate details of the lack of action by this Government, one would be here for the rest of the afternoon.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: We will sit and listen to you.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You would be joking!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am quite happy to accommodate the Minister.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is the best joke I have heard for a long time.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is easy to enumerate some of the actions of the Government that are responsible for the situation in this State at present.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have never been better off in your life, and you know it.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Let us look at the record of this Government in relation to the Police Department, under the Chief Secretary's control.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What are you talking about? Are you off your balance, or what?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Let us consider the Premier's actions when he was not willing

to uphold a decision of the Commissioner of Police, who was endeavouring to uphold law and order.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are out of your mind, man.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am not out of my mind.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The Premier was out of the State.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When you attack the standing of the Police Force you are out of your mind.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am not attacking the standing of the Police Force: I am attacking the lack of support given to it by the Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What again! That's a complete lie, and I challenge you to prove it.

The Hon. L. R. HART: But these are facts, which is the very reason why the Chief Secretary is becoming upset.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am not upset, but I don't like to see the force run down.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I do not place this at the Chief Secretary's door.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But it's my department, and I resent it.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The person who overrode the Chief Secretary was probably the Premier himself.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I assure you that the Premier never overrode the Police Department, so put that in your pipe and smoke it. I challenge you to name one occasion on which the Premier overrode me.

The Hon. L. R. HART: There was one.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There wasn't one.

The Hon. L. R. HART: There was one. The Chief Secretary will have his chance to speak when replying to the debate.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I hate to see a good force being spoken about in the way you are doing now.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Chief Secretary deny that a prisoner serving a sentence in this State was permitted to leave the gaol to address a group of demonstrators?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's how much you know. I was 12,000 miles away at the time.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The prisoner was demonstrating against the law under which he was charged.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You said the Premier overrode me, but I was 12,000 miles away. What are you talking about?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Repeated interjections and interruptions are definitely out of

order because they do nothing for this Chamber's reputation. I ask honourable members to desist from this practice, otherwise I shall have to resort to the full powers contained in Standing Orders.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You might have to if the honourable member keeps on talking in that way!

The PRESIDENT: I also warn honourable members that I expect them to maintain order in the Chamber and I suggest to the Hon. Mr. Hart that he can possibly avoid provoking other honourable members. I call on the Hon. Mr. Hart.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You're telling me!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Thank you, Mr. President. Can the Government deny that it did not pay the court costs of a union in a recent case that has been gone into in detail?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It wasn't a union: it was an individual.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You know what he means.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Let him tell the truth.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Government deny that it did not pay the court costs of a union official in a recent case which has been gone into in depth by other honourable members and about which I do not intend to go over again? This action by the present Government has reduced its credibility to such a low standard that the situation in this State is virtually getting out of hand. The Government believes in the policy that everyone should be allowed to do his own thing; in fact, Government members have made statements to that effect. Yesterday's newspaper contains a report that four illegitimate children are born every day in South Australia—something like 1,500 each year. Even more disturbing is the fact that the highest rate occurred in girls between the ages of 15 and 19 years; in fact, 11 children were born to girls between the ages of 10 and 14 years. This is an indication of the permissive society in which we are now living and which the Government is doing nothing to suppress.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: How would you rectify the situation?

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister has any amount of time in which to express his opinions. We are living in a permissive society which the Government is condoning and doing nothing to suppress. A recent press report states that almost 40 per cent of all arrests made by the police in Adelaide and Elizabeth



at the weekend were for alleged driving-under-the-influence offences. It is common knowledge that many road deaths result from such offences and, as they are on the increase, they will result in more people being killed. What effective action is the Government taking in this regard?

Recently, I read in the press that nine attacks had been made on schoolchildren in this State; this is a most disturbing situation and one which should concern the Government. All respectable citizens were no doubt disturbed at the evidence given in the recent Duncan inquest. However, the Premier has been quoted as saying that a person is justified in breaking the law if his conscience dictates that it is an immoral law, provided that he accepts the consequences; but the problem today is that people who break the law are not prepared to accept the consequences nor to abide by another law that is the penalty for breaking a law. Society is reaching a degradingly low level because of lack of action on the Government's part.

I turn now to the trade union movement, which seems to be having considerable difficulty in attracting membership. I suggest that, if it were not for the clause in the Industrial Code providing for preference to unionists (all things being equal), most employees in industry today would not belong to a union; this situation has been brought about by the militant attitude of union officials.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What is the number of the clause that provides for preference to unionists?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think he's referring to the Commonwealth pastoral industry award.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That clause was defeated in this Chamber, and the Hon. Mr. Hart was one of the members who voted against it.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I accept the Minister's interjection. The provision was in regard to the pastoral award, as suggested by the Leader. If it were not for this clause in the pastoral award, I doubt whether many people working under it would be union members.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That's only your opinion.

The Hon. L. R. HART: No, it is because of the militant actions of union leaders. The militant actions of the union hierarchy are the cause of some of the economic ills in this State. That statement is borne out by a report

in the *Advertiser* of July 26 in which Mr. C. W. Branson, the General Manager of the Chamber of Manufactures, is quoted as saying:

The chief problem of the Australian economy was the militant actions of the trade union movement, the General Manager of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Mr. C. W. Branson) said yesterday. Mr. Branson said: Because the average worker is always in fear that his job might be the next one called out in a strike or declared black, he and his wife are making sure that they have a few bob in their savings account which will be available to them in the event of inadvertent unemployment.

Many decent and respectable citizens who appreciate what the union movement has done for them would probably be willing to join a union if they could take an active part in union affairs. But such people are not willing to attend union meetings because of the stand-over attitudes of the hooligan element in the union movement. I have heard decent, respectable unionists say that they are not game to go to a union meeting and express their views because they will be either howled down or knocked down. This is why the general public is reluctant to join unions. People are also reluctant to become financial members of unions because their union levies are used to assist in the electioneering campaigns of the Australian Labor Party. The union movement says, "We give only a percentage of our union fees to the A.L.P.," and they give it because of the great myth that the A.L.P. is the only Party that cares about the workers of this country.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Where do you get your finance from?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I work for mine.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I am talking about your Party.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The union movement subscribes to the A.L.P. because of this great myth. I do not object to the union movement's making certain payments to the A.L.P. from the subscriptions of those members within its organization who are also members of the Labor Party. However, today many people in the work force are supporters not of the Labor Party but of some other Party. I would have no objection to the unions, if they considered it necessary, imposing a political levy and giving financial assistance on a pro rata basis to political Parties: that is, if 25 per cent of the members of the union are supporters of the Liberal Party, 25 per cent of the funds made available for political purposes should go to the Liberal Party, the remainder going to the Labor Party. Surely

no-one denies that that would be a fair arrangement. I bring these matters forward because this is the crux of the problem today, when people are unwilling to become members of unions or to support the union movement. I should like now to refer to the Aboriginal situation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You know as much about that as you do about trade unions.

The Hon. L. R. HART: There are many do-gooders on the Aboriginal band waggon. Many of the recent developments in the Aboriginal movement are being sponsored for political purposes. The promoters are often not Aborigines at all but are merely persons wishing to cause embarrassment to political Parties and who are willing to use the Aborigines to achieve their ends. Given the opportunity, and if properly guided, the Aboriginal could be a responsible person, capable of making his contribution to society. However, he can be easily manipulated and led for political purposes, not realizing that he is ruining his own image and making it extremely difficult for people, who have a genuine desire to do so, to help him. I refer honourable members to the report of the Legislative Council Select Committee on the Welfare of Aboriginal Children, which is indeed a valuable report. That Select Committee was appointed by this Council in 1969.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: During the time of the L.C.L. Government.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It was in 1969.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That's exactly what I said.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The honourable member can work out which Government was in office then. In any event, two members of the honourable member's Party were members of that Select Committee. I trust that all honourable members have read this valuable report. If some of the recommendations contained therein had been implemented, we would not be experiencing the trouble with Aborigines that we are experiencing today. This Select Committee operated over a period of 5½ months, and I pay a tribute to Black Rod in this Council, who acted as the committee's Secretary and who was of great assistance to it. The committee met on 46 occasions and interviewed 146 witnesses and other people in an unofficial capacity. It visited every Aboriginal reserve and mission station in South Australia.

In examining the Aboriginal situation, three essential factors arise: first, education; secondly, housing; and, thirdly, employment. The

great problem is: in which priority should these factors be applied, because without one the others cannot effectively be put into operation? For the purposes of this debate, I will take them in the order of education, housing and employment but, before pursuing that angle, I will comment on some of the recommendations contained in the Select Committee's report.

One of the great problems on the Aboriginal reserves has been the lack of incentive for the Aborigines to be ambitious. There is no incentive for them to be economically viable because any (and I emphasize "any") profits that they make are used for general revenue purposes and are not applied to the welfare of the Aborigines who produce that income. To explain this matter to the Council as briefly and as effectively as possible, I refer now to paragraph 80 of the Select Committee's report, which states:

The reserves at Point Pearce, Point McLeay, Gerard, Koonibba and Amata could be developed into self-supporting economic units. The Committee has been informed that at Amata, for instance, 10,000 head of cattle could be carried without interfering with the hunting opportunities of the Aboriginal people. At present, however, there are only 500 non-descript cattle on the reserve.

At Koonibba, on South Australia's West Coast, there are extremely good, modern workshops that are not being effectively or fully used. Koonibba could be a viable, economic unit if these workshops were being properly and fully operated. It could easily manufacture such articles as gates and other fencing requirements for the entire West Coast area. Indeed, it could be an economic asset to the rural community. The same applies to workshops on other reserves, particularly at Point Pearce, which is yet another example of a mission where full use is not being made of the facilities available. Until we attack this situation in such a manner that the Aboriginal can be a normal citizen, working at a job he is capable of doing, and producing wealth not only for himself but for his race, we will be in trouble with these people. They must be given this opportunity of being self-sufficient within their own communities.

The committee also recommended that a community centre be set up in the metropolitan area of Adelaide for use by Aborigines. The great problem is that the Aborigines at present have no meeting place. They come to the metropolitan area seeking employment, and the Aboriginal is a great person to fraternize with other members of his own race. However, the problem arises that he is fraternizing

in some of our hotels, which are becoming meeting places for Aborigines, leading to their becoming involved in a number of vices, involved with the police, and finally involved in a situation of being at variance with the law. If we provide a meeting place in the form of a community centre, some of the problems we face at present would tend to disappear. I commend to the Government the recommendation in the report that it should assist, on the basis of a 50 per cent subsidy, in setting up a community centre.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You also recommended Colebrook Home being kept open, and Millhouse closed it within a week of your report.

The Hon. L. R. HART: We did recommend that it be kept open. We visited Colebrook Home and saw the situation at first hand.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: And the Government closed it down the next week.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I accept what the Minister said, but we would agree, I am sure (the Minister was a member of the committee) that the Colebrook Home was serving a very useful purpose.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Then why did your Government close it down?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Unfortunately, I cannot answer that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: A crook Government!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Colebrook Home had served a very useful purpose and would have continued to do so had it been given the opportunity. The education of Aborigines is a very difficult problem, particularly in many outback situations. The only way in which this problem can be solved is to provide some form of pre-school education for Aborigines. Great problems are created with Aborigines living in the fringe and outback areas, because the environment in which they live is not conducive to education. They have no facilities for homework and none of the normal aids of the white child in a normal home, and so at the pre-school age the Aboriginal child is far below the standard of the normal white child.

In the primary school situation we find within the Education Department school-teachers properly trained for teaching Aborigines, dedicated to the cause of teaching them, but who, if they wish to gain promotion, must leave the Aboriginal situation for work in other areas. A scheme whereby teachers suitable for teaching Aboriginal children could be given

promotion within the area in which they work would help the situation at primary school level.

At the secondary school level we find that some Aboriginal children can cope with the situation if given the right environment. This is dealt with in paragraph 20 of the report which states:

A serious submission has been made to the committee that Aboriginal children lack the capacity to proceed beyond the primary level. It is true that children of Aboriginal families generally appear to run head-long into learning difficulties as they near high school age. But the evidence of experts is to the effect that the inability of Aboriginal children to achieve results commensurate with their potential can be attributed to their home environment. With few exceptions, home conditions are not conducive to academic progress. Aboriginal children usually come from poor, overcrowded homes where homework facilities are absent and study is discouraged. With a larger than average number of children in the home and a constant background of noise and interruptions, it is impossible for a child to do the home assignments. An immediate need to add to the family income and the fact that suitable employment cannot be guaranteed on completion of their courses are other reasons for the usually high drop-out rate at the secondary level.

On that basis alone it seems that housing should have a high priority in assisting Aborigines. If housing becomes the highest priority, then education must be next. Without education, employment opportunities are limited. In that field the Aboriginal has certain assets and attributes enabling him to work with his hands to a degree that would place him on an equal standard with members of the white population. I believe technical education is more important than academic education for the Aboriginal.

These are the difficulties we face in solving these problems. It will be difficult and it will take a considerable time. It will be slow and it will need a great deal of sympathetic understanding on the part of the white race as well as on the part of the Aborigines themselves. The two races must be prepared to co-operate, in which event there is the possibility that some results could be obtained in the short term, but in the long term we cannot hope for much advancement in the Aboriginal situation unless the Aborigines are properly housed and educated. At that stage probably they could be suitably employed. Housing and education must have equal priority, and we must attack this joint problem with a great deal of vigour. I commend to the Government the report of the Select Committee, and I support the motion before the Council.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Like other members, I congratulate His Excellency upon the manner in which he opened the current session, and also upon the way in which he has settled down in this State, at home among his fellow South Australians. I extend my sympathy to the relatives of Lin Riches, Bill Quirke, and George Bockelberg, all of whom I knew and held in very high esteem as members of this Parliament, and also to the relatives of the Hon. W. W. Robinson, whom I did not know as a member but about whom I have heard many favourable comments since I have been in this place.

The first point in His Excellency's Speech upon which I shall touch is that dealing with the medical school and the Flinders medical centre. I heard by way of interjection that the Minister was most definite that there would be 112 beds.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not at Flinders, but at Modbury.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thought the Minister mentioned that that was the case at Flinders. The point I wanted to make was in respect of the beds at the Flinders medical centre. I noticed that His Excellency, in the Speech that the Government approved on July 18, said that there was to be a 710-bed hospital and that this was in fact to be the Flinders medical centre. I received a letter from the Chief Secretary dated July 20 (two days later) in which he told me that there was to be a Flinders medical centre and that it was to be a complex of 680 beds. So it seems that 30 beds were lost in two days. I worked it out that, at 15 beds a day, by September 4, if the Chief Secretary is not too watchful in his plans, he will not have any beds left. Apparently, there was some error there. I am sure it was only a clerical error in either the Speech or the letter that I received.

The important point I make in this debate is that I bring to this Council the feeling of considerable concern about and criticism of the Government that I have noticed within my electoral district, in respect of the manner in which it has handled the whole matter of the Kangaroo Island dispute. I emphasize that, when I speak of trade unions and trade union power, I recognize that unions have made an extremely worthwhile contribution to the welfare of their members in this State.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not only their members but the population of the whole State.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Also, those who will not join a union.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Compulsory unionism is another matter altogether. That was the point of the Minister of Lands. I would be only too pleased to deal with it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: My point was that it benefited not only the members of the unions but the whole State.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I did not say it should be compulsory to join; I say that people should join unions because of what the unions have done for them.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thought the Minister was saying that unionism should be compulsory.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: No.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am pleased to hear that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I return to my first point, that, in being critical of some aspects of the trade union movement, I say emphatically that I recognize that it has played a very worthwhile part in South Australia, as the Chief Secretary has indicated. But it does not matter what the organization or institution is or who its members are; it does not matter whether it is representative of the employers or of the employees; it does not matter whether it is a group of people or one person—or a Government, for that matter: the people at large are always wary and should always remain wary that, whenever power is exercised in such a way that some people are hurt, the organization involved must be watched carefully.

The Kangaroo Island dispute was an example of unionism being too powerful and exercising its power at the expense of innocent people in this State. That is something about which the people at large are most concerned. When unions are prepared to use their power in this way against some people on Kangaroo Island who were not involved in any way at all with the industrial problem over there—against these innocent people, most of whom, we know, are battling financially and suffering the problems that many people on the land are suffering today, through economic and other difficulties and their geographical situation—that is an example of union power going too far.

The people of South Australia, who have observed what has happened, have accepted it as a warning to the whole State and to the regional communities that are isolated not to quite the same extent as the people on Kangaroo Island but geographically in some

respects. I refer, of course, to people in areas such as the South-East, the Murray River and Eyre Peninsula. It is very worrying to the people when, to the best of my knowledge, for the first time the unions took out the big stick on the populace at large.

It was not a case of using it on some individual, as happened to the hotelkeeper in Angas Street, who had to suffer; it was an example of the people at large on that island suffering severely. It is a dangerous situation when that occurs; it is something that the people of South Australia will not forget easily.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The people of Kangaroo Island must be grateful for the action taken by the Government in settling the dispute.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member thinks the people of Kangaroo Island are grateful for anything like that, he is much mistaken. I do not think he has been in touch with them very much.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: As a result of the action taken by the Government, the problem was resolved.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The resolving of the problem is another matter altogether. The second point I make, which is being talked about by the people in my electoral district, is that this whole matter indicated that this Government is frightened of the unions, and that the unions are in a position to wield power over the Government. When that state of affairs exists, that is something about which the people are upset—and I think they have every right to be. The unions exercised their power over the Government by making the Government pay this fine.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Tut, tut!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am sorry—costs.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Whose costs? Let us get it clear.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: But the payment was there.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How members opposite like to turn things!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The unions exercise this power over the Government. I want the Government to deny this if it can.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member is completely wrong again. I do not wish to interject, but the union did not ask the Government to pay its fine or costs.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Did the Government ask it to pay?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No. We were told by the employers' side that, if the costs were not paid, they would not go to conference.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I get on to my second point.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Who wielded the big stick then?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We will go on with the discussion and take my second point. As I said earlier, I am bringing into this Chamber the general opinion that has been expressed in my electoral district, that this example of unionism and the Government's relations with the unions prove to the people in my electoral district that the unions are running the Government.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is that why the Commonwealth paid the fines of some union officials?

The Hon. C. R. Story: The honourable member can say what he likes, but everything he says will not be printed in the press.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not always wanting the press to print what I say.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The Commonwealth paid the costs of certain union officials. Is the Commonwealth Government frightened of the unions?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not talking about that. I want this Government to stand up and answer the criticism being levelled at it here in South Australia, that the unions have proved on this occasion that they are the masters of the Government because, when the people of Kangaroo Island were being treated as they were by the unions, naturally people all over the State turned to the Government for help and leadership in this matter.

Unfortunately, of course, the Premier was not in the State at that time. I do not know whether he was out of the State on Government business! The point is that the leadership that the people got from the Government was nil. It was complete evidence that the unions were in charge of the Government, and the people did not like that state of affairs. I wish to refer to Mr. Dunford's costs.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They were Mr. Woolley's costs.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Honourable members know that the costs were payable by Mr. Dunford. In view of statements by honourable members opposite about union solidarity, I would have thought that, when the unions saw that one of their leading members had to pay a large sum, the unions would pay that sum. That is why I asked earlier whether the Government had asked the unions to pay the costs; apparently the Government did not do that. Apparently pressure was put on the Government to foot the bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: By whom?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The unions.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is completely untrue.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Some unions were hostile that the Government paid the costs.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I find that fairly hard to believe. I believe the position was that someone had to pay the money and Mr. Dunford could not pay because he did not have the money (and that was fair enough, at that stage) and it was a case of either the Government or the unions finding the money. The unions saw to it that the Government footed the bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am telling you that the unions never came near us.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not accept that statement.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Because it does not fit your argument.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Leader of the Government in this Council is telling me that during the Kangaroo Island dispute the unions did not come near the Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: On the question of paying the costs.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not accept that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You do not want the truth.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Of course the Government had discussions about paying the costs, and the whole State knows it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not with the unions.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Because the Government was concerned about the adverse public opinion that was being created, it had to pay the money. The Government went to the Treasury and took the people's money, held on trust; that money was supposed to have been spent in accordance with Estimates approved by the Parliament of this State. I ask the Government to show me where on those Estimates this expenditure has been approved. The Government knows that it cannot do it. In my view, it acted completely unlawfully—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: —because it took money from the State Treasury.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Not unlawfully.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am stating my view. When a Government takes money from the State Treasury under any heading or line that Parliament has not approved, it is acting unlawfully, and that is what the Government did. I believe a question has been asked—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The answer has been given.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: —as to what the Auditor-General will say about it. Of course, the Government knew that the relevant report of the Auditor-General would not be published until after June 30, 1973.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you think for a moment that the respected Under Treasurer would give us illegal advice?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I believe that the Treasury objected to the whole proposal initially.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you believe that the respected Under Treasurer would mislead us and give us wrong information as to whether it was legal or illegal?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not believe he would ever give incorrect information, but whether the Government would accept his advice or not is another story. I believe the Government exceeded the law in this matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I challenge the Government to request the Auditor-General to make an interim report on this one item and bring the report down in this Council. I want to see the comments that would normally be published in his report after June 30, 1973. I believe that the people would like to read the Auditor-General's views on this matter. The upshot of the whole thing is that the people at large are bringing these comments to those concerned, their representatives, and we have a clear duty to inform the Government of those comments.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: How many letters have you received?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have been to an average of five meetings a week, and it has been the main topic of discussion.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Stirred up by yourself.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the Government tries to justify its actions in regard to this matter, it can continue to do so, because the people will still be making their own observations. The time will come when the people, the masters of any Government, will have their say on the question through the ballot box. I give this caution to the Government: unless it is willing to run this State and take charge of the unions when they take action that adversely affects battling little people in the country and elsewhere, it will come under very severe criticism indeed.

Regarding the proposed development of Murray New Town, a few months ago I had

the privilege of discussing in England the planning of new towns with some experts, particularly a professor from the London University, a man who I believe was a professor of environmental studies there. We discussed the methods by which new towns can be successfully planned. It worries me when I see a project of this magnitude being started, because I wonder whether it has been adequately planned. If inadequate planning has been carried out, it could be a tragedy and of great damage financially to the State.

The legislation which the Government has already brought down and which has had the effect of freezing the prices of land in the area under discussion is legislation of which I wholeheartedly approve. I have no quibble with the legislation as far as it goes, because that was the proper action for the Government to take.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said that Sir Thomas Playford would have done it underhand.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I did not. You said that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: What I am concerned about is where the Government is going from this point on. I find that the English practice (and the English new towns, generally speaking, have been very successful) is that initially a Government officer (whose comparable party in South Australia might be a special magistrate) is given the sole task of holding a public inquiry into the whole question of the new town. In other words, it is opened up for complete public scrutiny and public discussion so that people in all walks of life can go before the inquiry and give their views concerning features of the planning of the town.

If we had a public inquiry of that kind here we would find that many people interested in the subject from an academic viewpoint would put their views. So would many interests which have been established in Elizabeth and which have seen some of the good and bad features that inevitably creep into any new town in its initial period.

Authorities dealing with transport could comment, and commerce and industry could give their views. Local government, both near the subject area and elsewhere, could give its view. The whole question of current population trends and the tendencies to restrict the growth rate could be put to such an inquiry, and many of the Adelaide interests that want to see residential renewal in this city, in preference to a new town elsewhere, could

give their views. Commerce, which needs custom in the city of Adelaide, could give its view.

Social bodies, such as the Good Neighbour Council, the Aged Persons Association, and other groups of that kind, could also give their views. In that way, the Government-appointed chairman after, say, six months of public inquiry, would bring down his finding on whether he believed the town plan should proceed. If he said that it should proceed, he would give his views on how the initial planning should be carried out and who should comprise the initial planning committee so that the scheme could get off the ground.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I understand they work excellently.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: With that kind of inquiry into the initial development of a plan of this kind there is a great chance of the whole venture succeeding. But, if that kind of public scrutiny does not take place, some of the problems that have occurred in America, where many new towns have not been successful, are likely to occur.

One of the problems that occurred in America was that, when a new town was established, after awhile there was a tendency for people in the middle-income bracket to move away from the main city into the new town, thus leaving a kind of vacuum in the existing city; from a social viewpoint, that can be a tragic state of affairs.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's happened a lot in California, hasn't it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I believe so, and the position should be studied. I stress that I favour decentralization, and I am a great supporter of any moves toward decentralization. However, the inquiry to which I have just referred might find that decentralization would be better accomplished if growth in several of the already established towns took place instead of it all being harboured in one new scheme.

No doubt a great fear exists among people interested in the venture that the town's position might be too close to the metropolis. People have said to me, "The Government knows that the present city stretches 50 miles from north to south now, yet it seems to be drafting plans that it will stretch 50 miles east to west ultimately."

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What was your answer to that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government should institute a very deep initial public inquiry.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What's your present view on that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have some fears in the long term that this might happen.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Isn't the one great thing in its favour the big range of mountains between the city and the new town?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The mountains are already causing concern. I was talking to people at a function last night from the Mount Barker area who own property there. They look forward to the day in the long term when their land might be used for housing estates. They said to me, and I agreed, that in the long term some housing settlements in the Mount Barker area west of the accepted catchment area would be an ideally pleasant rural environment in which people could live and commute by the freeway to the city.

It has already been stated in the press that a planner interested in planning and developing this proposed new town area had said that the area of vast open space between the city and the new town could be controlled, regulated and restricted by law. That has not left a very pleasant taste in the mouths of people who have held property up there for generations and who do not want to see themselves too much restricted by control and regulation.

If there was an inquiry such as I have suggested, such people in those areas could at least put their views, and they would feel happier when final decisions were made than they feel now. I hope the Government will consider such an inquiry, because I believe we have been somewhat lulled into a belief that new towns can be established easily and that they will succeed irrespective of the initial planning.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you think Elizabeth has proceeded well in its development?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I was coming to that point. People have been lulled into that belief by the success of Elizabeth. I am sure the Chief Secretary will agree with me that the conditions that exist today, compared with the conditions that existed at the time Elizabeth was planned, are different. Immigration was booming then.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You're referring mainly to costs, are you?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Not so much to costs but to the fact that there was a high rate of immigration at that time; so it was obvious that vast housing areas had to be found for the population growing up here and for the people stepping off ships from abroad. Some housing had to be found for those

people. We knew that the industrial growth rate was much greater then than it is now because, naturally, industry followed that high immigration rate, and circumstances were different then from what they are now. That is all the more reason why the Government should proceed with caution in this matter.

The only other point in the Speech with which I wish to deal is contained in paragraph 12, which deals with transport. I was disappointed that the Speech did not indicate what plans the Government had in mind to proceed with some of the urgently needed transport works in this State.

It seems that the Government is continuing ever so slowly, step by step, to implement the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. It is still frightened of public opinion and is trying to create the impression that it has scrapped the report.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: In fact, you scrapped part of the report, didn't you?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes; the Liberal Government did not approve all the report. Honourable members opposite have accused us of approving it all, but we did not do so. If the honourable member recalls the debate in this Council on this subject (and the decision made at that time has not been repealed), he will remember that we did not approve of the whole plan prepared by the Government of which the honourable member was a member between 1965 and 1968, of which that Government was aware in 1967.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The honourable member's Party scrapped part of it because it suited the political arena at that time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government has just announced that work on the new Hilton bridge was to proceed. That was one of the major projects contained in the M.A.T.S. plan.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They still haven't done the Islington crossing. I am still waiting for that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When the Chief Secretary was sitting on the Opposition benches, he asked several questions regarding progress in that matter. When passing the site last Friday I wondered how the Chief Secretary was getting on with it. The present Government said in 1970 that the M.A.T.S. plan was scrapped. However, we all know that Dr. Breuning was brought out in the same year at a cost of \$9,000. Although he made certain recommendations that honourable members in another place accepted, we in this Chamber did not hear anything about his report.



Then the Government's plans changed again, and in 1971 it appointed a Director-General of Transport. I do not want any of my comments regarding the Director-General of Transport to be taken as personal criticism of the man in any way. However, I cannot help referring to the office and his appointment and, naturally, I must make some reference to the appointee.

I have no criticism of the appointee personally. However, I am surprised (as indeed are many other people in the city) at the Government's inaction since this appointment was made. South Australia now has a Director-General of Transport who has not got a transport department under him. The Government seems frightened to give the man any power or legislative control over any departments: he has no power over the Railways Commissioner, the Commissioner of Highways, the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust or the Director of Planning.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Or the Transport Control Board.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is correct.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Which you refuted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know what the Minister means.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You knocked back control of the board.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: What we knocked back here was Ministerial control, which had nothing to do with the matter of the legislative power that the Director-General of Transport should have over these departments. The public of this State do not know that this Government has one of the most highly paid public servants in this State sitting somewhere or another without a department, with only one or two officers under his control, and that it is doing nothing to change the situation.

The Government is basking in some glory in relation to the progress it has made in the transportation field, but I have set out all that it has done. I intend to put certain questions on notice regarding this matter of costs.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Would you approve of legislation to give him complete control over transport?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am waiting to see the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Would you approve of giving him complete power? Be careful.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am always careful.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I know.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In principle it seems that, if the time has come for a Director-General of Transport to be appointed,

he should have the necessary powers before he takes up his position. That is why the Government lost the first appointee to the job. That reason was not given in this Parliament, but I happened to hear it when I was overseas a few months ago. It is when one goes overseas that one hears these stories through the back door. This Government, seeking to make political capital out of the question of transport, tells the people that it has scrapped the M.A.T.S. report, yet it brings in through the side door one plan after another.

It takes from the Commonwealth Government money that has been earmarked for the M.A.T.S. plan, and tries to camouflage its actions by appointing one of the most highly paid public servants in the State who has nothing to do when he gets here. The only work he has been given is to examine the dial-a-bus scheme.

The public is indeed unhappy about this position and, when they get held up in congested traffic on the way home each evening (and the Hon. Mr. Banfield knows what traffic congestion is like in the South park lands during the winter months, when motorists are waiting for clearances at corners), they ask what the Government is doing in relation to a modern transportation plan.

Many people ask what the Government is doing about the underground railway, in reply to which the Minister merely says that he can do nothing until he knows where the money is coming from. However, in Melbourne plans for their system were drawn up, and they kept knocking on the door and hammering Canberra for finance until the plan could proceed. Unfortunately, this State's Minister is frightened to proceed with his underground railway plan because he knows that it will be the last major decision he will have to make to prove that he has approved of everything in the M.A.T.S. Report. Those who suffer are the present motorists who want to use this modern rail rapid transit system similar to others being used in all big cities in the world.

The population at large has to suffer because of the Government's lack of planning and its inaction in the whole field of metropolitan transportation. However, I hope to have more to say about these matters when further legislation ultimately comes before the Council. In the interim, I fully support the motion.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.18 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 27, at 2.15 p.m.