

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 1, 1972

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

LIQUID FUEL (RATIONING) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

ABATTOIRS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the temporary absence of the Chief Secretary, has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 18 about country slaughterhouses?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: About 180 slaughterhouses licensed under the provisions of the Local Government Act operate throughout the State and supply the small communities not serviced by an abattoir declared under one of the four Acts dealing with abattoirs. These slaughterhouses should conform to the requirements of the Health and Food and Drugs Acts, which are administered locally by local boards of health. Inspectors of the Public Health Department, during their inspections in local board areas, make random inspections of the slaughterhouses and advise local authorities of the conditions requiring attention. The Central Board of Health has always exhorted local boards to supervise and maintain conditions at these premises, so that meat is produced and distributed free of contamination and so that the environment is not polluted by the waste products generated during slaughtering.

Some local authorities have required upgrading of premises, but in other cases the slaughterhouses are not satisfactory in all respects at all times, and improvements both in the structure of the slaughterhouses and in the methods of operation are needed. When unsatisfactory conditions may endanger health, local and State health inspectors recommend to their boards that notices be served requiring the conditions to be remedied. In most cases owners take the necessary action on warning that a notice may be served or renewal of licence refused if remedial action is not taken. In the mid-1960's the slaughterhouses in the Kadina-Moonta area were rebuilt under threat of delicensing, and one of the present slaughterhouses on Yorke Peninsula is under direction to be rebuilt. Proprietors of several other slaughterhouses have voluntarily rebuilt their

premises following inspections by officers of the local or central board.

CATTLE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on July 19 regarding the estimated number of cattle expected to go to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board works for sale and slaughter soon?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Director of Agriculture states that the total cattle population of South Australia at March, 1971, was 1,196,400 head. The populations on a divisional basis were as follows:

Western Division	71,260
Upper North	29,425
Lower North	57,640
Central	314,492
Murray Mallee	78,390
South-Eastern	536,931
Outside of counties	107,266

At present, we have no readily available data on the origins within the State of cattle yarded and sold at Gepps Cross or how many of these cattle sold at Gepps Cross are destined for slaughter elsewhere. About 63 per cent of slaughterings occur at Gepps Cross. A number of these cattle are, however, from other States.

BOAT HAVEN

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture received from the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked on July 25 regarding a boat haven in the South-East?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Works states that the possibility of providing a breakwater at Port MacDonnell is being investigated. Regarding the provision of a boat harbour protected by a breakwater at Kingston, the Minister of Marine has informed me that this project is not feasible at this stage as funds allocated for this type of project are insufficient for a scheme of this magnitude.

OUTER HARBOUR TERMINAL

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture received from the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked on July 25 regarding the new passenger terminal at Outer Harbour?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Marine states that the contract for the new passenger terminal and cargo shed at Outer Harbour has now been let and the contractor's time for completion is 52 weeks. The shed and terminal should be fully operational at the end of this period.

CIGARETTES

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In the absence of the Minister of Health, has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on July 25 regarding the labelling of cigarette packets with cancer warnings?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Chief Secretary states that the Cigarettes (Labelling) Act, 1971, provides that the Act will come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) legislation similar in effect to this Act has been enacted in respect of not less than three of the other States of the Commonwealth; and
- (b) such legislation has, or is likely to, come into operation.

It is understood that labelling will be compulsory in Victoria as from January 1, 1973. As the position in some of the other States is not yet clear, it is not possible to say when action in respect of labelling will be taken in South Australia. It will, however, be taken as soon as the requirements of the Cigarettes (Labelling) Act already mentioned have been complied with.

HONEY INDUSTRY

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on July 27 regarding research into the honey industry?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Research projects of interest to honey producers are being undertaken in South Australia by the Agriculture Department and the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. Departmental projects include the establishment of a pollen herbarium, the morphological classification of pollen grains from South Australian flora, pollen analysis of South Australian honey types, and field trials on the management requirements of honey bee colonies for maximum honey production and maximum pollination of seed crops.

The projects have been financed from State funds although \$400 is to be allocated in 1972-73 from the Honey Research Trust Fund for the purchase of a microscope. Waite Institute projects, which have been financed from university funds, plus an allocation of \$2,165 in 1972-73 from the Honey Research Trust Fund include: the identification of feeding stimuli; factors affecting the results of the use of pollen supplements, (e.g., brood rearing); relative attractiveness of South Australia pollens, irrespective of nutrition values; collection and storage of pollen by honey bees (behaviour); and nosema control.

COORONG

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked recently regarding extending the investigation being made of Lake Bonney to cover the Coorong?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In 1969 an investigation was made into the feasibility of diverting water from the Blackford Drain into the Coorong. The route investigated was generally northward for 13½ miles from Mount Scott along the eastern edge of the range. At this point a cut would have to be made through the relatively high range into the line of swamps which leads northward into the Coorong. About 16 miles of drains would have to be constructed. At the time of the investigation the estimated cost was about \$1,500,000. In view of the seasonal flow in the Blackford Drain, the salinity of the land through which the drain would travel, the doubtful benefit to the Coorong, and the cost involved, the proposal was unattractive. Due to the depressed level of the land near the Blackford Drain at the Princes Highway, it would not be possible to construct a drain northerly through to the Coorong at this point.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I appreciated the Minister's reply, but my question was not directly related to any scheme to bring water into one end of the Coorong; rather, it asked for a broader survey of the entire stretch of water. I understand that the Coorong is affected largely by the amount of water let out over the Goolwa Barrage. I therefore ask the Minister whether the Government will consider a survey of the Coorong on a broader basis than merely on the Kingston end.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will have the matter investigated for the honourable member.

SUPER CARS

The Hon. L. R. HART: On July 19 I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a question regarding Government support of the abandonment of the development of super cars. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Roads and Transport states that so soon as he was aware of the proposed production of so-called super cars he wrote immediately to the General Manager of General-Motors Holden's, expressing his and the Government's

concern at the production of vehicles capable of speeds of about 140 miles an hour. The Minister also raised this matter at a recent meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. Each of the other Ministers of Transport agreed that production of such cars was highly undesirable. The matter has been referred to a committee of A.T.A.C. known as the Advisory Committee on Safety in Vehicle Design, which committee will no doubt report in due course to A.T.A.C. Therefore, the Government and the Minister of Roads and Transport are actively supporting moves in New South Wales and other States to have abandoned the development of high-speed cars.

SCHOOL BUS ROUTES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Education to the question I asked on July 19 regarding school bus routes?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Education Department offers parents a subsidy on a school bus service where there are insufficient children to meet the department's requirements for a service operated by a bus contractor or with a departmental bus. A subsidized service is arranged by a school bus committee, comprising parents of children on the route, and this committee obtains a bus operator and negotiates the daily payment for the service. If a bus operator requires more than the amount of the department's subsidy, the committee arranges for the parents of children who benefit to pay the amount that has to be made up. The department is not involved in these negotiations and is not aware of the parents' contributions towards the cost of the service.

There are 37 subsidized services, terminating at Blanchetown, Brown's Well Area School, Carrieton, Corny Point, Cowell, Crystal Brook, East Murray Area School, Elliston, Eudunda, Gladstone, Hallett, Hamley Bridge (two services), Haslam, Jamestown, Koongawa, Milang, Morgan (two services), Mount Barker, Mount Hope, Mount Torrens, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Purnong, Quorn, Rendelsham, Salt Creek, Siam, Two Wells, Waikerie, Whyalla, Wirrulla, Wudinna, and Wunkar. On the basis of costings of departmental buses for the 1970-71 financial year, the average cost, including drivers' wages, for each type of bus is as follows:

Mini—18 child passengers . .	22.4c a mile
Small—30 child passengers . .	29.3c a mile
Medium—42 child passengers . .	31.0c a mile
Large—66 child passengers . .	31.2c a mile

Costings for 1971-72 are not yet available and, in view of increases in running costs, etc., present costs could be slightly higher than the above figures.

MEAT

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my question of July 20 about the labelling of meat?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The matter of meat substitutes was brought to the attention of the National Health and Medical Research Council at its last meeting in May, 1972. As a result, a draft standard for substances derived from soya bean and sold or represented as a substitute for meat will be discussed at the August meeting of the Food Standards Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council. Meanwhile, it is considered that Food and Drugs regulation 7(a) provides protection for the consumer from misrepresentation. This regulation provides that a label or advertisement shall not contain any statement, claim (explicit or implicit), design, device, fancy name or abbreviation which is false or misleading in any particular concerning any food.

RADIATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Dr. P. M. Ronai, the Director of Nuclear Medicine at the South Australian Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, has recently stated that people are subjected to between 20 and 50 times more medical radiation than they are to radiation from all the nuclear tests that have been conducted so far. Will the Minister have this matter investigated and report to the Council on the probable effects on the South Australian population of the present level of medical radiation?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

TREE PULL SCHEME

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 20 concerning the agreement for a tree pull scheme between the Commonwealth Government and horticulturists in the Murray River area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Grants of up to \$4,600,000 will be provided to the States to fund tree pull compensation. The scheme will include other horticultural industries whose products have been in continuing over-supply, plantings of which take at least five years to

reach full bearing and have a useful bearing life of at least 10 years. The scheme is expected to apply principally to canning peaches and pears and to apples and fresh pears, with the object that half the funds will be applied to pull canning fruit trees.

Compensation rates will be confined within a maximum of \$500 an acre for canning fruit and \$350 an acre for pome fruit, with the firm object that the average cost will be \$350 an acre and \$200 an acre respectively. These rates would vary with the age of trees. The actual rates paid would be set by administering authorities after adjustment for the condition of the trees, canning access and other relevant circumstances of individual applicants.

Applications received by a State in the period from July 14, 1972, to June 30, 1973, will be eligible for assessment within the total sum available. The scheme will apply in two types of circumstance: first, to a grower who is predominantly a horticulturist, is in severe financial difficulties, and wishes to clear all his orchard and leave the industry; and, secondly, to a grower who does not have adequate financial resources to remove surplus trees without assistance but who could continue a viable enterprise if redundant trees were removed and the land put to other use. As a safeguard against replanting, the grower will enter into a contractual agreement not to plant specified fruit trees on land owned by him for five years. The authority will seek an encumbrance on the title to cover the case where land is sold.

DAIRY INDUSTRY

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 19 concerning dairy industry regulations?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Draft regulations under the Dairy Industry Act, 1928-1969, have been prepared by the Crown Solicitor and are now in the printing stage. I expect that the regulations will be ready for consideration by Cabinet and Executive Council before the end of this month.

WALLAROO BUILDING

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: About two years ago, when the National Trust of South Australia formed a branch at Wallaroo, it endeavoured to acquire as its headquarters and as a museum a building that was used at one

time as a post office. The trust was informed that the building would be made available after it had been vacated by the Police Department, which was using it as a residence for one of its officers. The building has been vacated and is at present empty, but the branch of the trust has been informed that the department requires to make further use of the building. In Wallaroo another residence, which could be used instead of the other house I have mentioned, is also empty and has been used by a previous police sergeant. As the Wallaroo branch has waited patiently for this building, as a Cornish festival is to be held in this area next year, and in the interests of tourism, can the Chief Secretary say what is the present situation regarding this historic building and whether its transfer to this branch of the National Trust could be expedited?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As I am unaware of the current position regarding this matter, I will have inquiries made and obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as practicable.

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I direct my question to the Chief Secretary because it involves Government policy. Under the Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Act, 1972, the fuel supplies of district councils have been frozen. District councils have been asked by the Minister of Local Government to keep their staffs employed wherever possible, but certain councils question whether they can continue to employ their staffs gainfully over any long period. That being so, can the Chief Secretary say whether it is permissible for a council to dismiss its employees and to re-engage them under the rural unemployment relief grant scheme?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: This matter is quite foreign to me: I know little about it or about the rural unemployment scheme. Possibly the Minister of Lands can help in this regard. It is a question of contract between the employer and the employee and of whether an award exists. Not knowing the details, I cannot give a reply.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am aware of the existing situation and I know that various councils were contacted last Sunday and asked to co-operate with the Government in conserving their fuel supplies. However, it is up to the councils themselves what they

do in this regard, and it depends on the provisions of the appropriate award. I am aware that some councils have dismissed their permanent employees. Inquiries have been made of my officers (and these were eventually referred to me) whether rural unemployment relief scheme money could be used to re-employ erstwhile permanent employees on work now being done by people receiving rural unemployment grants. That is a matter for the councils themselves, because all that is laid down in the scheme implemented by the Commonwealth Government is that the persons employed must be persons who are registered for employment.

It is a matter for the councils to decide, but they must realize that the sum available under the scheme is based on the unemployment evident in those areas before such action was taken by them. The sum approved in recent weeks was to cover the three months from the beginning of the new financial year. Councils would be advised to examine what they are doing in regard to spending this money, because it is based on spending for the three months after the commencement of the financial year. These people are not ineligible to be re-employed, but it is for the councils to decide.

FISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (on notice): Can the Minister of Agriculture inform the Council of the Government's view of the three submissions made to him by the Australian Fishing Industry Council (S.A.) contained in a document dated June, 1972?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The three submissions made by the council are still being considered by the Government.

STOCK FOODS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stock Foods Act, 1941-1948, as amended by the Stock Licks Act Repeal Act, 1956. Read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from July 27. Page 313.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, as is traditional, compliment His Excellency the Governor on his appointment to this high office in this State. No doubt I express the opinion of most hon-

ourable members when I say that the originality of thinking in his speeches has been most interesting to the people of the State. However, I could not help thinking during the opening ceremony in this Chamber what a pity it was that His Excellency did not *ad lib* during his Speech from your Chair, Mr. President, when dealing with Government business. Had he been able to do so, it would have been a much more interesting occasion because of his originality of thinking. I refer next to the four former members of this Parliament who have passed away since the last session, all of whom came from Northern District, each having in his own way contributed something worth while to this Parliament and, indeed, to the State generally. I refer first to the late Mr. Lin Riches, whose pride in Port Augusta, whose record term in local government, whose fantastic enthusiasm when he organized and seemed to be the guiding light in the running of the poinsettia festival, whose appreciation of the problems of the Aborigines and whose earnest efforts to help them in as many ways as possible will leave a name in Northern areas that will not be forgotten for a long time. Of course, his name appears on several buildings in Port Augusta and is connected with several organizational projects, which gives him a degree of immortality.

The late Mr. George Bockelberg was for many years the member for Eyre in another place, and he also served local government in Streaky Bay. A man with a dry sense of humour, Mr. Bockelberg knew all the people in his district regardless of their political colour or thinking. He appeared to know almost everyone in his day—their family tree, whom they married, and where they had gone. Mr. Bockelberg was a fine man and a most interesting character in his own right.

Mr. Bill Robinson was also a former member of this Chamber. It was my privilege to enter this Chamber following the retirement of Mr. Bob Wilson, who retired at the same time as Mr. Bill Robinson. Mr. Robinson, too, served local government well, and was a Director of South Australian Farmers Co-operative Union (as it was then known), one of the few South Australian stock firms that was able to keep its financial head above water. During the post-war years when Mr. Robinson was a Director of that company it made advances in many areas of industry in relation to stock and station facilities throughout the State.

Finally, one cannot help remembering Mr. Bill Quirke, the former member for Burra in

another place, who was expelled from the Australian Labor Party by its State Executive for having the strength of his convictions and speaking out against the referendum authorized by the Commonwealth Government, on which the Labor Party said that members were free to vote as they saw fit. Mr. Quirke took the opportunity forcibly to express his opinion to a degree not acceptable to the Executive of the A.L.P. and, of course, history records what happened to him from then on. However, this did not daunt the man, and he continued to serve his district, always with an independent spirit and character, as an Independent member and later as a member of the Liberal and Country League. He did much for the people of his district with his originality of thinking and his ability, as well as for the State generally when later he became a Minister. Each of these men contributed something to the State in their time, and were all men born in the years when manners and common-sense were the mark of a gentleman. Each helped me personally, and I only hope that I have been able to learn from their advice.

It is not uncommon at this time for one to refer to strikes. The land appears to be slowly coming to a halt as a result of the fuel crisis, which is of national moment at present. While we have a democracy, there must always be freedom of expression, and the freedom to strike is a privilege guarded by the worker, which he will not relinquish while we live in a democracy. Indeed, strike action is often used by a union as the final weapon to prove that it desires justice or certain changes made. Unfortunately, as industry expands, the work force increases and the unions expand, it is not always possible for the rank and file members of either side to know what they want or where they are going. This is why we have union representatives and shop stewards to guard their interests.

There are management boards and committees whose role is to take care of the problems as management sees them. I am not unmindful of the fact that there is still a great distrust between management and unions. When a union demands wage increases industry immediately looks to see how it can meet those demands—by absorbing the increase, passing it on, or using some other alternative. Whatever happens, industry fears that it will have to increase costs. We have, therefore, this dog-chasing-dog process all the time, and a lack of appreciation of management profit motives compared to the union motive of wanting better conditions for

its workers. Perhaps we will never have a Utopia in this respect. We must continually try to appreciate these problems in order to achieve a far greater understanding. I believe the late Ben Chifley, when Prime Minister of Australia immediately after the Second World War, was the author of the present Commonwealth arbitration system, except for any changes that have occurred in subsequent years.

The system of arbitration, with both parties putting their cases before an independent tribunal, and that tribunal giving its findings, has been used as a basis for the settlement of disputes. At present in South Australia the Minister of Labour and Industry has directed that any union considering having a strike must give him 14 clear days notice of its intention, so that the Minister will have the opportunity to take the unions and the management before the Industrial Commissioner, who can then adjudicate on the problem. Of course, if he is unable to adjudicate in a manner satisfactory to both parties, adverse results can follow. If any moves in this direction fail, the threat of strike action raises its head again.

This is obviously a sensible system, which has been well tried for many years. It seems, however, that there is still room for further advancement. There is still a need for greater understanding between unions and management. I use as a simple example the recent Gepps Cross abattoirs strike, where a man was dismissed. When he was dismissed, the workers at Gepps Cross immediately went on strike, causing suffering to the livestock left in the yards, inconvenience to the management, and, worst of all, hardship to pensioners and to families on minimum incomes, because the shortage of meat made it necessary for supplies to be imported from the Eastern States, resulting in higher prices.

The next step is that both parties will appear before an industrial commissioner, who will then decide whether or not the dismissal was justified. In my opinion, this method is wrong, and ways must be found to improve the system. I put forward the suggestion, humbly, that there should be a minimum cooling-off period of two working days before any strike can take place, and during that time a committee comprising representatives of the workers and of management must confer. I suggest the appropriate Act should be amended to enable this to be done. If the representatives, at the end of the cooling-off period, have found no solution, then the right to strike could remain. However, if a solution is found then a saving results to all concerned.

I understand the first words used by an industrial commissioner when parties appear before him in an industrial dispute are, "Have the parties conferred on their log of claims?" If the answer is, "No", the parties are then sent away to confer, to air their differences, and to come back only with any outstanding points of disagreement that may remain. But why should they go to the commissioner before they get together? Why should this not be done at some earlier stage, so that all are familiar with the problems involved? I realize that in many industries a sensible relationship exists between management and worker but, because that is not universal and because there are faults on both sides, this compulsory cooling-off period of at least two days could help each side appreciate the other's point of view.

This suggestion is not unique in present-day legislation. Parliament has recently passed an Act providing for a cooling-off period of from five to 14 days in the case of goods purchased from door-to-door salesmen, enabling the purchaser to return the goods during that time if they do not prove acceptable. The press has stated recently that the Government intends to bring in a two-day cooling-off period in connection with land sales, so that if either the purchaser or the seller has a problem the sale does not proceed until the expiration of the cooling-off period and no legal obligation arises until the expiration of such period.

I thank Government members for their advice and suggestions regarding what I have said. While we have distrust and misunderstanding, with consequent lack of communication between worker and management, these problems will continue, and they will persist until each side can appreciate the point of view of the other. To me, this is far wiser than airing dirty linen in court. South Australia is a great State in a great country. Surely neither side wants us to sink into oblivion, into a morass of strife, because of strikes, misunderstandings, and a lack of appreciation of the other man's viewpoint. My suggestion may be an oversimplification of the problem, but I make it in the hope that the Government will think it worth some consideration.

I turn now from the lack of communication in industry to the problem of communication for country schoolchildren, a problem which occurs in the northern areas of the State and which I put forward for sympathetic consideration. At the moment eight children living in the area of Mambray Creek, 28 miles north of Port

Pirie, attend secondary school at Port Pirie. These children each pay 63c daily to ride on a Government-subsidized bus for 13 miles from Mambray Creek to Port Germein, where they board the Education Department free bus to complete the journey to Port Pirie. This cost of 63c works out at \$255 for each child in a school year.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Just about private school fees.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes. Because of the rural crisis (and I do not wish to lay emphasis on that), and because these children come from areas outside Goyder's rainfall line, their parents face a double problem. The fall-off in farm income is one factor; the other is that the area averages one good season in about five, so their annual income problem is even greater than that of many other primary producers in South Australia. Some parents believe they cannot afford to keep sending their children on the school bus, and they are worried in case it is necessary to keep them at home. If only two of the children drop out, the number travelling on the bus will be reduced to six, and the Education Department will subsidize the bus only where seven or more children travel. The parents concerned realize the need for secondary education for their children, because there is no money for the children to return, when they leave school, to the land which is their heritage. If only two parents are unable to afford the fares in the next school term, the whole group of eight children would be uneducated and could well become another burden on the labour market.

Ironically, primary schoolchildren from the same area travel to Port Germein on a free school bus, but because it arrives at Port Germein later than the bus leaving Port Germein for Port Pirie, the older children are unable to travel on it. The vehicle taking the secondary schoolchildren from Port Germein to Port Pirie leaves each morning and returns empty from Port Pirie. The driver then goes to his place of employment and in the afternoon drives the empty bus to Port Pirie to pick up the children and to bring them home, so we see, on the one hand, whatever it costs to run an empty school bus, and on the other parents not being able to afford to pay for a subsidized bus service, all in the same area. I cannot help praising the basic concept of the school bus system which is providing wonderful help for children and parents in the scattered rural areas of the community, but there is still hardship to parents reflected on the children.

I am most interested in and grateful for the reply given today through the Minister of Agriculture regarding the running of Education Department buses. The cost a mile of running a mini 18-child passenger bus was said to be 22.4c. That would be much cheaper than the 63c a child that the parents of the children are having to pay in the cases I have put before the Council. In conclusion, let me say that I believe that Labor in this State has never held office for more than three consecutive years: I wish it well in its last year of office.

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

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I support the motion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I join all other honourable members of this Council in congratulating His Excellency, Sir Mark Oliphant, on the manner in which he delivered the Speech at the opening of the Third Session of the Fortieth Parliament. I also congratulate Sir Mark on his appointment as Governor of this State. It is a great honour to South Australia to have one of its most illustrious sons appointed to this high office. In the short time since his appointment, Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant have endeared themselves to the citizens of this State and on more than one occasion Sir Mark has shown that he is indeed something more than a figurehead. I join, too, other speakers in publicly expressing my deepest sympathy to Lady Harrison and her family for the untimely death of Sir James Harrison. My sympathy is also expressed to the relatives of Lindsay Gordon Riches, Percival Hillam Quirke, William Walsh Robinson and George Baron Bockelberg. I knew those gentlemen very well.

I support this motion so ably moved by the Hon. Frank Kneebone and just as ably supported by the Hon. Tom Casey, both of whom I thought made very good speeches. I was surprised, therefore, when the Leader of the Opposition began his speech by saying that both the previous speeches lacked lustre. He may have been thinking of another speech by the Leader in another place, which did not merit a line in the press. So, as to where the lack of lustre is, there must be a difference of opinion on what is and what is not news. The most surprising thing about the Leader's speech was that, although he stated that the speeches lacked lustre, his answers to those speeches took him into the second day of talking in an attempt to discredit what had been said by

the Ministers. It is not a bad example of lack of lustre when the honourable member has to go into the second day in referring to those so-called "lack lustre" speeches.

Of course, he did not discredit them in any way. He failed at that just as miserably as he failed in his attempt to discredit the Government for the manner in which it had helped to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the recent dispute on Kangaroo Island. The Government is to be congratulated for the earnest and energetic manner in which it handled the situation while members of the Opposition, both here and in another place, were attempting to stir up strife both here and on the island for the sole purpose of trying to distract the limelight from their own hopeless political shambles, not only in this State but throughout the Liberal and Country League movement in Australia. There is plenty of evidence of that, and I may refer to it later.

It is significant that not once during the Kangaroo Island dispute did any member of the Opposition request the Commonwealth Government to attempt to settle the dispute, and yet it was a Commonwealth award that operated in the pastoral area and the proper place for settlement was with a Commonwealth conciliator, not with a State court. Why did members of the Opposition not make any approach to the Commonwealth Government to settle it? It was purely because they thought it was an opportunity to stir up trouble and the State Government had no way of settling the dispute because they knew it was out of its jurisdiction; but that did not stop them from continuing to stir. Several members of the Opposition went to Kangaroo Island for that sole purpose; they went to a meeting over there where certain suggestions were put forward to the farmers. Whether or not they exercised a vote over there we do not know, but we do know that they did express their views on something that did not influence the settlement of the dispute.

Unfortunately for the Opposition, the Government did everything in its power to bring about a settlement and, to the utter dismay and disgust of honourable members opposite, a settlement was eventually achieved. This angered the Opposition and, instead of congratulating and thanking the Government, it has gone about in as many places as possible abusing the Government, in spite of the fact that the Government was able to effect a satisfactory settlement. It is more than coincidence that the Hon. the Leader, the Hon. Mr.

Dawkins, the Hon. Mr. Hart and the Hon. Mr. Hill kept saying that the Government had paid Jim Dunford's fine—in spite of the fact that on each occasion they spoke these members were corrected in that regard. It was no coincidence that there was a smear campaign from honourable members opposite in an attempt to misrepresent the position.

The Hon. Mr. Hill went even further than that. After being told by the Chief Secretary what had actually taken place, he said, "I do not and will not believe that." He did not want to know the truth; he was not interested in the truth. He ran about the district for five nights of the week misrepresenting the position and, when he was told the truth, he did not want to know what the position was and would not believe it because it upset his line of argument that he had been expounding for five nights of the week, which no doubt he is continuing to do at present. There is silence from the Opposition: honourable members opposite know very well that what I am saying is true or they would say that I am misrepresenting the position. It is pleasing to know that, by their silence, they now agree with me when I say that they were misrepresenting the position. I hope their misrepresentation will not continue much longer.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is unfortunate that you have to make your whole speech on your own today.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I knew something would be said sooner or later. I am given to understand that at a meeting of the L.C.L. this morning honourable members were instructed not to say a word when the Hon. Mr. Banfield got to his feet. The Hon. Mr. Story may find himself in trouble. He will have to think up a good excuse for breaking the decision made at the L.C.L. meeting, for I understand they are pretty strict. However, he has broken out. I knew that would happen because honourable members opposite have been misrepresenting the position and they could not go on doing so for much longer.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You are having a very bad trot.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You have broken your instruction; you will finish up in "the Movement"! It has been reported that Sir Arthur Rymill may resign his seat to allow the Hon. Mr. Story to continue in this Council, and it has even been suggested that you, Mr. President, may resign. However, you are at all times very fair and I would not like you to leave in these circumstances merely to allow the Hon. Mr. Story to step into what

is, after all, not a very safe seat once you have vacated it. So, Mr. President, do not be too anxious to resign so that Ross Story can take your seat.

The Government has been accused of paying Mr. Dunford's fine and costs, and doing so under pressure from the trade unions. There is nothing further from the truth. At no time did the trade unions request the payment of Mr. Woolley's costs. Mr. Dunford had no fines imposed on him, and not one cent of his costs were paid by the Government.

Despite the fact that a Commonwealth Industrial Court has been set up to consider disputes under Commonwealth awards and despite the fact that everyone else in Australia who has had an industrial problem during the last 60 years has refrained from taking civil action in the Supreme Court against a trade union official, Mr. Woolley took his problem to that court. Of course, this is a Commonwealth election year, and the Commonwealth Government is trying to build up a law and disorder issue. The Commonwealth Government is attempting to create as much disorder as possible, because it believes that that will react against the Labor Party in an election year. However, the Commonwealth Government should think again. In spite of the turmoil caused by the oil dispute, in the Mosman by-election last Saturday in a blue-ribbon Liberal seat there was a reduction of 10 per cent in the Liberal vote. Yet the Commonwealth Government believes it will be able to retain office by using the law and disorder issue! Mr. Woolley was encouraged by Liberal and Country League members who promised him financial support. Maybe those members are not members of this Council; maybe they are members of another place. Nevertheless, they assisted Mr. Woolley in his attempt to crush the trade union movement.

Not only Liberal members of Parliament but also many other members of the L.C.L. promised Mr. Woolley financial support if he would take his case to the Supreme Court and build up costs to more than \$9,000. As a result, Mr. Woolley won a legal point and a recommendation from Mr. Justice Wells that in future some other way of settling such disputes should be adopted. Mr. Woolley may have had the law on his side, but the Supreme Court had no chance of settling the dispute because it was not set up for that kind of purpose. For the last 60 years people have been aware of that point and have therefore kept away from the Supreme Court for such purposes, but Mr. Woolley did not do so.

So, there is significance in his taking the case to the Supreme Court.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: He has not been the only one to go to the Supreme Court.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He is the only one who has taken action for tort in 60 years.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about the private bus people?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: How far did they go when they realized that the Supreme Court was not the place to settle the argument?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They got judgment in favour of them.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They did not; the dispute was not settled in the Supreme Court. No such dispute can be settled in the Supreme Court, and the honourable members who have interjected know that. All the judgment did in the Woolley case was to widen the dispute. Honourable members opposite should know that, if they attack a trade union official, the whole trade union movement will support that official. Decisions of the disputes committee are not always unanimous; for example, today's newspaper says, "Wide split in unions". However, there was no split regarding the attitude toward taking the case to the Supreme Court. Taking the case to that court worsened the position, and it was here that the Government acted responsibly. In the absence of any Commonwealth offer of a conciliator, the State Government offered the services of Mr. Commissioner Lean, who did a magnificent job in finally bringing about a satisfactory settlement.

Some very responsible people on Kangaroo Island also assisted in bringing about a settlement, and the trade union movement was always willing and anxious to discuss the matter with Mr. Woolley, but more often than not Mr. Woolley was advised not to go to the conference table. Before he finally went to the conference table he said that he would do so only if he got \$9,000; they were his own costs. However, he did not want a settlement: all he wanted to do was to get the money back. He had been urged to do that by those Liberal members of Parliament who had earlier given him a hand-out. They realized that it was a lost cause, and they wanted their money back. Of course, we all know that this is an election year and that the Liberal Party's campaign fund is very low because that Party has lost much support. The Opposition has not given one word of appreciation to the Government for its efforts:

it has given only abuse and misrepresentation. Several points clearly emerge from the dispute; first, industrial disputes cannot and will not be settled by the Supreme Court. They must be handled by courts set up specifically to handle them.

It is important that both sides agree to get together to discuss their problems. The Hon. Mr. Geddes, in a thoughtful speech, dealt with this matter today. The editorial in today's *Australian* refers to this point. If it had not been for pressure applied by the Commonwealth Government, there would have been no oil dispute and no airline dispute. The Commonwealth Government advised the employers involved to keep away from the conference table. It does not seem to matter to Mr. McMahon that the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission stresses conciliation, because he believes that in no circumstances must the oil companies negotiate. Further, Mr. McMahon said to Ansett Transport Industries and Trans-Australia Airlines that in no circumstances must they reach a settlement by agreement. In the past the oil workers have worked under an award that has always been negotiated around a conference table, and it has been ratified by the court. However, nowadays the oil companies are instructed to keep away from the conference table.

The oil industry agreement expired and it was time for a new one. Accordingly, the union submitted its log of claims to the oil industry for the purpose of discussion. One of the items on that log of claims was a request for a 35-hour week. The Commonwealth Government told the oil industry that it was not to discuss that matter; so, the unions, in their desire to reach a satisfactory agreement, withdrew that request and continued to ask the industry to negotiate. When Mr. McMahon saw that the trade union movement was willing to withdraw that request, he said to the oil companies, "You cannot continue to negotiate in any circumstances." Why has this suddenly come about? Why the sudden pressure from the Commonwealth Government that they must no longer attempt to negotiate with the trade union movement? Simply because it thinks it will bring about turmoil in the country for its own political end. Does it think that turmoil will bring the Liberal Party the vote at the coming election? Members opposite say, "We are interested in trade union members. We look after their interests, provided they do not talk with anyone from whom they might be able to get something. We are interested in keeping them

away from the conference table, where they can discuss their claim with the employers for whom they work."

Regarding the oil industry, I quote from the editorial in today's *Australian*, a newspaper which I do not think is favourable to the Labor movement. The editorial states, in part:

It is becoming clear that no-one wants the strike except the Government. The oil companies do not want the strike. The unions and the A.C.T.U. do not want to continue. And the public very certainly does not. Mr. McMahon should now recognize that in heading for full-scale confrontation he is not only on the wrong tack, but on one which will expose him to increasing unpopularity and criticism.

But what did we hear from Mr. Hill regarding the South Australian Government's unpopularity in this State? He attended about five L.C.L. meetings a week, at which people said, "That is a terrible Government we have. What are you doing about it?" He said in the Council that the Government had lost its popularity, and that he hears this said everywhere. Dyed-in-the-wool Liberal members attend these meetings and they say, "What a terrible Government we have in South Australia." The editorial in the *Australian* continues:

The only reasonable course of action left is for the parties concerned to resolve the oil strike by negotiations around a table.

This is something which, hitherto, the Prime Minister has told the oil industry they were not to attempt, and this is in line with what the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service said recently. He said, "Let the unions put up what they like as their claims and we will get the oversea boys to bring them into line. Let them fight the trade union movement of Australia. We are not prepared to do it ourselves, so we will call on the oversea boys to do it." That is what has been attempted, but look at the mess that has been brought about as a result.

It is significant that trade union gains have been only miserly in comparison with the profits made by the employers. I understand that the profits of two of the largest oil companies in Australia were about \$20,000,000 during the last year—not a bad profit for two companies! All the union was asking for was an increase of a few dollars a week, but it was suggested that the oil companies could not afford it. I doubt whether that is a genuine suggestion. I think the real suggestion is that the oil companies can afford it. They do not want to do something for their workers who help them earn such huge profits; but the

Government did not want the oil companies to negotiate.

The third point that came out of the Kangaroo Island dispute was the complete dislike for the trade union movement by all factions of the L.C.L., whether conservative or progressive. Even the Hon. Mr. Hill, who seems to be one of the most progressive members of the Party, said that the unions should give up their struggle in attempting to get a fair share of the community's wealth produced by the workers. He did not say one word about how the big boys go merrily on their way making the huge profits, without any restraint by the Government or anyone else. His only concern was that the unions should not keep on getting their share of the cake. Where was the concern for union members when the Broken Hill Proprietary Company increased its price for steel a couple of times in a year? That will increase the cost of many commodities. Not one word of criticism of the B.H.P. Company. What is more, the company does not have to negotiate for price increases in the way we must arbitrate for wage increases.

Yet Opposition members say, "We will look after the workers. Don't worry about the trade union movement or the Labor Government. We are your allies." But not one word of condemnation of the big boys who are constantly increasing prices without referring them to anyone. A reference to the *Sunday Mail* each weekend will show how food prices are increasing each week, without any increase in wages. Obviously, it is not the wage structure that brings about these increases; but not one word from the Opposition. Let the trade union movement attempt to get an extra 5c or 10c from the big boys and they are down on us like a ton of bricks.

It was evident from the speeches by members opposite that they know little about industrial matters. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris, when speaking about the Kangaroo Island dispute, said that some quicker means of conciliation would be welcomed by all concerned. I have news for the Leader! In the Commonwealth sphere, such action has been available since 1904, when the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act constituted the Commonwealth court; it was revised in 1956. An Industrial Court has existed in South Australia since 1913 and an Industrial Commission has existed here since 1966. The Leader, when referring to the island case in the Supreme Court, said that some quicker means of conciliation would be welcomed by all members

concerned. Surely that is an indication of how backward the Liberals are in their thinking: they are so far behind that they have not caught up with the fact that conciliation and arbitration have been in operation for many years. The Leader is still trying to catch up with that.

The Hon. Mr. Hart showed his complete lack of knowledge on industrial matters when he could not distinguish between a Commonwealth award and the State Industrial Code. I hope he will be able to distinguish between Arthur and Martha if he debates a certain Bill to be explained by the Hon. Mr. Hill tomorrow; if not, we will be in serious trouble.

Last evening the Hon. Mr. Hill referred to the lack of confidence of this State's people in the Labor movement. What does the President of the Torrens Branch of the Young Liberals have to say about the L.C.L.? This is one of the Party's own boys and one of their more progressive voices who, I understand, is well respected in the Liberal Party. At the annual meeting of the Torrens Branch of the Young Liberals, he said:

The Prime Minister has shown himself to be a petty thinker out of touch with his people, his country's youth and with political common sense. Federally, our Prime Minister is breaking new ground in Australian political unpopularity.

He believes that Mr. McMahon's attitude would probably succeed only in dismissing himself from office. We hear from the Hon. Mr. Hill all about the terrible South Australian Labor Government, yet this is a Young Liberal thinking for himself, not tied down by the rules of the Party, but someone respected in the community who says such things about his own Liberal Prime Minister. What he said regarding the Prime Minister's unpopularity was clearly revealed by the 10 per cent loss by the Liberal Party at the Mosman by-election last Saturday.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins was just as confused between fines and costs. The Hon. Mr. Hill, even when told the true position, would not believe it, because it destroyed his spurious argument. Therefore, how could any worker believe that any member of the L.C.L., as suggested by some of their members, could possibly look after his interests? There are several different set-ups, two of which have been recognized—the Liberal and Country League and the Liberal Movement. The joke made by the Hon. Mr. Geddes this afternoon was not a bad one.

One can only think that he took the opportunity of saying goodbye to this Parliament while he had the chance to do so. It is, therefore, no wonder that the workers cannot believe what they hear, when members opposite say that they will look after them. Being a union secretary for over 17 years, I used to go to non-union shops, at which the employers would tell the workers, "You do not want anything to do with the unions. We will look after you and give you all you want." On examining their books, we saw that these non-union shops committed most breaches of the award, despite their saying to the workers "Do not worry about joining the union. You can trust us." I do not know exactly what the Hon. Mr. Story said last night about not trusting princes, but one cannot trust an employer who says to his workers, "You do not need the union. We will look after you."

I was interested to read not long ago that a recently-deposed Leader of the Opposition in another place, a one-time Premier, on whom, it has been reported, \$250,000 of L.C.L. funds had been spent building up his image, was complaining that the public could not obtain sufficient information from the Government and its departments. It is obvious that the gentleman concerned was only speaking from the experience of his own personal actions during his brief period as Premier of this State, because it is well known that it was more difficult to obtain information from him or his Government than it is to reconcile the differences within the Liberal Party. All honourable members know that that reconciliation is wellnigh impossible. It is even more difficult than ascertaining who is the L.C.L. Leader and, indeed, more difficult than knowing what is the L.C.L. policy. We know very well who the Deputy Leader of the L.C.L. is, because he has his foot in both camps; it does not therefore matter to him whether Steele Hall bobs up or whether Dr. Eastick does.

Honourable members know that, whoever wins the battle on September 1, the L.C.L. conference will not be open to the press—a situation different from that regarding the Labor Party, which has nothing to hide from the public and which has at all times had the press at its meetings. However, we will hear nothing about the Liberal conference on September 1, because the press will be excluded from it. Perhaps Mr. Perryman, Mr. McLachlan or Mr. Jessop (whoever may be President then) will hand out some sort of a press

release saying how they will resolve their differences. However, we will not have a journalistic report of that meeting, because its doors will be locked. At 7.30 p.m. the press will be told to leave and to return later when they will be told what has happened. This does not happen with the Labor Party. The Liberal Party is obviously afraid to let the public know what it is doing.

I was pleased to see in His Excellency's Speech that the Government intends to introduce a Bill to provide for the appointment of an ombudsman. This move is something that is normally recommended by Opposition Parties and shelved by Governments. Members of the present Government at one time introduced a Bill but, because their Party was not then in office, they could not have such a position created. When the Labor Party came to office in 1965, the Opposition was anxious to introduce a Bill creating such a position. However, when that Party later returned to office it made no attempt to do so. The Labor Party would have created such an office in 1965 or 1966 had it not been accused by the Opposition of introducing too many Bills. That Government did not want to burden honourable members with another Bill creating such an office. Now that this Government has caught up with legislation that has been lagging as a result of the 30-year term of office of the Playford Government, it has been able to give notice of the introduction of this Bill. I now see from His Excellency's Speech that a Bill is to be introduced this session for this purpose.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It's a wonder that the Hon. Mr. Hill didn't introduce a Bill creating the office of ombudsman when he was in office. He is a constructive sort of politician.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Destructive?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No, constructive.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am sorry. Had the Minister said "destructive" I could have agreed with him, but I cannot do so when he says "constructive". Of course, the Hon. Mr. Hill was only one Minister. He was popular then, but no-one is sure where he stands at present, because he has not declared himself. Members of the L.C.L. are not sure behind whom they must line up—Steele Hall or Bruce Eastick. However, we will hear more about that matter on September 1. We will see then who is controlling the purse strings; that is when the puppets will come into action. We in this State are most fortunate in having

a Government which has nothing to hide and which is anxious to ensure that the people of this State can, if they have a possible grievance, go along to someone whom they can trust to look into their problem.

Last February, I was honoured by the State Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, together with Mr. Jim Ferguson, a member of the other place, to represent the State as one of its delegates to the eleventh Australian Area Conference held in Wellington. We were well looked after, especially by Mr. Ivor Ball, to whom I express my sincere appreciation for his valuable assistance. When Mr. Ball does something, it is done properly, and this occasion was no exception. At that conference the delegates were addressed by the New Zealand ombudsman, Sir Guy Powles, O.B.E., E.D. It was a most interesting and informative address, at the conclusion of which delegates asked many questions. Sir Guy told the delegates that the first ombudsman was established in Sweden by the constitutional law of 1809. Although that constitutional law has been amended from time to time, it is basically in force today.

In its present form, the Swedish law provides that the Government shall appoint a citizen of known legal ability and outstanding integrity to supervise, in the capacity of a representative of the Government and according to the instructions, the observance of the laws and Statutes by those responsible for administering them. Also, it shall be the duty of the ombudsman to present to the Government annual reports on the administration of the office, giving an account of the administration of justice throughout the realm, subject to his supervision, and calling attention to defects in the laws and Statutes, and to make suggestions for their improvement.

Finland was the next country to establish such an office, in 1919. Denmark appointed an ombudsman in 1955. New Zealand passed a Statute setting up the office in 1962, and there has been a steady growth of the institution at national and State levels. Also, a number of Bills for the appointment of an ombudsman have been presented to various Legislatures but have not been passed. As a rule, Opposition Parties believe that we should have them, but Governments believe they will be a nuisance. The basic characteristics of the ombudsman appear to be that he should be an independent and non-partisan officer of the Legislature, completely free from control by the Executive. He deals with specific complaints from members of the public, who

should have direct and unimpeded access to him, about administrative injustice and maladministration. He has full power to investigate administration, including the right of access to all files and papers. He has authority to criticize and to publicize administrative actions, but he has no authority to direct; he may only recommend and persuade. And sometimes, Sir, a little bit of gentle persuasion goes a long way. The ombudsman is required to report regularly to the Legislature.

It can be seen that an ombudsman can be a man to be respected, not to be feared. I think such an appointment would take away many of the complaints at present handled by local members of Parliament, who have not got the same access to papers and files as the ombudsman would have. Members of the public come to their Parliamentary representatives when they think they have suffered an injustice, and we do our best for them, but we have not the same powers as the ombudsman. I think that, when this office is established and when people are fully aware of the position, they will go directly to him, instead of coming to members of Parliament. Whether that will mean a reduction in the rate of pay of members of Parliament, I do not know; we will not have so much work to do, but that is a chance we will have to take.

The ombudsman acts as a safety valve for pent-up frustrations developed by citizens in their dealings with impersonal administrative machinery. It is interesting to note that figures of the work of many ombudsmen throughout the world show that, of the number of complaints fully investigated, less than 20 per cent is found to be justified. The proposed action of the Government to appoint an ombudsman will be appreciated by the public, and I am sure that departmental heads will find he is able to justify most of their actions.

Throughout its term of office the Government has shown consistently that it is keen to protect the rights of the people. A number of Bills have been passed dealing with consumer protection, although I must admit that some members opposite have been a little tardy at times in approving of such legislation. I am pleased that the Government, in its desire to see that the people in this State have the same rights to elect their representatives for the Legislative Council as for the House of Assembly, will again bring down a Bill to provide for full adult franchise in Legislative Council elections. For far too long, many people in South Australia, through the actions of the rank Conservatives and their representa-

tives on the benches opposite, have been denied the right to elect the people they want to represent them in this place, yet these same people have never been excluded from the operation of the laws put through in this august Chamber.

Some time ago South Australians were entertained by the comings and goings of certain people entering and leaving by the side, front, and back doors of the offices of the Liberal and Country League on North Terrace. The great cat and mouse game was on. A leading participant in this game was the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who believes in the permanent will of the people, as expressed by a few people back in the 1840's. Another participant was Mr. Steele Hall, who was gradually getting the message that possibly all the people of the State could be entrusted to elect their Legislative Council representatives. Needless to say, the game was a rugged, tough, and bitter affair. For a very short time it appeared that at last there was a glimmer of hope for those who had previously been denied their rights. Headlines appeared in the press saying, "Hall Wins", "A Victory for Democracy", "L.C.L. Agree to Adult Franchise for Legislative Council", and so on. It sounded very good, but then came the let-down when we went on to read the small print. Certain conditions had been attached to this magnificent victory for democracy, the effect of which was to nullify completely any advantage that may have been gained as a result of the great victory of the then Leader of the Liberal Party. In fact, it was made even more difficult to have the wishes of the people reflected in this place.

Among the conditions attached was one stipulating that separate rolls must be kept for each House. Why should this be so when everyone is to have a vote? What is wrong with one roll? Another condition covered voluntary enrolment for the Legislative Council, and also voluntary voting. Elections were to be held on a day other than a day on which an election for the House of Assembly was to be held.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It was all done for a purpose.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it was. It reminds people of the hypocrisy practised by members opposite. They claimed that the Government should not indulge in unnecessary expenditure. They took this attitude about money wisely spent by the Government in keeping industry going in South Australia. They condemned the Government for doing that, but these same members want

separate rolls—and what would that cost? They want elections to be held on separate days—and what would be the cost of that? It would be about \$250,000 a touch! These are the people who condemned the Government for spending \$9,000 recently, saying it was wasting the money of the people, yet they want to come out for democracy and spend \$250,000 on an extra election day. Members opposite did not tell us what it cost to hold a by-election on a different day from the referendum on shopping hours. It was about \$70,000, as compared with the \$9,000 spent in the interests of the State, and I doubt whether the Midland by-election was in any way in the interests of the State. It had to be held, of course, because it was constitutional, but because another vote was being taken in the district it could have been held on the same day. However, the Opposition insisted that the Government should spend \$70,000 on that. True, we got a very fine representative, but he has been in this place only 18 months and now he has decided he wants to go down to the House of Assembly. That is what he thinks of the \$70,000 that was spent on him. He is packing his bags to go to the other place, just at a time when we appear to have a worthy representative.

The Hon. E. K. Russack: Thank you for the compliment that I will be elected to the House of Assembly.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member will be there, because he will have to congratulate the other member who takes the seat on opening day! But there was \$70,000 down the drain in one day to find a member. As I recall it, only 50 per cent of the people in the district were on the roll. The honourable member got only 38 per cent poll of the 50 per cent, so less than 10 per cent of the people in the district voted our worthy friend into office. And now he is giving it away!

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Your friends did not turn out for that election.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We on this side do not believe in voluntary voting, and we show our contempt for it by keeping away from it. There is no doubt that honourable members opposite have carefully studied the position in local government, where voting is voluntary and so is enrolment. We all know that the polls for local government return anything between 2 per cent and 45 per cent of the ratepayers on the roll—and we are not too sure what percentage of ratepayers are on the roll. It is

this kind of vote that members opposite would like to see operating for their election to this Council. They are not even interested in “first past the post”, but they want a 2 per cent to 45 per cent, and they want preferential voting, too.

As an example of the size of the vote recorded for members of this Council when elections are held on the same day as those for the House of Assembly compared with elections held on separate days, we find that in the periodical election for the Legislative Council held on March 2, 1968, there was a 95.15 per cent poll, including a 95.60 per cent poll recorded in the Midland District—not a bad type of poll even though there would normally have been only 50 per cent of people at that poll but, because it was held on the same day as the election for the House of Assembly, there was about a 95 per cent vote. In the Midland District by-election held on September 12, 1970, when there was no voting for the House of Assembly, it was down to a 39.22 per cent vote. If that is the type of restricted democracy that the Liberal Party wants and believes in, it is no wonder that the people of this State will never give it the majority of their votes. I support the motion.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the motion and join other honourable members in wishing His Excellency the Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, a long and happy term of office. It is with regret that I join other honourable members in offering sympathy to Lady Harrison on the unfortunate death of Sir James Harrison, who was highly respected by honourable members of this Chamber. Indeed, he was held in affection by them for his upright character and the human way in which he mixed with the people of this State. Honourable members will come to know Sir Mark Oliphant better with the passage of time because by tradition the State Governor is always closely associated with this Council. I join other honourable members in offering sympathy to the families of Mr. W. W. Robinson, Mr. L. G. Riches, C.M.G., Mr. P. H. Quirke, and Mr. G. B. Bockelberg, who were all members of this Parliament at one time or another.

Bill Robinson (as we knew him) was a colleague of mine in Northern District. I knew him very well indeed. He was a kind man, particularly to new members entering Parliament, and was able by example and advice to guide them and help them substantially. Mr. Riches, although not of the same Party as Mr. Robinson, was a House of

Assembly member from Northern District. He was highly regarded by all his colleagues from that district. Likewise, Mr. Quirke and Mr. Bockelberg were House of Assembly members living in Northern District. They, too, were held in high regard by members of this Parliament. I join with other honourable members in sympathizing with their families. I also express sympathy to the family of Mr. John Pembroke Steele, I.S.O., M.M., who was Secretary of the Public Works Standing Committee from 1946 to 1958. Prior to his appointment as Secretary of that committee, he was Clerk-Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms in the House of Assembly from 1926 to 1946. I understand that the funeral took place at Centennial Park at 12.15 p.m. today, when this Council was represented by yourself, Mr. President, and the Clerk of the Parliaments, Mr. Ball, and the Public Works Standing Committee was represented by its Secretary, Mr. Hourigan.

Turning to the Address in Reply speeches that have been made and remembering Parliament as it has been in the last two sessions (we are now entering the third), I think that yesterday was probably unique, in that a special sitting of Parliament was called to discuss a matter of urgency. The Bill first went through the Lower House of Parliament, where an important and critical amendment to it, moved by the Leader of the Opposition in another place, was accepted by the Government. When the Bill reached this Chamber, two more amendments were inserted by this Council and again were accepted by the Government. They were important, almost critical, amendments. We have seen something new in the handling of legislation, in that the Government, although it had the numbers, accepted critical amendments from the Opposition. I hope we are moving into an era when we shall see less of personalities and more of constructive attitude to legislation. I must admit that for a short time here this afternoon I got the feeling that the Hon. Mr. Banfield was likely to get political at some stage.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He did not get political once.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: But I have heard him make that speech before, on more than one occasion. I will not comment on it except to say that I found it rather confusing because obviously the Kangaroo Island dispute has caused embarrassment in some quarters as nearly every speaker has referred to it. It surprised, and indeed concerned, me when the Hon. Mr. Kneebone spoke to observe the attitudes expressed towards this dispute. The

Hon. Mr. Banfield's speech was somewhat confusing today. When speaking of industrial matters, he apparently recommended that the Kangaroo Island dispute should have been taken to an industrial court, but the oil industry dispute should not have been. This appears to be an absolute contradiction.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No; he was talking about two different things.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I admit that the disputes involving Kangaroo Island and the oil industry are two different things.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He criticized the fact that we could not get into conference.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I know that on Kangaroo Island a different situation existed, in that in the Industrial Code a clause had been deliberately inserted to protect employees from employers because the employees might or might not be members of an association. What happened on Kangaroo Island was that the union organizer attempted to make Mr. Woolley break the law in regard to the Industrial Code. The suggestion that such disputes should be settled in the Industrial Court is puzzling, because that court is used by the trade unions when it is to their advantage to do so, but the unions will not abide by the court's decisions when those decisions are not advantageous to them. So, Parliament will have to be very careful in considering any move to take away protections that the law affords to the ordinary man in the street.

I find it difficult to follow the argument that the Prime Minister is responsible for the current oil dispute. I believe that the workers are on strike to gain an additional \$21 a week, and originally they also wanted a 35-hour week. It seems ludicrous for anyone to suggest with conviction that the Prime Minister is directly responsible for the dispute, because there is no evidence for such a suggestion. As far as I can recall, the suggestion came from Mr. Hawke in one of his many appearances on television, when he used flamboyant words such as "cartels". He often uses that word when referring to the oil companies, but I believe that the word refers to any association or group. Consequently, it would probably fit the Australian Council of Trade Unions as much as it would fit any other group. I believe that the attack on the Prime Minister is quite deliberate and that it has been mounting in intensity. Further, I believe that the attack is completely unfair because, to the best of my knowledge, no-one has given any proof to support the accusations against the Prime Minister.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You had better read the reply that the Premier gave during another debate yesterday afternoon in another place.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. C. R. Story): I remind the Chief Secretary that he should not refer to a debate in another place.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I suggest that the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan read the editorial in this morning's *Australian*.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! I shall make any rulings that need to be made.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: In no way would I consider an editorial as proof: it is merely an expression of opinion. I rose to speak this afternoon not because of what the Hon. Mr. Banfield said, because I have heard similar speeches on other occasions.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They are improving each time.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The sequence is changing. I was fortunate enough this year to be sent by this Parliament to the United Kingdom as a guest of the British branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to attend a seminar on Parliamentary practice and procedure. The seminar involved four weeks of intensive study. In the association there are more than 30 member Parliaments, and I was impressed by the quality of the delegates who attended the seminar. Many of them were from nations that had been established for only a short time; indeed, one such nation celebrated its first birthday during the seminar. The delegates from such nations were men of ability and standing who were searching for a form of government and a form of Parliament best suited to their needs. They were not seeking personal publicity as reformers; they were genuinely seeking a suitable Parliamentary system for their countries. I am making these points because of what has been said about reforming our South Australian Parliamentary system.

This afternoon the Hon. Mr. Banfield referred to the handing out of information. If I understood the honourable member correctly, I believe he was referring to a newspaper article stating that a system used in America would be suitable for this country. Of course, honourable members are well aware that America has an entirely different system of government. That country is a republic, with a President and with Ministers who are not responsible to Congress. I believe that our present system is very satisfactory in this regard. If public servants were forced to dis-

close information on every question put to them we would have absolute confusion in government and administration. I was also gratified to find that among the very distinguished people who lectured at the seminar was a gentleman who had an intimate knowledge of the member Parliaments of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; that lecturer upheld the Parliaments of South Australia and Victoria as the two most efficient Parliamentary systems in the British Commonwealth.

In the British Parliament there is a very real understanding between members of Parliament and the press. At Westminster the press has a large, self-contained area as its headquarters, and there is communication between members of the press and members of Parliament. Further, members of the press are admitted to the Strangers Bar, and they can talk to members of Parliament. It is claimed that in such talks a confidence has never been breached publicly. That may be a big claim to make but I believe that, in the main, it is true.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I would not doubt that. I have had a lot of experience with the press. When a member of Parliament tells journalists something in confidence I have never known them to breach that confidence.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I can say the same thing. This is one of the reasons why the information in the British press is so accurate: the press has greater contact with members of Parliament, and they can consequently get more than one side of the story. As a result, they are better able to assess a situation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Further, they have a greater knowledge of the job they are asked to perform. In this morning's paper there is a glaring example of what I have in mind.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: While travelling to the seminar I looked at the State system in California and the federal system in Washington. The committee system in the American Senate is such that virtually all the work is done by committees. One criticism made by senior people in the American Congress was that, because so much work is done in committee, attendances in the Senate Chamber were low on most occasions. I point this out to those members of Parliament here who have advocated a system more along the lines of the American Senate and the Commonwealth Senate. This Council has done excellent work both on joint committees

with another place and on Select Committees on important matters affecting the community. To enter into a system of almost total committee work would be impracticable for a Council consisting of 20 members, whereas the Australian Senate and the American Senate have much larger memberships than we have.

I believe that many of the countries in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association which are setting up their own form of government would find that the ideal country from which to learn is Australia because our Parliaments, particularly our State Parliaments, are smaller. I was gratified to learn that a seminar will be held in Australia. Westminster is a most interesting system of Parliament, built largely on tradition. I could speak at some length on Westminster, particularly on the role of the House of Lords, which, although its powers have been somewhat diminished over the years, still plays a substantial part in forming English legislation.

I point out to those who urge Parliamentary reform that, after having seen systems in many parts of the world (I even visited the Parliament in Munich on my return), and from the conversations I had with representatives of the 30 member countries of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, we are fortunate in this State to have one of the most efficient systems that can be found. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said that our system was formed in

the last century. That is true, and that is only a short time in a country's history. I often wonder whether our forefathers who framed the Constitution knew how wise they were and whether they could have foreseen the checks and balances a Constitution requires—a Constitution that still functions efficiently in this modern age of astronauts walking on the moon, television, etc.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They would be disappointed if they thought it was working efficiently in 1972. The system is not working efficiently!

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I do not think the honourable member is making himself clear.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: The honourable member does not have to answer interjections.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Acting President.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You're lucky.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: If the honourable member gets an opportunity to attend a seminar, he should take advantage of it. I support the motion.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 2, at 2.15 p.m.