

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 11 electors of South Australia stating that the crime of incest and the crime of unlawful carnal knowledge of young girls are detrimental to society and praying that the Legislative Council would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received and read.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SPORTS COMPLEX

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: On July 27, 1976, in reply to an inquiry by the Hon. C. M. Hill, I stated that I had been informed by the Board of the South Australian Meat Corporation that there are no plans whatever to establish a major sporting complex, which press reports had indicated might be located at Pooraka. I added: "In fact, at no time has Samcor considered establishing any complex at all for Samcor employees."

Following the Hon. Mr. Hill's question, I discussed this matter further with the corporation and found that the original information on which my answer was based did not give a full account of the situation. In order to dispel any misunderstanding, I wish to give the Council the following information on this matter:

- (1) In 1974, the Australian Government indicated clearly its policy of assisting the development of community sporting complexes. The Samcor Board owns land on the eastern side of the Main North Road which it felt could be suitable for a sporting complex.
- (2) The Samcor board commissioned Hassell and Partners to carry out a study of the project for a fee of \$38 475. Hassell and Partners commissioned Kinnaird, Hill, DeRohan and Young to carry out a water resources study for \$6 300. This amount was met from the total fee.
- (3) It was the board's intention to seek funds for the project primarily from the Australian Government, but funds would also have been sought from the State Government, local government, the private sector and sporting organisations.
- (4) The second stage of the study was completed in December, 1975. By this time, a change of Government had taken place in Canberra, and it became obvious that funds would not be available from the Australian Government. It was not possible to proceed, and the project has been abandoned.

QUESTIONS

HOSPITAL GRANTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: A levy of 3 per cent is made on local government bodies by the Hospitals Department to reimburse the hospitals in that particular area of local government, and in this case I refer to Tatiara. I believe the position is that the Hospitals Department's 3 per cent rate is disbursed to the Tatiara Hospital at Bordertown and the hospital at Keith. There is no hospital in the Coonalpyn Downs council area but the contributions over the years have been disbursed from this revenue to the hospitals at Meningie, Keith and, I think, Lamerook. The proportions of that 3 per cent are 41 per cent to Keith, 39 per cent to Meningie, and 20 per cent to Lamerook. However, I believe that Keith Hospital is now getting no reimbursement from the Coonalpyn Downs area, because Keith Hospital is not a hospital in the Medibank scheme. Can the Minister of Health say whether this is a fact and what reasons there are for the Hospitals Department not making a payment to Keith Hospital, even though it serves the Coonalpyn Downs area?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The 3 per cent levy from councils for distribution to the hospitals has always been on the basis that the levy does not go to private hospitals. Keith Hospital was well aware of this when it decided to become a private hospital, and the Government at this stage sees no reason to vary a practice that has operated for 40-odd years. That is why there is no distribution to Keith Hospital.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But it has been done at Tatiara.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Which one is that?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Keith.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am saying that Keith Hospital has become a private hospital.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But you are disbursing the 3 per cent to Keith Hospital from the Tatiara rates.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not think that is right. It is not the practice to disburse council rates to private hospitals, and it has not been for 40 years. I will examine the matter that the Leader has raised, but the Keith Hospital was aware of the position before it made its decision.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Minister of Health please define for me what he means by "private hospital"? Keith Hospital is owned and operated by the community in Keith: it is not a private hospital.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Keith Hospital now is operating on the basis purely of making a profit.

MOUNT LOFTY DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a not-so-brief statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, representing the Minister for Planning.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The Director and Chairman of the board of the Botanic Garden recently have drawn my attention to a proposed development of 5.79

hectares known as Mount Lofty House, overlooking the Botanic Garden property. It would seem, on current indications, that the present developer, Mr. F. G. D. Hill, has embarked on a course of action intended to circumvent regulations that might otherwise prevent his proceeding with what I think could only be termed the rape of this property. In May, 1976, clearing of pine trees covering the easterly and steeply sloping faces commenced. The debris (stumps, etc.) was allowed to roll down to the boundary fence of the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden. The fence was broken in several places and, although the contractors were written to, no repair work has been carried out. I have obtained a copy of the development proposals. This is an astonishing document. No reference is made to the cold, clammy, wet and foggy conditions which naturally prevail in this region for many months of the year. Although the submission states that effluent will be collected to a central treatment plan on the lower slopes of the property and the resultant effluent will then be pumped out of the watershed area, should any mechanical breakdown occur this effluent will most certainly flood through the Coral Fern Gully with devastating effects. This development, which could be well described as an environmental disaster, has extremely serious implications as far as Mount Lofty Botanic Garden is concerned. The area has tremendous tourist attraction and is now nearing the development stage. In consequence, it will be open to the public in the next year or so. Will the Minister investigate these matters urgently and take whatever action is appropriate to see that any further destruction or so-called development ceases immediately? Further, can the Minister inform the Council whether any action can be taken to restore the vast damage already done?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister for Planning and obtain a reply.

MESSAGE PARLOURS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct a question to the Minister of Health. Has the Minister any reports or statistics from the Public Health Department to indicate whether the problem of venereal disease is serious as a result of the operation of massage parlours?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The report that I have received in this regard is quite to the contrary. I understand from my recent discussions with the department that it considers that, as a result of contact between the massage parlours and the department, it has some control over the spread of venereal disease from this area. As a matter of fact, the figure, compared to the outside figures, was low. Consequently, the answer to the honourable member's question is that the Government does not consider that there has been a serious outbreak of venereal disease as a result of the activities of massage parlours.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I understood the Minister to say in his reply to the Hon. Mr. Hill that the Health Department had made contact with the massage parlours and was satisfied that the incidence of venereal disease from this source was no greater, and was in fact less, than it was from other sources. The reply seemed to indicate that, as a result of the contact between the Health Department and massage parlours, there was information denoting

some incidence of venereal disease from massage parlours. Does this contact indicate that there is some incidence of venereal disease from massage parlours?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. I indicated that.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Minister's replies indicate that the Health Department has evidence indicating that prostitution is carried out in some massage parlours. In view of this evidence, will the Minister ask the Attorney whether prosecution against massage parlours as brothels under sections 28 and 29 of the Police Offences Act has been considered?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Let me make it quite clear that I did not say that we had evidence that prostitution was being carried out in massage parlours. Let us get that quite clear.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is implied in what you said.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not imply it. I was asked whether someone had been affected by venereal disease at a massage parlour, and the reply was "Yes". People have been affected by venereal disease in their own homes, but does that mean that prostitution is carried out in their own homes? At no stage did I say that prostitution took place in massage parlours. Regarding the other part of the question, I can tell the honourable member now that, where evidence is available, action against massage parlours is taken already. This is an instance where the evidence is not easily available in relation to the question of prostitution.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is prostitution a crime?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not know. The Hon. Mr. Burdett has asked me whether we will bring proceedings for prostitution. He has asked that the Attorney consider the matter. I am trying to say to the honourable member that already this action is being taken. I am also telling him that the evidence is not easily available. The fact that someone reports to the Public Health Department that he is suffering from venereal disease and that he believes he got it at a massage parlour is not evidence that prostitution is being carried on at that place.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Will the Minister ask the Attorney to let me know by reply in the Council how many prosecutions there have been in the past six months of massage parlours as being brothels under section 28 or section 29 of the Police Offences Act?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is a different question, and the honourable member will get a different reply.

PSYCHIATRIC SYSTEM

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Health a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: A letter has been received from the Citizens' Commission on Human Rights dealing with the psychiatric disorders of people and stating that the commission expects the Minister of Health to launch an inquiry in order to establish how effective or ineffective our present psychiatric system is. Does the Minister intend to launch such an inquiry?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No requests have been made to me, and at this stage I am not considering the launching of such an inquiry.

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I note on page 326 of the current issue of the South Australian *Government Gazette* that the Water Resources Appeal Committee has been appointed. I also note that an Acting Chairman has been appointed. Will the Minister ask his colleague why an Acting Chairman has been appointed? If I recall correctly, the Act provides for the appointment of a "permanent" Chairman for five years. In making this request for information, I hasten to add that I am casting no reflection whatever on the gentleman appointed to the Acting Chairmanship.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

FORESTRY INVESTMENTS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Some pamphlets from forestry companies seeking investment funds are still appearing in South Australian letter boxes, including my own. Last session I asked the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries whether his department was taking steps to warn people of the possible dangers of such investments. At that stage I understood that our Woods and Forests Department was using literature prepared by the Victorian Forestry Board to give information to the public on this matter. As these investment pamphlets are still around, can the Minister say whether the South Australian Government is willing to go further in this matter?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Woods and Forests Department has now prepared its own material setting out guidelines by which people can judge for themselves about investments in forestry projects. The information sheets are available from the department and from the Registrar of Companies in South Australia. I understand that more than 100 of these sheets have been handed out, and I therefore assume that the South Australian public is aware of the need to get this sort of advice before investing in forestry projects in this State.

MEDICAL BOARD

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Last week, a report in the *Advertiser* under the heading "Doctor 'not denied justice at inquiry'" stated that the South Australian Full Court had made some comments on the provisions of the Medical Practitioners Act, under which the Medical Board operates. The report states:

Both the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Jacobs criticised provisions of the Medical Practitioners Act under which the Medical Board operated. The Chief Justice said it was "significant" that there was no machinery for a special tribunal to hear complaints under the Medical Practitioners Act as there was in such statutes as the Legal Practitioners Act and Dentists Act . . .

"The Medical Board, as it seems to me, must in a sense be both prosecutor and judge if it is to function at all . . ."

Mr. Justice Jacobs said that considering the importance of the subject matter, the statutory procedure for dealing with complaints "leaves something to be desired" if the mere appearance of complete impartiality is to be preserved.

Will the Minister, in association with the Attorney-General, study this judgment and consider whether any amendment is necessary to bring the procedures of the Medical Board under the Medical Practitioners Act in line with those operating in other professions?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Medical Board has been operating satisfactorily until now. I have not seen the report to which the honourable member has referred, but I will consider it and take up the matter with the Attorney-General.

ALICE SPRINGS TO TARCOOLA RAILWAY

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: When it was first decided to construct the new standard gauge railway line between Alice Springs and Tarcoola, it was planned that 36 kg rail would be used. However, I am informed that about 322 km north of Tarcoola, almost on the route of the new line, large coal deposits were discovered, and for this reason it was decided to use 49 kg rail instead. Should the department now use 27 kg rail, the fastest that any train of economical size could travel over the line would be 48 km/h. With 36 kg rail, not much weight would be involved in speeds up to 96 km/h. However, with 49 kg rail, train speed would be limited only to the extent of the rolling stock and/or locomotive engine power. In other words, using 27 kg rail would be similar to the tram line between Adelaide and Glenelg. Even to contemplate maintaining the existing line would be ridiculous, as it presently has 76 different speed restriction areas and, because of flood waters has been closed for 27 weeks in the past 27 months. The cost resulting from the loss of freight, together with the cost of maintaining and repairing the existing line, would be twice as much as the cost of building the new Tarcoola to Alice Springs line. Is the Minister aware that the Federal Minister for Transport has sent a committee to Port Augusta to investigate the possibility of using 27 kg rail on the line between Tarcoola and Alice Springs, and that the Federal Minister has asked for an estimate of the cost of maintaining the existing narrow gauge line for a further 15 years?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

TRANSPORTABLE BUILDING

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister for the Environment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Towards the end of last year a contractor was engaged by the Education Department to move a transportable classroom from Ceduna to Coober Pedy. After proceeding as far as Hiltaba Station on a direct route from Wirrulla to Kingoonya, the contractor was stopped from proceeding as a result of a request from environmentalists. These people, through complete ignorance of the situation, caused the building to be re-routed and taken an extra 560 km, through Port Augusta. As it was contended by the local people that this re-routing was much humbug, I have been asked to ascertain the extra cost involved. Will the Minister obtain that information for me?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

WATER HYACINTH

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I understand that the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries recently attended a conference dealing with the problem of water hyacinth in the Eastern States and preventing its infestation of South Australian waterways. Has the Minister any comments to make to this Council about the conference he attended?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The conference was held, but unfortunately I was unable to attend it, because of ill health. However, the South Australian Government was represented at the conference by members of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. Our representatives made it plain at the conference that South Australia was willing to play its part in controlling water hyacinth, especially in the Gingham watercourse, near Moree. It was decided that the cost of the programme put forward by the New South Wales Agriculture Department amounting to about \$200 000 would be shared equally by the four Governments concerned, namely, the New South Wales, Victorian, South Australian, and Commonwealth Governments. Plans will proceed on that basis.

X-LOTTO

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have received from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union correspondence under the hand of its President and Secretary concerning advertisements appearing in the press for what is known as X-Lotto. The view of the union is that, because of the rather large size and the format of the advertisement, strong influence is brought to bear to encourage some people to gamble in such a way that they risk more money than they can really afford to lose. I have noticed in the regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1970, that under section 11 (6) (a):

No advertisement shall be exhibited, published, distributed or displayed without first having been submitted to and received the written approval therefor from the Minister.

Has the Minister approved of the recent advertisements for X-Lotto? What guidelines does the Minister adopt when giving such approval? Can the Temperance Union be assured that no larger advertisements than those currently appearing will be approved by the Minister?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This is not within my portfolio. However, I will take up the matter and get a report on it.

MINES DEPARTMENT BUILDING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the erection at Glenside of a Mines Department building, which was approved by the Public Works Committee nearly three years ago. The Mines Department at that time strongly supported a proposal to build a multi-storey office and laboratory building, and also a core library combined with a geophysical laboratory, at Glenside on

land owned by the Government. The Public Works Committee at that time found that the existing core library, the replacement of which was vitally necessary, then occupied three separate buildings in the Mines Department works depot at Thebarton generally being unsuitable accommodation in an area where the stored material could disintegrate or at least become damaged over a period. Indeed, I believe that that is occurring. The Public Works Committee was satisfied at that time that a new Mines Department building was required, and it recommended the construction of the building, which then would have cost over \$3 000 000. As time goes on, the provision of this building, and particularly the core library, becomes more urgent. Will the Minister ascertain from his colleague when Cabinet is likely to proceed with the provision of this necessary accommodation?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yes; I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

RAILWAYS STAFFING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked recently about railway staffing in South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The matter is still being negotiated.

WIRRABARA BRIDGE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked dealing with the demolition of a bridge on Highway No. 1 near Wirrabara?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replacement of the flood-damaged Wirrabara bridge over the Rocky River on the Main North Road is proceeding as quickly as possible, and no delays have occurred. Consideration was not given to demolition of the old bridge being carried out by contract, as the Highways Department has the resources available for this work. The old structure will be removed by the department, with the assistance of the Mines Department, and a new bridge will be built by contract. The Army was offered the opportunity to carry out demolition because such work offers good opportunities for military training. In this case the Army declined the project because the department requires special precautions and limits to explosives charging due to the proximity of buildings.

CUMMINS TO TUMBY BAY ROAD

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked about the sealing of the Cummins to Tumby Bay Road?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Completion of the Cummins to Tumby Bay road is not included in current Highways Department works programmes. A departmental gang is now being shifted to Port Kenny to complete the Talia to Streaky Bay section of the Flinders Highway, and it is hoped that it may be possible to direct these resources to the Cummins to Tumby Bay Road in about two years time. No more definite reply can be given, as all programmes beyond the current financial year are dependent on the still unknown terms of the Commonwealth Government legislation covering aid for roads for the period beyond June 30, 1977.

ELECTORAL ACT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Hon. Martin Cameron. Does the honourable member agree with the statement of the Leader of his Party in another place, reported in the *Advertiser* on August 5 of this year, that the Electoral Act contains a gerrymander and that the terms of reference to the Electoral Commission were not satisfactory?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is not obliged to reply.

BUSH FIRES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries a reply to a question I asked about bush fires?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The honourable member will appreciate that 1975-76 was the first time any Government in South Australia found it necessary to adopt a policy for assistance at bush fires in the pastoral areas of the State; and when this policy was announced it was assumed that payment of accounts for plant hire by Government departments or private contractors would be a routine administrative matter. However, the reconciliation of departmental and contractors' accounts with authorisations by the Director of Emergency Fire Services for the deployment of equipment to fires has proved most difficult. Moreover, the late submission of a number of accounts for assistance at fires has compounded the problem, and it is only recently that I have been able to assess the situation fully. It is clear to me that there must be a refinement of the present policy to ensure more precise administrative guidelines and speedier payment of accounts in the future, and I am preparing a submission on the matter. I hope that this submission will receive Cabinet approval soon and that payment of all outstanding accounts can be effected shortly thereafter.

PRAWN FISHING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries a reply to a question I asked on August 3 about prawn fishing?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Five Ministerial permits to fish for prawns have been issued recently to Messrs. J. R. Antoney, J. K. Hagen, J. R. Swincer, F. J. Alexander and P. J. Maher for Investigator Strait and the area south of Kangaroo Island but no prawn authorities have been issued for that area or the Gulf of St. Vincent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Is it a fact that at least one of these licences is for fishing in the gulf area?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will look into the matter and obtain a reply to the Leader's question.

TOW-TRUCK INDUSTRY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked about tow-trucks?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague the Minister of Transport has set up a committee of inquiry chaired by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, Mr. G. C. Strutton, and comprising representatives from the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, the Royal Automobile Association, the

Police, and the St. John Ambulance Brigade. The committee will need to identify problems which exist in the tow-truck industry and then examine ways and means to eliminate them.

HOUSE VISITORS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement before directing a question to you, Mr. President.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Last week I had the pleasure of escorting a group of students from Strathalbyn High School on an inspection of this Chamber. Previously, those students had been in the House of Assembly, in their general tour of Parliament House. After I had had a talk with them, I asked whether there were any questions, and one student at the back of the group asked me why they could not sit in our benches, when they were able to sit in the benches in the House of Assembly Chamber. The day of the visit was not a sitting day and there were no private papers belonging to members on members' benches here. The students went on to point out to me the sign that was in position on the centre of the floor, indicating that visitors were not at any time to sit in members' benches. I ask respectfully, Mr. President, whether this matter can be considered further by you so that possibly a more satisfactory policy than exists at present can be laid down.

The PRESIDENT: I will undertake to examine this matter further. I understand that some time ago a direction was given that seats were not to be occupied by visiting parties, because of problems that had arisen regarding complaints from members about interference with files on their desks and about the opening of drawers. I will examine the matter further.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Works to a question I asked regarding Bolivar effluent?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Works has informed me that he has not ruled out an approach to the Commonwealth Government for economic assistance to provide a preferred irrigation scheme on the Northern Adelaide Plains. However, before any approach can be made to the Commonwealth Government, it is necessary to obtain the reactions and, if possible, the support of the people of the area, and comments are now being sought from the people involved.

TOURIST BUREAU

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before directing a question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the Corbett report, which, as honourable members know, was a report of a committee of inquiry into the Public Service in South Australia, reference was made to the possibility of a Tourist Bureau Division being established. One relevant paragraph, on page 130 of the Corbett report, states:

The committee do not propose to comment on the Tourist Bureau Division, having learned that it is to be investigated by a separate committee.

I have heard that this separate committee is known as the Tattersall committee, but I am not certain of that and merely make that reference in passing as a possible guide and help to the Minister. My point is that the Corbett report is available for study to honourable members on both sides and is, of course, of special interest to members of the Opposition, who are in the course of examining the best possible future structure of the Public Service. So that members can be apprised of the whole situation, I ask the Minister whether he would be kind enough to supply to members of Parliament a copy of this separate committee's report so that a complete study of this overall matter can be made.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am aware of what the honourable member is asking. This was an inter-departmental committee set up to examine the structure of the Tourist Bureau. It is not normal to make inter-departmental committee reports available and, in these circumstances, I am afraid that I cannot agree to the honourable member's request.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Open government!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Not open shop.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister of Health told me in the Council on February 18 that tenders for stage II of the redevelopment of Glenside Hospital would be called in August this year. Will he now say whether tenders have been called, and whether any changes have been made in the plans for that redevelopment as a result of the proposed new mental health legislation which, I understand, will be introduced this session?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Cabinet has approved the construction of three new buildings that will accommodate 232 beds. The proposed development will provide a balanced group of wards for the three medical units operating in the hospital, namely, the Cleland, Paterson and Downey teams. The first new building of stage II will be the psycho-geriatric assessment centre, providing 128 beds in a single-storey building estimated to cost \$4 750 000. This modern and pleasant building will replace existing wards and provide back-up accommodation for long-stay patients needing treatment beyond that provided in Downey House. It will also relieve the plight of psycho-geriatric patients presently housed in substandard conditions.

It was intended originally to call tenders this month but, because of a slight variation in planning, tenders will now be called next month, with an expected completion date of June, 1978. The \$1 700 000 Cleland sub-acute ward will provide 63 beds and extend the services available at the adjacent Cleland House. This new accommodation will allow the redistribution of long and medium-stay patients currently housed in substandard accommodation in old and obsolete wards at Glenside Hospital, and should be finished by June, 1978. The \$2 100 000 Paterson maximum care ward is due for completion by September, 1978. It will provide 41 beds for patients requiring close observation and supervision. The new maximum care ward will replace the old E ward, which is unsuitable for the purpose of treatment and supervision of patients in a closed ward setting. The existing patient accommodation will not be disturbed during the course of building construction. Siteworks and landscaping to cost \$300 000 will be progressively completed with each stage of the proposed development.

Stage I of the redevelopment is nearing completion. This comprises the \$1 000 000 Paterson House, a 64-bed, subacute, single-storey building. Other buildings recently completed in the overall expansion programme have been the \$750 000 Downey House psycho-geriatric assessment unit and the \$250 000 outpatients centre. By any world standard the image of mental hospitals created with the new buildings places South Australia high in the achievement of helping the mentally ill. Therefore, stage II is not expected to be affected as a result of the legislation intended to be introduced.

BREAD

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I refer to the August, 1976, issue of *Choice* magazine in which the matter of bread quality is raised. The magazine is somewhat critical of the quality of bread consumed by Australians, and particularly calls for an end to the bleaching of white flour with chemicals, a procedure, it says, that is banned in New Zealand. Part of the report states:

Bread is not the weekly wash and a public aware of the facts would be unlikely to demand luminous whiteness.

The report also states that Australian white bread does not match New Zealand's product, because millers discard too much of the useful nutrient from white flour. The South Australian and Federal President of the Housewives' Association apparently agrees, as she has said:

I think we over-refine our flour, and we don't get the goodness we should out of the bread.

Will the Minister of Health ask the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs to investigate the complaints made by *Choice* magazine, and report to the Council on whether any amendment to the legislation or regulations is necessary to deal with the problems outlined in that report?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will call for a report.

UNDERGROUND WATER BASIN

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (on notice): In view of the recent statement of the Minister of Works that the underground water basin of the Northern Adelaide Plains could last somewhat longer than was previously considered possible:

1. What conclusive evidence can the Minister provide to substantiate that the latest estimates of the life of the basin are correct?
2. To what extent under the new estimates is it considered that salinity will occur?
3. If it is not intended to use recycled water from the Bolivar treatment works to the extent which might be envisaged as a result of the Agriculture Department report, what plans has the Government to use this very valuable asset rather than letting it run to waste in the sea?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

1. The re-analysis of the basin consisted of reviews of the latest data and the use of a more rigorous mathematical treatment than used hitherto. A subsequent intensive checking and review process has ensured the conclusiveness of the work.

2. It is not possible on the basis of present knowledge to give a detailed prognosis of salinity rises, area by area, although work is now in hand that may enable this to be assessed in the future.

3. The report entitled "Bolivar Effluent Irrigation Study" has been on display in the Northern Adelaide Plains irrigation areas and, by personal letter, all growers have been invited to submit comment. In light of this comment, other technical reports and other demands for the use of Bolivar effluent, the South Australian Water Resources Council will be asked to advise me of the best way of managing the total water resource of the area.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from August 4. Page 407.)

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In supporting the motion, I refer to the period of office that Sir Mark Oliphant has enjoyed as this State's Governor. It has been said that future Governors will be considered most controversial if they involve themselves in many areas in which Sir Mark has involved himself. It has also been said in this Chamber by many honourable members that they wish Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant well in their retirement. I hope that Sir Mark does not retire in the sense that that term usually implies. I hope that, having severed his connections as this State's Governor, he will continue in scientific research. Sir Mark is indeed an eminent scientist, and I hope that he will make his opinions available to those members of the community who are today crying out for additional information to enable them to make up their minds regarding what ought to happen in relation to the peacetime use of nuclear energy. In this respect, I refer not only to uranium mining but also to its processing, so that it can be used as a material for the generation of power in Australia and other countries.

As evidenced by a national poll recently undertaken by a prominent newspaper, 75 per cent of Australia's population was most unhappy and extremely concerned about future uranium mining. They were concerned because no international guarantee could be given in this respect. It seems that there was also concern because of the way in which the question was put to the public. Much concern was expressed on the basis of what international machinery could be made available to ensure the proper, adequate and necessary control of wastes from the processing of uranium used as a power source. It seems to me that the younger people of the world today are more concerned about this matter than are those of us who have had nothing more to worry about in the past in this respect except, say, for mustard gas. The only other danger that is of comparable significance is a danger that has received relatively little publicity—germ warfare, or biological warfare. Such a danger would be the only thing that would diminish people's concern about nuclear energy processing.

The present Governor is removed from the hard-core thinking that is evident on each side of the argument. The type of article that is written depends on the school of thought toward which an expert on uranium enrichment leans. People must be sick and tired of reading Baxter one day and Burnett the next day. It is not so much what Baxter says on Tuesday or what Burnett says on Thursday: because people cannot make up their minds,

there is a need for trained, expert, scientific opinion to weigh the arguments of Baxter and Burnett, who represent the two different viewpoints in this field.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Whom would you suggest?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In reply to the honourable member, who recently scurried back into the Liberal Party, I point out that I would dearly like to see the retiring Governor of South Australia accept the role that I have outlined. Our Governor has expressed opinions in many fields—for example, conservation, and what is termed housing pollution. In this regard he has been outspoken on the question of housing adjacent to the Bluff at Victor Harbor. The future role that I am suggesting for the present Governor would carry immense public responsibility, and most people would be happy to be advised by the Governor on the matters to which I have referred.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Will the State Government appoint the Governor on his retirement to consider the question of the Redcliff project?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I had hoped that my suggestion would be devoid of Party politics, yet the honourable member has asked whether the State Government will appoint Sir Mark Oliphant. The honourable member knows as well as I do that there has never been any discussion on whether the State Government intends to appoint anyone to such a position. I would think that the Governor, after completing his term of office in South Australia, would not want to be bound by such a commitment. I am suggesting that the talents of Sir Mark, as a private citizen, wherever he may live, should not be lost to the community, nor should his voice be silenced.

I am making my suggestion in the interests of those who want a clearer interpretation of the scientific arguments than that provided by newspaper writers who deal with many so-called scientific facts. No honourable member could decide which opinion was right and which was wrong. Obviously, there must be a "centre" opinion coming from a person with sufficient scientific understanding of what is being written in the daily press.

It has been said that many of the matters raised during this debate have been federal rather than State matters. This is understandable because, for the first time in a number of decades, the economic situation in Australia is such that many people are underprivileged and denied the right to work in the community. Only last Wednesday I asked a question in this Council on a number of issues because I wanted to mention them here today. There may be some criticism of the fact that almost every honourable member has dwelt on Federal issues, rather than State.

I turn now to an aspect of development of which the State Government is the architect—the Monarto scheme. This question is being belted every day by Leaders of the Opposition and Opposition members generally. I do not know whether they kick this project because, in the very short term, we have experienced some disappointments in connection with promised funding from Federal Governments of both political persuasions; indeed, three political persuasions. Honourable members opposite hope to gain some cheap political advantage from the fact that Monarto may not go ahead as quickly as was first planned. It was not planned that at this stage there should be hectares and hectares of houses. The plan is still intact. True, the Monarto Development Commission has accepted responsibility for areas other than Monarto. Basically, the project is related to the question whether South Australia, particularly Adelaide, should have the type of development that

makes possible additional housing suitable for a predominantly young population. It is no good looking at the projected population figures for the year 2000.

Some people have tried deliberately to misread the Borrie report and say that there is no need for Monarto, but that argument is so stupid that one should not spend much time in rebutting it. Most honourable members opposite were members of this Council when their Party was in Government—in the 1950's and 1960's. Therefore, it does not need me to remind members opposite about the way Liberal Governments in the 1950's and 1960's grossly neglected to acquire land that was necessary for additional schools to meet the educational needs of a younger population.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: When the Labor Government came to office there was scarcely sufficient land available in any of the developing areas to build sufficient schools and ancillary facilities. In the eastern suburbs, the State Government acquired from the Federal Government between 5.2 ha and 6 ha of land, which was previously a training area for the Postmaster-General's Department. The negotiations were nearly botched up by the Hall Government between 1968 and 1970. Actually, the area fell short of the Education Department's requirements by 2.02 ha or 2.42 ha. After the State Government had acquired the property from the Commonwealth Government, the Morialta High School was built there. Why is the area provided for that school much less than the area that would normally be provided? It is because of the neglect of Liberal Governments. There was no other suitable land in the area for a high school and ancillary facilities.

Much the same thing can be said about hospitals, because it was the Labor Government in South Australia that saw the need for a hospital in the north-eastern suburbs. It was the South Australian Labor Government that saw the need of developing areas to the south. The Modbury Hospital, which is a public hospital, has none of the restrictions associated with it that apply to so-called private enterprise hospitals. I refer to the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth, the only satellite region for which the previous Liberal Government can claim any responsibility. What a hospital it is! I am not criticising any of the male or female staff of the hospital, but I am critical of the previous Liberal Government, which abdicated its responsibilities to a community needing proper medical services. Although it is now 1976 and man is picking up handfuls of soil on Mars, one cannot get emergency services within 19 kilometres of the G.P.O. of this city at Sir Lyell McEwin Hospital.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The soil samples from Mars are being analysed on Mars. They are not being brought back to earth.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is unfortunate that the honourable member does not go to Mars; certainly, his thoughts would be just as valuable 1 000 000 km away. Today, only 19 km from the G.P.O. the community is denied adequate medical facilities in an emergency. That is a shocking state of affairs. The Hon. Mr. Geddes can frown as if to say, "What is that fellow talking about?" However, I want to get through to the honourable member that the neglect of previous Liberal Governments has created this situation.

There has been muddled thinking by the Opposition about Monarto. If Opposition members look at figures showing the age groups of people in South Australia, they will be astounded at the numbers of people aged between 10 years and 20 years. True, honourable members opposite can say, "What is he talking about by expressing concern

over the housing needs for people 10 years old?" At some stage the back-log will have to be caught up. In 10 years, these people who are now 15 years of age will almost certainly seek to realise what Liberal members term "the great Australian dream", and many of them will require housing. If we do not develop areas such as Monarto, where will we locate these people? Will they have no choice but to build on the flat uninteresting plains to the north of the city?

Indeed, one honourable member opposite in this debate pleaded that we should not develop Adelaide towards the area around Virginia, Two Wells and Angle Vale because it was a prime vegetable-growing area. Much can be said for the honourable member's views in that regard, although I do not necessarily agree with his other comments in this debate. Perhaps it is part of the Liberal Party philosophy and defence of free enterprise to have the beautiful Willunga Hills built out and raped like the Adelaide Hills.

What alternative is there? If the available land at Monarto is not used to meet future housing needs, and comparable housing is provided on other land, half to the south and the other half to the north of the greater metropolitan area, this will result in housing settlements on the coastal plains extending from the Light River and Mallala in the north, to the area over the Willunga range, extending almost to Victor Harbor on the south coast and to the Normanville area on St. Vincent Gulf. Of course, new roads will be needed and there will be heavy usage of existing roads.

The policies of past Liberal Governments have denied the agricultural community the opportunity to continue its agricultural pursuits in some of the State's best agricultural areas, which are now built on, and that applies even to the Marion area. In considering the future housing needs of the people of the city of Adelaide, members cannot refer to the growth of Port Pirie, Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Lucindale, Bordertown, Lamerloo, or even Orroroo. Members should consider what the future community is to be offered in housing and services as foreseen by the Government in relation to Monarto. They should then accept the responsibility for what they are saying and shade in on a map of greater Adelaide the areas that will have to be taken from open space in Adelaide to replace the area at Monarto. Honourable members opposite have to agree that the Monarto concept is one based on the premise that it will limit the frightful growth of the greater Adelaide area. For that reason, Monarto is a commendable project.

Honourable members opposite have suggested that many Government members have come up through trade unions and, because they have not had direct experience with rural problems and other matters, they are not qualified to speak on them. It would be embarrassing to relate that view to a matter raised in this Council today by the Hon. Mr. Burdett concerning rape and massage parlours, because the suggestion is that one should not speak on a topic unless one has experience of it. I do not believe that is fair, but this example illustrates to those honourable members who have said that Government members know of nothing other than trade union affairs, certainly nothing about rural matters, education—

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I merely asked a question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Perhaps the honourable member can at last see the stupidity of his recent interjection regarding this matter. I now refer to unemployment, which should be a great concern to all honourable members. Unemployment is now at its highest level since the Second World War. Honourable members opposite might say that unemployment is the result of actions of

a previous Labor Government, and Government members can say it is largely attributable to the McMahon Government, which sowed the seeds of the great down-turn. Certainly, nothing can be said in support of a narrow political view on this matter, especially as 500 000 people at least are deprived and underprivileged as a result of what has happened.

Honourable members can say it is a world-wide trend. Honourable members opposite know what has occurred since last December. They should be aware of the broken promises, and they must feel guilty about their support of what happened last November. I will not say any more about that now. However, we now have almost every employer organisation in Australia making submissions to the Commonwealth Government, virtually saying, "For God's sake change your so-called economic policies, for God's sake change your attitude on so-called Federalism!" Honourable members opposite keep silent because they know that they have been assailed by business interests recently, not only in this city but beyond, to bring to bear any pressure they can upon three or four men in Canberra, not all of whom are necessarily politicians, to change the mood of this Federal Government. The Hon. Mr. Hill sits there in gloomy silence.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I am silent for the reason that I support the mood of the Federal Government.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Who would have thought that I, a professed socialist, would stand up in this Chamber and refer to a document called "Conzinc Riotinto of Australia Limited—submission to the Minister for Industry and Commerce on the White Paper for Manufacturing Industry"? I do this in an attempt to convince members opposite, particularly the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, that they must bear some responsibility for what is happening today. I quote:

Private enterprise around the world is finding the burden of government taxation destroying the motivating forces which over the last 200 years have created the world economy as we know it.

That is not so important as what I am about to quote; it is over the signature of one R. H. Carnegie, an old grammar school colleague of Malcolm Fraser, and of all the other silver tails of Collins Street. I quote again:

We believe continuous unemployment at present levels will be socially divisive in Australia, particularly if it is coupled with a shortage of skilled people and an unwillingness to provide training opportunities for young people. While we accept the need for inflationary tendencies to be stopped, we do not believe that a sustained high level of unemployment can be an acceptable basis for Government policy.

The fact is that that is the policy of the Federal Government today.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Rubbish!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You can read what both Lynch and Street said in a press report only last week. The fact that you merely sit there and say "Rubbish!" suggests that you are being more than foolish. I continue quoting:

We are concerned to see that productive jobs are available and the capabilities of Australians to do these jobs progressively upgraded. We want jobs to come largely in the market sector so that the economy is not over-burdened with an overlarge non-market sector.

That means that this report is at variance with the ramblings and ravings of Malcolm Fraser and Sir Henry Bland, who says, "The Australian Broadcasting Commission will no longer cover demonstrations against the Governor-General"—if I may refer to him as a Governor-General. So with Bland and Stone in the Treasury, Fraser as Prime Minister and Cooley in the Public Service are really the innermost

Cabinet. Members opposite really should have the courage to start going to town on some of the stupidities that are occurring today. The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, who is a member of the Metal Trade Industries Federation, is not here at present, but there is a document, which I know is in his possession, from that federation, which lays down clearly that many thousands of people have been adversely affected by the policies of this Federal Government; it should realise the stupidity of its ways and allow the manufacturing industry to pick up and the people to become employed again.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Can you produce any proof of what you are saying?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No, I cannot.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Then shut up.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I suggest that the honourable member listen to what I say. I challenge the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw to produce in this Chamber a document about 2½ centimetres thick which supports what I have said. It is a report from the industry he represents and is, in fact, a representation and a direct submission to the Federal Government in regard to that industry. Does anyone suggest that the metal trades industry is only a small employer? It is one of the principal employers. I do not know where the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited stands in regard to employment figures. I quote further from this document which, under "People at work", states:

The Green Paper confirmed that for many Australians working conditions were bad, and must be improved; that more consultation, rather than confrontation, was required at shop-floor level and that the solutions would need to be Australian, emerging after debate and discussion; and that the whole community lacked understanding and required education in simple economics.

Working conditions: It is unfortunate that Volumes II, III and IV of the Green Paper have only recently become available for study, since they deserve wide study and thought by all Australians concerned with industrial society. The studies in those volumes confirm that work for many Australians in manufacturing industry is physically and socially unpleasant, and that there are special disadvantages suffered by both women and recent migrants. Conditions which are unsatisfactory to present employees will be at least as unsatisfactory to future ones. There is therefore, a real urgency for change in a number of directions. We see the role of Government as one of example and encouragement rather than direction.

Where does it leave the Tonkins and the Dean Browns in their criticisms of what has been said about the Government's neglect in the Federal sphere of industrial relations? Where does it leave those two honourable gentlemen and their criticism of the State Government's policy and endeavours being made towards what should be a proper concept of participation at a level that will result in much more understanding and relativity between the workers and management? All the Opposition can do is just sit here and yell and rave, trying to coerce people into accepting the policies that the Federal Government has in regard to so-called worker control.

Members opposite have done nothing at all about studying worker participation, involvement and consultation. What do they do? All they can do is condemn, and nothing else. The document from which I quoted is from Conzinc Riotinto of Australia, the firm that was so bloody-minded in the late 1960's and wanted a different system of loading ore into ships ex-rail at the wharf at Port Pirie; it was so set against participating in discussions or recognising trade unions in the area that it was prepared to scrap a piece of machinery worth about \$1 000 000, and that equipment never operated at Port Pirie. Not

only was that company's attitude displayed against the workers' organisations but, if ever a giant company came close to being convicted of contempt of court, it should have been in the proceedings that followed its refusal to employ *bona fide* trade unionists in that area who had the constitutional coverage to do the work in question as well as having the right, under Federal Act, to carry out that work. I will quote further from the document. It states:

The problem of meeting and generating change will mean adjustment by management as well as by union officers; and in both areas there exist a number of formidable barriers. The recommendation of the Green Paper was for increased discussion, hopefully in the direction of consensus. The lack of awareness of common problems exists throughout industry. There is insufficient awareness among managers of the real problems of inadequate organisation and structure in Australian industrial unions, and of the importance which should be placed on the union movement's efforts to improve its efficiency. There is scope for far-sighted assistance by companies towards such initiatives as adequate training and broadened experience for trade union officers.

However, we hear no support for that concept from members opposite. We hear only words of condemnation and ridicule from those who ought to know better and who maintain that they are the captains of industry in this State. The document continues:

The concepts of "worker participation" and "consultation" are as yet inadequately developed or understood in Australian industry. Slogans are no substitute for hard thinking and discussion. There is already an increase of cautious discussion and practical involvement on a range of common problems. Consultation will be vital in the rationalisation of industry which we have suggested above. No obvious answers from solutions developed in other countries have yet been brought forward for Australian conditions. It appears clear that local problems of consultation can be met only by solutions developed locally. Experience outside Australia suggests that different societies will find their own individual solutions.

The document also states:

A long history in which confrontation has been encouraged as the preferred method of industrial negotiation does not mean that change is impossible. It simply means that, both for employees and for enterprises, it is the more desirable and urgent.

I do not want to quote further, because honourable members opposite have heard me previously referring to the shortsightedness of employer organisations in this country. Must I repeat, for the benefit of members opposite, that Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, one of the biggest employers in Australia, recognises no trade union, in a proper concept of industrial relations. Let any member opposite tell me whether that company is prepared to acknowledge an employee organisation for the settlement of disputes in its area, even at Whyalla.

I now refer to a matter that should be of concern to every member of the Chamber. I refer to the real intention of the present Federal Government to change the role and, indeed, the constitutional "set-up" of the arbitration system in Australia. Are we going to be a witness to the expulsion from this country of some of the best brains in the industrial field, such as the President of the Industrial Court and the principal judges of the Full Bench, to some far-off post in Geneva? Are we going to see these people banished to jobs, created for the purpose of banishment from this country, so that the Government can set up a new and different concept of what the court ought to be?

Have we not been witness to the fact that the present Federal Government has broken every one of the industrial promises that it made to the community? I suggest to members opposite that one of the most significant speeches made by Fraser was made on January 21, 1975, well

before he became Prime Minister, to the Forty-sixth Anzus Conference. In that paper, honourable members will find all the frightful things he said he would do. I will not quote from the document, because there would be too many red faces if I did so. The interference in our present system of arbitration doubtless will incur the wrath of all who have any slim understanding of what is involved in industrial affairs in this country.

I will now try to give the lie to the policies that the Federal Government is pursuing at present, policies that are not in the best interests of the people. The Government has stated that there is to be such a reduction in public spending that inflation will come down, but we have had a reduction in the public sectors that has had no effect on inflation, when we consider the cuts against capital that ought to be working capital. The Federal Government has abandoned the Alice Springs to Tarcoola railway line. It has stated that it is the champion of the free enterprise system. Every one in this Chamber knows that we will have to wait with bated breath for Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to complete the Alice Springs to Tarcoola rail link. We will wait for God knows how long for private industry in Australia to say that it will take up the slack in the road programmes of this country, resulting from the policies on which the present Federal Government is bent.

We know the sort of work undertaken by Perry Engineering and the great public works that can flow only from Federal Government involvement. The present Federal Government ought to examine closely the present restrictions on trade, not only in the manufacturing industry areas but also in primary industry, having regard to the existence of the European Economic Community countries. There has been condemnation by members of the present Federal Government when in office 10 years ago right up until the present time in regard to what the E.E.C. was doing about trade in the rural and manufacturing sectors.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: What is the Federal Government doing to the canning fruit industry?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I thank the Minister for that interjection. Only last week, the Federal Government rejected a plan that would have permitted the growers of fruit in Australia to have a place in the sun in this country and to be in a position not different from that of the wheatgrowers, forgetting a drought year, because of the centralised grain-marketing authority in Australia. There is not such a centralised marketing arrangement for preserved fruit, dried fruit, and so on. As a result, we are weakened as a trading nation. We are a target for every trading area that can take advantage of the stupidity of our situation.

At the meeting of the Agricultural Council last week, the Federal Government refused to accept a sensible and proper approach. Has it no regard for what happened regarding the citrus industry a few years ago? A central marketing authority is essential. Is there any sense in these "trade" departments in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia competing with the markets of Singapore, as they used to do? First, people would go from Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide and the wiley men would pull them in one by one, and take advantage of a stupid system. That still persists today.

Why do the fruitgrowers of this country have to wait for payment for their product? Why is not there an examination of the system by the Federal Government so as to do away with the present system, which is unfair and discriminatory? You, Mr. Acting President, and other gentlemen opposite know that B.H.P. is paid, in the

season in which the containers are supplied, for the metal used in those fruit containers. The Colonial Sugar Refining Company is paid for the sugar in the current season, and the transport interests, including shipping interests, receive their payment, even though the fruit may not be sold.

Why are the growers, who put up with all the risks and losses, deprived of their current income year earnings? When growers say that no trade unions in South Australia would put up with this, they are speaking the truth.

We are indeed in a serious position in relation to trade. We must examine this matter in relation to actual exporting costs. We must also examine the levies that are imposed in this area. These problems have been caused by the stupid head-long rush into containerisation. For every container that is loaded, there are three unloaded ones in all parts of the world. Levies are imposed on the export of beef, mutton and all other primary produce, because it is necessary to employ people to export them.

If honourable members opposite want to find a more equitable basis for handling these goods, in the interests of trade generally in Australia, they should support a closer examination of whether a Federal tax should be imposed, because every tonne of produce that comes into or goes out of Australia should bear a levy. At present, we have the ridiculous situation that if one's wheat is exported through a port employing waterside workers, a levy is imposed on it. However, if the port through which the wheat is exported employs members of the Australian Workers Union, that levy is not payable. Because waterside workers are not employed at a port that has the greatest export tonnage passing through it, not one cent is imposed as a levy. I refer to Hamersley Iron Ore in Western Australia, which pays not one cent in this respect. Petroleum products do not attract the levy, either.

I examined the figures a couple of years ago which showed the total exports from the Commonwealth. I think these were in the 1971 *Year Book* or in an earlier edition. If a levy of only 2c a tonne was placed on all export products, we could reduce the crippling levy which is imposed on primary industry and which is almost prohibitive. This is one cost factor that ought to be examined. I say that in order to refute some of the false allegations that have been made by members opposite and by so-called responsible Federal Ministers. In this respect, I refer to Mr. Street and Mr. Lynch, who say that everyone that demands a wage rise is keeping someone else out of work.

Wages and salaries increased by about 28 per cent in 1974, whereas in 1975 the increase had dropped to 13 per cent. Since last November (bearing in mind that accurate figures are not yet available for 1976) there have been indexation denials, to such an extent that wage restraint is operating more today than it has ever operated, except within the framework of the national security regulations during the war and shortly thereafter.

Despite this, we hear Mr. Lynch screaming, as he did last Friday, that there ought to be wage restraint. It is interesting to note that Mr. Lynch made a submission to the tribunal that deals with Federal Parliamentarians' salaries, including those of Ministers. What did Mr. Lynch do? He insisted on a percentage increase over and above the normal increase being sought by his Ministerial colleagues. He says, "I want more, because I am the Treasurer. However, I will tell everyone else that they should seek not a wage increase but a wage reduction." I am sick and tired of the workers being blamed for everything that happens, and of hearing that it is anarchy for

the trade unions to be involved in what can be described as a political strike. If the employers take some action against the people, it is not considered to be a strike or something that is political.

It is wrong to say that the Medibank stoppage was a political strike in the real sense. It represented a direct reduction in the workers' take-home pay and, if that does not concern trade union officers, I should like to know what does. Also, the interests of trade unions are indeed narrow; this is because they are concerned with a certain industry only. Yet we see in this Chamber the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw introducing Bills intended to reduce workmen's compensation benefits. He spoke about industrial training, and suggested that employers should be given some sort of inducement to provide industrial training for apprentices. If one compares the dental, engineering and other professions in this country, one comes to a very different conclusion regarding what is required in the trade area. The prerequisite to being trained as a craftsman is that one must obtain employment. However, in the last couple of years we have witnessed a denial of the people's aspirations to train as mechanics, bricklayers, and so on. The same restriction does not apply to doctors and lawyers, to whom all the country's tertiary facilities are available. Despite reports that it has been difficult for some lawyers to obtain employment, their training for that profession gives them many other reasonably good employment opportunities that are denied to apprentices.

I am sick and tired of unions and employees generally being criticised. Unfortunately, they are getting all the blame for what is happening in society today. I ask honourable members opposite whether they can blame the workers of today or those of yesterday for the obsolescence that has been built into the motor vehicle industry. The engineers and other professionals design motor vehicles so that they will rust out in 52 weeks or 104 weeks. It is not the employees. The fact that a building collapsed and killed people was not the workers' fault: it was the design that brought about that unfortunate occurrence. It is not the quality of the work of bricklayers and carpenters that causes people to complain about cracked houses: it is the specifications and the system, which are outside the workers' control.

I do not hear the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw saying much about the system. Let me examine the involvement of the honourable member. He is tangled up in Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers; Adelaide Brighton Cement; Johns Waygood-Perry Engineering; and Quarry Industries Limited. The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw is a Director of Adelaide Brighton Cement, which has the following subsidiaries: Excavators (S.A.) Proprietary Limited; Glen Osmond Quarries Limited; Greenhill Quarries Limited; Linwood Quarries Limited; Quarry Industries Concrete Limited; Quarry Transport Limited; Rockdale Quarries Limited; Stabilised Rock Bore Limited; Stonyfell Quarries Limited; Hot Pave Proprietary Limited (60 per cent of the shares). Their banker is the Bank of Adelaide, with which Sir Arthur Rymill is associated.

The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw is also tangled up in Johns Waygood-Perry Engineering; Johns and Waygood Proprietary Limited; Johns and Waygood Holdings Limited; Ray Burton and Company Proprietary Limited; Johnsway Galvanising Company Proprietary Limited; Sandringham Estates Proprietary Limited; Bernard Smith P.D.M. Proprietary Limited; Perry Engineering Company Limited; Perry Engineering (Whyalla) Limited; Forwood Holdings Limited; Forwood Down and Company Limited; Gibb Miller and Company Limited; G. M. Industrial Electrics Limited; Forwood

Down (W.A.) Proprietary Limited; Johns & Waygood Lifts Limited; Edwards, Main and Company Proprietary Limited; Phoenix Foundry Limited; and Phoenix Engineering (Bell Bay) Proprietary Limited. Yet these hypocrites here say that trade unions have too much power! What hypocrites are members opposite, in every sense of the word! Where is their conscience, when they stand here and criticise the workers?

Mr. Dean Brown does not have a shred of industrial understanding in his whole body; while he sticks to the concept of moral rearmament, that will escape him. Is it any wonder that Government members suspect the utterances of members opposite when a person is sitting in this Chamber with company interests to the extent of those of the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw? His understanding of industrial relations is non-existent. The whole of his time is taken up in attending board meetings—a lucrative source of income.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will you enumerate Bob Hawke's associations?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: One could name them on half of one hand.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Tell me.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No. The Leader wants a comparison between Bob Hawke and the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw. That is the extent of the Leader's thinking. Bob Hawke in not represented in the Stock Exchange. During the false boom in 1969 and 1970, a fine of a few lousy dollars was all that resulted from the prosecution of a Mr. Shierlaw. God knows how much money office workers were conned into losing; to them there was talk about gold in the sky. The old western stories of a salted mine pale into insignificance when we consider the unpunishable white collar crimes of the Shierlaws business.

The Hon. Mr. Cornwall this afternoon sought information on a project in the Adelaide Hills. It is bloody murder in this day and age. The law ought not to permit such rape of the countryside. Whenever a responsible State Government seeks to ensure that the countryside will be protected, we hear cries of "Free enterprise" from members opposite. They plead that the real estate industry should not be interfered with. However, they want every possible restriction on trade unions. The Hon. Burdett—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will address members as "The Hon. Mr."

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I did.

The PRESIDENT: No. The honourable member said "The Hon. Burdett". That is not suitable in this Council.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Hon. Mr. Burdett had his fling about a travel organisation. However, when it got to the stage where people were losing money and when his investigations led him to the fact that some of the people he represented were involved in the shady side of things, we heard no more about the matter. The honourable member's pet phrases today are "massage parlours" and "venereal disease". I do not know what his pet phrase will be next week. The honourable member ought to turn his mind to the serious things happening around him. For example, he has never condemned the Hon. Mr. Hill, who introduced into this Chamber the frightful term "dole bludger".

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The honourable member did.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not. Last week you said that I had said that, but I did not use that expression. You concocted that. Just because you have used the expression as an everyday expression, you have imagined that I said it.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You said it. You used the expression.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not. I will ask the honourable member a question on that tomorrow.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If the honourable member asks a question, he should ask it of the front bench.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I will ask you, which is my right.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: How much longer are you going to let him rave on, Mr. President? I do not interrupt the honourable member, as he is interrupting me. In conclusion, what I have said today may not be all that is to be said regarding State matters. Certainly, I could continue by referring to the Federal Government's intention about the recent railway transfer legislation. Conventions are followed by honourable members opposite only so long as it suits them. Nothing has been said by honourable members opposite or by their Commonwealth colleagues about increases in doctors' salaries in the past 12 to 18 months, yet these increases have been far in excess of increases in salaries and wages paid to workers in industry and workers generally. I did not see any doctors running around yesterday telling their Minister, Mr. Hunt, that they would agree to wage indexation. Yet last night we heard the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, Mr. Hawke, refer to restraint on behalf of the millions of people he represents. There is absolute silence from honourable members opposite. I hear not a word from the guilty men!

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We are busy!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Obviously, they know that what I have said is the truth. We have heard no announcements from the medical profession about what it will do. It is the ordinary people and pensioners who are denied under the present scheme. Can honourable members opposite say who is ripping off Medibank? It is not the patients who are ripping off the system: it is the doctors and professions in the community engaged in white collar crime. Information has become known to me only in the last couple of weeks of a practice that is difficult to catch up with. I refer to the form filled in by patients for pharmaceutical goods. In areas where, say, the chemist is well known the doctor can write out a prescription for a mother and/or child and then go to the chemist after hours and write in two or three more items. Certainly, such action is hard to detect. How do we catch up with that? Yet it is happening all the time.

Members opposite claim they seek a system that cannot be ripped off, but that will be difficult to obtain. However, I am more worried about the new system to be introduced. Even our Minister of Health cannot explain the full details of the new system.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is yet to be explained.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: True, we are yet to be told. We can see a conjurer on television holding up his fingers to indicate the number of options open to us, but there should be no options. Members of the community who become sick should not be denied hospitalisation. I will conclude now. What is squawkin' Dawkins on about?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member should conclude. He has said that he will conclude.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: There is no restriction. It reminds me of what was said on the A.B.C.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He doesn't know his a.b.c.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I could ask for leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Standing Orders in this Chamber provide for leave for remarks to be concluded.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Standing Orders are made to be broken, whatever they are. I support the motion. Members opposite should interest themselves in problems confronting people in the community today, especially problems concerning the little people in the community, rather than refusing to see those problems because of their own vested interests and muddled thinking resulting from their adherence to the policies of liberalism. I am sure you, Mr. President, would not want me to draw any comparison between liberalism today and liberalism as enunciated by members of the Liberal Party 150 years ago.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. I extend my personal sympathy to the families of three former members of this Parliament. James Ferguson was the Liberal member for Yorke Peninsula from February 2, 1963, to May 29, 1970, and he was later the member for Goyder from May 30, 1970, until March 9, 1973. I had a personal friendship with the late Mr. Ferguson. Indeed, I was honoured, along with several other members, to go on a Commonwealth Parliamentary visit to New Zealand with him. I found Mr. Ferguson to be a thorough gentleman. He was always loyal to his Party and, although I did not agree with his political philosophy, he acted as he saw fit. I did not know the late Horace Cox Hogben and William MacGillivray, but I extend to the families of those men my deepest sympathy. I have no doubt that both these gentlemen carried out their duties to the best of their abilities.

I join with other honourable members in paying a tribute to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant. I thank him for the way in which he has carried out his duties for the benefit of the State. When His Excellency was appointed, a number of eyebrows were raised in South Australia. In fact, several people said that the appointment should never have been made, and that it involved a lowering of the standard of the office of Governor. That statement could not have been more wrong, and Sir Mark has since been recognised as one of the most dynamic Governors that South Australia has ever had. It was unfortunate that his appointment was delayed for two years through a change in Government in 1968. The two-year delay was to the detriment of the State. I also express my thanks to Lady Oliphant, who has carried out her duties with dignity and enthusiasm. I know that she is looking forward to her retirement, and she can retire knowing that the whole State has respected her for the way in which she has carried out her duties.

As this was perhaps the last time that the Governor will call Parliament together before his retirement, I again take the opportunity of thanking His Excellency for the way in which he has carried out his duties. I have had much to do with His Excellency, perhaps more than many other people, because of our association in Executive Council. I can assure all honourable members that His Excellency was by no means merely a rubber stamp: he has looked at all projects put before him before signing his approval. In addition, he has taken a keen interest in the welfare of the State, and I join with other honourable members in wishing Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant a long, happy and healthy retirement.

I support the views of honourable members who have congratulated the Government on its achievements. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Hill concerning his remarks about the South Australian Film Corporation. It must have hurt the honourable member to give such praise.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Not at all.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am pleased to hear that. However, while the honourable member was giving such praise in that area, perhaps he could have given praise in other areas where great advances have been made.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I give praise where it is due.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If the honourable member did his homework properly, he would know of the areas I am referring to.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did my homework, but that was all I could find.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: South Australia, because of good management and careful house-keeping by the State Government, is the best equipped of all States in Australia to minimise the effects of the Prime Minister's financial assaults, and the Hon. Mr. Hill would know that. The Australian Government's cost-cutting exercises will affect this State's public transport, water filtration, the building of schools and hospitals, community welfare, sewerage reticulation, growth centres, and all the other services.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And will bring down inflation; why don't you add that?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It will bring everybody down; it will bring all the services down. If this is the sort of thing the Hon. Mr. Hill wants, let him say so; let him say that he approves of unemployment going sky-high.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not say that at all.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You did.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I said it would bring down inflation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You said it would bring down inflation, after I had said that it was cutting down on expenditure in these areas.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I said it was bringing down inflation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Does the honourable member agree that this is the best way? Does he agree that it is in the best interests of South Australia and Australia that the Australian Government should be making cuts in these areas? Let him go into those areas that have been seeking sewerage reticulation through the years and tell the people there, "I agree with what the Federal Government has done in withholding funds to assist you in this area." Let him go to the areas that will be affected by the cuts.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Whenever Labor comes in, unemployment goes up.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Let him go and say, "You lucky people!" The Fraser cuts will affect the building of schools.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: In the interests of the economy.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Earlier this session the Hon. Mr. DeGaris indicated that he was in favour of these sorts of cuts, yet he was soon asking, "When are you going to make extensions to certain buildings?" How deceitful can honourable members opposite be in these circumstances when they agree that cuts be made in these areas but still want money to be spent? Where shall we get the money from? Make up your minds: do you want these things or do you not? If you do not, get out and tell the people that you approve the cuts being made in these areas.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We want to defeat inflation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Tell people involved with nursing homes that you are happy that the Fraser Government should make cuts in its allocations to them; tell people caring for the sick and the aged that this is the sort of thing you approve of, because that is the indication you are giving us today and that was the

indication given by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris earlier. Is the Hon. Mr. Hill happy about cut-backs in transport allocations?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I am not happy about inflation, and that is what is ruining the country. You should be taking a more responsible attitude.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What about Monarto?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If this is your only worry, tell the people: "Don't worry about transport, hospital facilities or nursing homes; everything will be all right because we are dealing with inflation. When you are dead and buried, you will not have a worry in the world." You do not utter one word about these economies being made at the expense of the under-privileged.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I soon won't be able to afford a pair of shoes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You are damned lucky to have a pair of shoes. Where has the Australian Government—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister should address the Chair when making his remarks, and not speak across the Chamber to other honourable members.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As the policy of the Federal Government is seeking a high unemployment rate, soon no-one will be left to provide the Hon. Mr. Dawkins with a pair of shoes. If his wages are cut back, he will be happy to go to the Community Welfare Department; he will want a hand-out, and he would be the first one to complain if it was not made to him.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: On a point of order—

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yet the Commonwealth Government is making cut-backs in that area, and honourable members opposite are happy about it. South Australia, through good administration and careful house-keeping, is the best equipped State to offset these cuts. This is the only State in the Commonwealth to balance its Budget. It is able to assist by taking up some of the leeway caused by actions of the Federal Government. We were in a position to take up some of the slack, and that has not been done by other States.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You drag the money out of the people.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Where are we going to get it from? Let us examine this matter. You go out into the street and ask the people: would they sooner have a reduction in taxation or would they prefer the building of nursing homes and welfare services to continue; do they want their roads and transport upgraded or do they want a reduction in taxation? You put that to the people. We know what the answer would be. This Government has already taken action to reduce taxation, and honourable members opposite know that very well.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This Government has not the highest taxation rate in Australia, either. Let it be known to honourable members opposite that this State's taxation is not the highest in Australia.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But you have the highest increase.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Over what period?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Two years.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: A lousy two years. The fact remains that this State is not the highest taxed State in the Commonwealth. We can still balance our Budget and we still assist the Australian Government to carry out things that are truly its responsibility, as the Opposition knows very well.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you say we are the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not say we were the lowest taxed State: I said we were not the highest taxed State in Australia. The honourable member had figures given him the other day and he knows exactly where we are in this regard.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: We were third.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You would like to hang your hat on the fact that we are the highest; you are disappointed. What is wrong with you? Would you prefer it to be that way? The Opposition has no grounds for complaint, because we are giving service to the State. Although we are upgrading our services, we still do not have the highest taxation in Australia. We are assisting the Fraser Government and doing some of the job that rightly belongs to it, while members opposite are pleased about cuts made in these areas throughout Australia. In addition, our unemployment percentage is the lowest in Australia. Where can anyone get better than that? This does not please members opposite, because they know that their policy is to maintain an unemployment rate of about 6 per cent or 7 per cent.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is absolute rot and rubbish.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If it is rubbish, why was this figure set in Tasmania several years ago by the Liberal Party, and why is it that, when the Liberal Party has come back into office, it is gradually getting back to that figure as an ideal percentage of unemployment? The Fraser Government certainly is working towards that figure now, and members opposite do not like South Australia to have stopped some of that drift.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: South Australia has more unemployment than it has had for years.

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

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is because of the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member knows well that the Fraser Government has been in office since last December, and the figure increased tremendously last week, in the July figures, whereas, under the Whitlam Government, the figure dropped in that period. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins says that this is a Whitlam Government problem. I know what members opposite are doing about the position: they are trying to create an area of unemployment so that they will have it over the workers of this country.

The Hon. Mr. Hill suggested that some specialist creature such as a country housing board could wave a presumably magic wand to make Adelaide's additional population suddenly live in the country. What a silly proposal that is! The Hon. Mr. Hill should be aware that the South Australian Housing Trust has maintained a very strong country building programme since the early war years, and to date has completed 20 812 houses in 390 different country localities. In the past 12 months, 935 houses were completed in 77 country towns and at present work is in progress on a further 843. The Hon. Mr. Hill should not say that we are not doing something to house people in the country areas, when these figures are there and have been available to him.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You could do more.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In the case of a cut-back in housing money available from the Commonwealth Government, I ask the honourable member to tell us how we could do more. The honourable member

suggests that it was good for the Fraser Government to make these cut-backs, and now he says that we should be building more and more houses with less and less money. The honourable member wants to have it both ways. Over the years the trust has established and maintained very close links with local councils in all country towns. The trust, through its housing programme and planning sections, has relied heavily on local councils to provide the necessary information to assist the trust in assessing demand and formulating a programme in the particular areas. Further, on a regular basis, trust officers visit major and minor towns and have discussions with the small local industrialists as well as with local government, and, of course, in the major areas trust area offices have been established, and one of the roles of the area officers is to keep in close touch with local people to assist in meeting demand.

I further point out that, as an extension of the trust's area office system, there are agents in 46 smaller country towns and these agents are usually conducting commercial activities and are well established in their respective towns; also, they are in a position to liaise with local councils on the question of housing requirements. Furthermore, Housing Trust application forms, for both rental and sale, are available in country area offices, from agents and at most district council offices.

The Hon. Mr. Hill claimed that, in many instances, the price of country houses was less than the price of houses in metropolitan Adelaide. The honourable member is seeking to have his cake and eat it too. House prices reflect demand, and the price of existing houses in country areas is lower than their equivalents in Adelaide only in areas where there are houses surplus to requirements. Where this is so, of course, there is no need for intervention by any public housing agency. However, the honourable member argued his case for a new country housing agency on the basis of high demand for country housing. In areas of high demand what matters is the relative cost of new housing, and it is quite untrue to suggest that new houses cost less in the country. The minor advantage of cheaper land is more than offset by other cost factors. Building material costs and shortages of skilled labour force the price of construction in the country often to as much as 30 per cent more than that of equivalent building in Adelaide. Even in an area such as Murray Bridge, close to Adelaide, construction costs are significantly higher.

The honourable member should be made aware that the city has always carried the country in housing. Construction costs in country areas have always been more expensive than in the city, but at the same time there has been a need for rents to be kept at a low level. This requires rent averaging and if a new country housing body was established to be responsible for the country programme then this averaging could not occur and thus country rents would have to be much higher. Is this what the Hon. Mr. Hill wants?

In the near country towns the trust has already foreseen the demand for housing and has planned new house construction subject to State planning approvals. Many subdivisions are now available for construction to commence, and in other areas serviced allotments have been purchased. The trust expects programmes during the coming year at Gawler, Freeling, Wasleys, Eudunda, Kapunda, Mount Barker, Nairne, Strathalbyn, and of course the home park, consisting of 55 units, at Nuriootpa, is nearing completion.

It should also be pointed out to the honourable member that through close liaison with local councils, business people, progress associations, and Government departments

(their requirements are increasing), the trust has been able to plan to produce a five-year programme to the financial year 1980-81, and this covers 54 of the larger country towns and townships. Again, the honourable member should be aware that waiting lists for public housing made available through the trust are in general significantly shorter in the country than in the city. The time elapsing between application for and allocation to housing in country centres is on average between one and two years less than in the metropolitan area. The honourable member has not done his homework, as I suggested earlier. He is suggesting an expensive and unsatisfactory substitute for a system which already works well. The South Australian Housing Trust is sensitive and well informed.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You can say that again, about being sensitive.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No. I refer to my statement that the trust was well informed and, because it is sensitive to the demands in the country, it is keeping in touch with them. The trust is well informed about the demand for housing in country areas and is actively working to meet the demand. What did the Hon. Mr. Hill have to complain about in those circumstances? What does he think that his new statutory body would achieve that is not already being done by the trust?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I suggest that you consider what I said and not just run up to the trust to get its point of view.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Does the honourable member think that I should accept his point of view? The honourable member did not put forward any case to indicate that nothing was being done in the country areas, although he seemed to suggest that through his speech. Doubtless, the Federal Government is not going over too well. Does the Hon. Mr. Hill agree with that?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No, everyone is still with Fraser.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Does the Hon. Mr. Hill think that the Fraser Government is going over all right?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Good! This is where he disagrees with Mr. Anthony, who publicly stated in the press last week that the Fraser Government was not going too well.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Read it!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member should read it himself. The honourable member gets the newspapers.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You produce it!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not have to produce it. The Hon. Mr. Hill came in hook, line and sinker, and he knows very well that this statement was made by Mr. Anthony.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No, I don't.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Is the Hon. Mr. Hill saying that it was not made?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I am asking you to produce it.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not have to produce it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You do. You made the claim.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. Anthony made the claim that the Fraser Government was not going too well, and I am supporting that claim. That is all I am doing.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Mr. Anthony said, "Some people say".

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He did not. At the convention, Mr. Anthony said, "We must look to ourselves. We are not going over too well." I could not agree with him more; nor could the people of Australia.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What a weak argument! Why don't you produce the paper?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not have to produce it. The cost-cutting exercises are now beginning to bite, and they are biting hard. Outraged protests are being heard by many who voted for his Party at the last election. Those people were conned into voting for the Fraser Government at the last election because of certain promises that it made before December 13. Within six months of those promises being made, Mr. Fraser went on television and said that those promises were made only to achieve a certain end—and that end was to get into Government. He admitted that he had no intention of honouring those promises. Mr. Fraser conned the people of Australia into voting for his Party's return to office. No sooner had he got in than he turned his back on most of the promises he made.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Absolute rubbish!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He accused Mr. Whitlam of not honouring certain promises. However, if Mr. Fraser were genuine, he would say to the people, "We are now in the same position that Mr. Whitlam was in, and we cannot do the things we promised." That is what he would do if he were fair dinkum. Mr. Fraser has therefore conned the people with promises regarding matters about which he knew nothing. He should not have made those promises if he had no intention of honouring them.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He's bringing inflation down.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is so, and he is bringing everyone else down, too. He is bringing down the school building programme, the road transport system, the community welfare system, Medibank, and so on. He is bringing down everything and, of course, inflation can be added to the list. Regarding care of the aged, on July 19, the Commonwealth Government claimed that it was actually overdoing its care for the aged, and proceeded to cut back funds for nursing homes that look after our sick and elderly. Regarding care for the aged, in a television interview on July 19, the South Australian President of the Australian Medical Association, Mr. Jim Harley, described—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: These are the people whom the Party to which the honourable members opposite belong conned and who are now waking up to the Federal Government's deceitfulness.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Your Government—

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Poor old "Dawky" is at it again.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Mr. President, why don't you shut him up?

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation. I must ask the honourable Minister of Health to help me keep some order by referring to honourable members correctly.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Dawkins is trying to bluster his way into the debate by saying that I am condemning the Whitlam Government, but we have not got a Whitlam Government; it is the Australian Government, comprised of the Liberals and the Country Party. The A.L.P. got 100 000 more votes than did the Liberals at the last election.

For the benefit of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, the statement to which I am about to refer was made by Mr. Jim Harley, who described what the Fraser Government was doing for aged care. He said that the Government's move was wrong, and most undesirable, and would rebound on it economically. Mr. Harley does not vote Labor: he obviously voted for Fraser.

On the same programme, the superintendent of an aged persons home, who is also an executive member of the Australian Council for the Aged, Reverend Vern Harrison, accused the Commonwealth Government of deception and claimed that, if reimbursement did not come through, many of Adelaide's church and charitable homes would become bankrupt. As the cuts bite deeper, many are having second thoughts as to the wisdom of the manner in which they cast their votes on that occasion. Honourable members opposite know that, as does Mr. Anthony. Local councils can also take little comfort from Commonwealth cut-backs. It is expected that councils will have no more to spend this year than they had last year, despite their having supported Mr. Fraser's election to office. Now, they are waking up to the fact that Mr. Fraser cannot honour his promises.

Cut-backs in transport spending restricts road building and maintenance and directly results in the increase of registration and drivers' fees. If we are to maintain any reasonable level in this area, the Government must take up the slack. Honourable members opposite say that this is a good thing. In the public spending sector, the next year's school rebuilding and replacement programmes will be severely cut back, creating unemployment and affecting the private sector contractors. Yet the Australian Government gets up and says that its policies are working! Obviously it means that this is because of the greater pool of unemployed that it is creating.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Unemployment was greater 12 months ago.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. Fraser was going to stop this; he was going to reverse the trend.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And he will.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: When? We will not be here then.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No, you will be on the Opposition benches.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Australian Government has no intention of trying to reduce our unemployed pool from its present rate of 5 per cent or 6 per cent. That is that Government's policy, and honourable members opposite know it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Your Government created the unemployment.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Mr. President, how can one hear the Minister of Health, the Leader of this Council, while no action is being taken against the continual mutterings and inanities of your members opposite?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You aren't allowed to stand up unless you take a point of order.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I stood up on a point of principle, you log.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Sumner pointed out—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He talks a lot of tripe.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I should appreciate the Hon. Mr. Dawkins letting me go through this, as Mr. Fraser obviously spoke a lot of tripe, because it was Mr. Fraser whom the Hon. Mr. Sumner was quoting. I agree that it was tripe which Mr. Fraser put over and about

which the Hon. Mr. Sumner was talking. This is one of the few occasions on which the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and I agree. It was tripe, and the people of Australia are waking up to it. I am agreeing with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, because the Hon. Mr. Sumner was quoting what Mr. Fraser said, which was uncooked tripe. Mr. Fraser said that he would put an end to Government extravagances and excesses and that there would be no international safaris by members of Parliament. However, Mr. Peacock was overseas for 13 weeks or 14 weeks. Further, Mr. Anthony, Mr. Nixon, and Mr. MacKellar have been overseas. Mr. Whitlam has just come back from an overseas trip. Yet we were told by Mr. Fraser that there would be no international safaris. Actually, Mr. Fraser could not get out of the country quickly enough. It is a wonder that he did not come to the Torrens River to see whether Russian ships were there.

Mr. Fraser also said, "No more jobs for the boys." However, the Hon. Mr. Sumner has revealed what has really happened in this connection. Mr. Fraser has been in office for only nine months, yet there is already a long list of jobs for the boys. "Government by deception" is the only suitable term to describe the present Australian Government.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: When are you going to talk sense?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: When I get something sensible from the honourable member to answer. In the eight years I have been in this Council I have not heard one sensible thing from the honourable member. Mr. Fraser said, "We will work positively in co-operation with trade unionists." However, it was the Fraser Government's actions that provoked the first national strike in Australia. That shows how positively the Australian Government has been working with trade unionists! Never before had there been a national strike.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And it was a flop.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If it was a flop, why are members opposite so concerned about it? Mr. Fraser also said, "We stand by our commitment to abolish the means test on pensions." What has he done? He has completely forgotten about the people who need that benefit. When in opposition, Mr. Wentworth moved a motion that the means test be abolished. Of course, members of the Liberal Party can do that when they are in Opposition, but they do not really mean it. Mr. Wentworth thanked the good Lord that the Liberal Party did not have the numbers at that time to carry the motion. The Hon. Mr. Sumner quoted from a press report in which Mr. Chipp criticised the Government's broken promises, as follows:

A former Liberal spokesman on social security, Mr. Chipp, said recently a Government social security Bill had made pensioners a political football again. He said he was disappointed the Bill did not make pension increases instant and automatic, as the coalition had promised before last year's election.

We know what has happened to Mr. Chipp: he did not get a guernsey in the Ministry. Mr. Fraser also said, "If elected, a Liberal and Country Party Government would support wage indexation." We all know very well the type of support that the Fraser Government is giving to wage indexation. Mr. Fraser conned workers into believing that they were the ones who could stop inflation and that they should take the kick in relation to controlling inflation. The Fraser Government conned the trade union movement into reducing wage claims, because of the Government's promises about wage indexation. Of course, the Federal Government opposed full wage indexation. First, the Fraser Government said that it fully believed in wage

indexation; next, it believed in wage indexation only up to a certain ceiling; and now, it believes in wage indexation only up to a certain percentage. How can anyone give any credibility to the present Australian Government in these circumstances? Mr. Fraser also said, "Our reforms will maintain the purchasing power of wages."

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Will the Minister give way?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: On April 30 last year, when Mr. Justice Moore introduced the eight guidelines for indexation, he suggested that if in any quarter the increase was more than 2 per cent he would encourage the parties to argue what form of indexation should apply. I suggest to the Minister that, in the last three wage cases, that is precisely what the Federal Government has done.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is a very good suggestion, but why did Mr. Fraser not come down with that plan before the election? Why did he not indicate before the election that he would ask the Arbitration Court to go below full wage indexation? Prior to December 13, Mr. Fraser's Party said that it favoured full wage indexation. Never mind about Mr. Justice Moore: he was only responding to things put to him by the Australian Government and others. If the Australian Government had intended to stand by its promises, it would not have suggested to the court that there should be something different from full wage indexation. In doing that, it was not honouring its promises. Can the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw tell me whether the Liberal Party, before the election, said that it would support wage indexation?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Will the Minister give way?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: In the last election campaign, the Liberal Party said that it would support the indexation guidelines and support indexation. I am suggesting that it has acted completely in conformity with the guidelines.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is not correct; that is not what Mr. Fraser said to the people prior to December 13. He said that his Party would maintain the purchasing power of wages, yet inflation is already running at between 12 per cent and 15 per cent. The Fraser Government is therefore doing nothing about maintaining the purchasing power of wages, because it is asking the court to go below full wage indexation.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: It is maintaining indexation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Fraser Government said it would reform the taxation system. It suggested that members of the community would not have to pay so much taxation. What happened? The Fraser Government promptly takes Medibank out of the general taxation area and imposes a 2.6 per cent levy. Does such action reduce taxation? The Fraser Government has, in fact, increased taxation by more than 2.6 per cent because, previously, a person taking out private health insurance obtained a taxation rebate on that insurance. Now people not only pay the additional 2.6 per cent levy but they also will not obtain a taxation rebate for their health insurance cover. If that is not a situation of conflict, I should like to know what is.

All honourable members know that the Australian Government does not want Medibank and is doing everything in its power to discredit Medibank. On about June 24 or 25, the Australian Government told all States that \$300 000 000 would be provided to meet the cost of

Medibank up to September 30, 1976, so that that sum would be included in the 1975-76 financial year. That was a most dishonourable tactic by the Australian Government. However, it was not unexpected, because that Government will do anything and hope to get away with it.

Therefore, when honourable members review the figures showing the cost of Medibank in 1975-76 they should remember to deduct \$300 000 000, which was paid to the States in advance. The Australian Government stated that it would ensure that no person was denied legal aid because of a lack of means, yet within six months it announced that the legal aid programme had been cut and that a \$50 fee would be imposed on each application to the Family Court. In some cases four or five applications might have to be made to the court by the one person, and it could cost as much as \$250.

Estimates for the Department for the Environment, Housing and Community Development have been reduced by \$400 000 000. The sewerage programme has been slashed from \$145 000 000 to \$50 000 000. Increases in rents in Housing Commission houses and growth centre budgets have been reduced to cover only essential legal commitments, and even these commitments are challenged, because the Australian Government is trying to get out of every commitment it can.

Mr. Fraser was recently in Montreal, and I do not deny him the right to be there. However, once in Montreal, he was not game to tell Australia's competitors of his earlier announcement of substantial cuts in allocations to sporting projects. Mr. Fraser wanted to make a big fellow of himself whilst he was overseas. He said he would institute an inquiry into sport. Why did he not reinstate the original grants made for sporting projects? I refer to the comments of the Federal Government's Deputy Whip, Mr. D. Cameron, in the following report:

He said it would have been worse for Australian athletes "if the previous Government had lost office earlier".

The report continues:

To give them their due, the Labor Party when in Government helped sport like it had never been helped before.

As the Labor Party had been so helpful, the Liberal Government promptly cut back expenditure in this area, because the community was enjoying benefits from the actions of the Labor Government. The report continues:

Mr. Cameron, who has led two Australian karate teams overseas in the past five years, said the Labor Party had been handing out about \$1 000 000 to Australian sporting organisations before our entry into the "chopping events". Yet it was only in the next day or two that we saw a press report stating that Mr. Fraser would have Mr. Cameron on the mat. Mr. Fraser was probably saying, "How dare he criticise an action of this Government."

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Mr. Cameron will be denied his preselection.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. The Hon. Mr. Hill referred to the Art Gallery and commended its high standard of exhibits and displays. The State Government has played a major role in the change from nineteenth century thinking that galleries must educate and improve the mind and is assisting the gallery in many ways to emerge from its former role into its new life in Adelaide. We are presently examining ways by which the work of contemporary artists can be extended out into the community, as is so successfully done in Europe. This does not mean squandering public moneys, because many undertakings can be carried out without additional cost, and much of the essential planning can be started without financial commitment at this time.

The Art Gallery Act always limited the board's responsibilities to the gallery's North Terrace location, but the State Government amended that Act in 1975. The Art Gallery board acting in an advisory capacity can now look beyond the gallery walls to other parts of the city and the State to provide community involvement in the visual arts. The board can take initiatives and make suggestions for the setting up of regional galleries and help with their planning.

In the medium and long term, permanent open-air art displays and works purchased or sponsored as part of a structured programme will be seen throughout the metropolitan area and in major regional areas. In many respects the Festival Centre plaza was the first step in such a programme. The South Australian Art Gallery has assembled a group of large outdoor sculptures from Australian artists, and a selection of these sculptures will be placed in public places around the city as part of the Government's "gallery without walls" programme. These moves are now well under way and will ensure that the Art Gallery will remain a centre of interest and, I hope, controversy.

I remind honourable members opposite of the problems associated with the passage of the Art Gallery Bill last year and the subsequent results obtained now that the Bill has been passed. The Hon. Mr. Carnie has returned to the Liberal Party from the Liberal Movement, although I do not know whether or not he has been treated to the fatted calf. The honourable member looks well, probably because he does not have to do so much hard work: he has now only to do what he is told. The honourable member has only to raise a point of order if a Government member goes too wide in the Address in Reply debate. Obviously, that is the price the honourable member has had to pay to the Party he once condemned. The Hon. Mr. Carnie referred to his belief in the freedom of speech (all Liberals believe in this so long as no-one is getting back at them). The honourable member has not had to pay much of a price in order to get a nice soft seat, without any worries, and certainly not having to worry about the \$27 000 debt of the Liberal Movement. The honourable member knew well that he would be relieved of all those pressures, and we saw him adopt the Liberal attitude of trying to stop a Government member.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He even thinks that Tommy Stott is a good bloke.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: True. It is remarkable to listen to what has been said. The Hon. Mr. Carnie has even adopted the Liberal attitude of union bashing. He did his best; I know he did not go over too well, but he did his best in true Liberal fashion. I do not blame him for that; he has to earn his place on the front bench, which I understand he has been promised. I do not know how they got over the rift between the Hon. Mr. Carnie and the Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Liberal Party, but all is well now, because the Hon. Mr. Carnie has adopted the true-blue Liberal stance of having a go at the unions and trying to stop freedom of speech at every opportunity, by every means he can. Where would the Establishment be without the unions? The members of the Establishment have built up their place in the community because the unions have been there and because they have known they could talk to the trade union movement, that unions could work in the community. They know that, as a result of union activities, everyone's standard has improved. I know that honourable members opposite say there should not be any trade unions.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: No.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Then why keep on bashing the unions at every opportunity? From the beginning, unions have had the task of guaranteeing and protecting against threat man's right and dignity, security and freedom. That is what unions are all about. Why the conservative reaction against them? One member in another place spoke about the Tolpuddle martyrs, who were transported for seven years because they dared to fight exploitation and tried to organise a union. They reckoned it could not happen here. There can be no doubt about the success of unions in the case of justice and human dignity; nor can there be any doubt that the freedom of the working man—freedom from want and care, freedom intellectually and psychologically—has increased considerably, just as the fact cannot be over-looked that at the same time security in and out of working life has improved because unions have fought for these things. Do honourable members opposite deny these things? Let them get up and say so instead of bashing the unions.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you believe in private enterprise?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Then why keep on bashing it, just as the Hon. Mr. Foster does?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I told you the truth.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister, not the Hon. Mr. Foster, has the floor.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Leader asked, "Do you believe in private enterprise?" and I said "Yes".

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Then why do you keep on bashing it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not bashing it. Don't you believe in unions?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Of course I do.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Then why keep on bashing them?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Why do members opposite, including the Hon. Mr. Carnie, the Hon. Mr. Burdett, and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins get up and bash them? If they believe in them, why keep on bashing them?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: They are all guilty.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The unions having achieved many of these things and having made sacrifices to improve the benefits of the workers, why are honourable members opposite saying there should not be preference to unionists, when they have had to fight for these things? Honourable members opposite say (and we agree with them) there should be preferences for returned servicemen who went away to fight for their country. Unionists, because they have been fighting for the conditions that have been achieved in Australia, should have the same preferences as those given to the returned servicemen.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Do you believe in compulsory unionism?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, but I do believe that a person should pay for what he gets. If a person goes into an industry knowing he is going to get four weeks annual leave, sick leave, long service leave, and a rate of pay that has been achieved for him by unionists, he wants that job and he goes in and has to pay for what he wants, just as if I want a suit from John Martin's I have to pay for it. Many people who go into industry wanting the set of conditions applying in that industry to apply to them do not want to pay for it. Put John Martin's

and Myer's in the same position and see whether they would provide the goods that people wanted if they would not pay for them.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: How strong do you think the trade unions would be if it had not been for the servicemen of this country?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. President, let me put it to you this way: where would this country be had it not been for the unionists and the workers who fought to preserve Australia? The very fact that they are returned men does not mean they were not unionists. They went away to protect the conditions for which men had been fighting for nearly 100 years. They should have the same preference, because the unionists have fought for these conditions. Returned servicemen, as the Hon. Mr. Whyte knows, are very good unionists and, if it had not been for the working class of Australia, no contingent would ever have been sent overseas.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Some did not go too well.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We all know that the fighting units of Australia are the best in the world. The Hon. Mr. Whyte is a returned serviceman, and he has the audacity to say they did not go too well. Where are we getting to?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Will the Hon. Mr. Banfield give way?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I do not wish to take up much of the Minister's time but the instance I cited was not in regard to the ability of the Australian forces as fighting men. My point was that there were many good unionists in the services who did not show much appreciation of some of the unionists who would not load ships with ammunition.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Those people who came back and found that conditions had improved while they had been away appreciated those improved conditions. Can you deny that?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You did not answer his point.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did answer his point.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Why wouldn't they load the ships with ammunition?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Do they all the time have to bow down? When they are having something put over them, do they have to bow down and carry out every instruction? The workers did not start any of these wars. The workers were only gun fodder, in the eyes of the Establishment, which was pleased to have them. Do not let us get into the argument that, because someone else starts a war, we must accept every condition laid down. No-one would accept that.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Did the bosses stop making profits and exploiting labour during the war?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course they did not.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Winston Churchill and parasites made fortunes out of it.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Ruddy communists.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much disorder this afternoon. I have been sitting here, listening to this debate, and it has been floundering along, with no direction, and fed by interjections. The honourable Minister will resume his remarks.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. My point of order is that the honourable member made the remark, by implication, that there were communists here. It is fair enough if he does not want to withdraw it, but we know what he said.

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member taking the point of order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes. Why should he not withdraw? He should at your insistence withdraw the allegation that we are communists, not at my insistence. He made the remark, all right. He still has his face buried in the *News*.

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member objecting to what the Hon. Mr. Dawkins said? I did not hear exactly.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: He said that we were communists.

The PRESIDENT: Did the Hon. Mr. Dawkins make that statement?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I did not say that the honourable members were communists. I did use the word but I did not use it about the Hon. Mr. Sumner, the Hon. Mr. Foster, or anyone in particular. I withdraw the comment.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I would sooner be a communist than a damned Liberal.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member persists, there will be an objection taken on that, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Perhaps we can appoint the Hon. Mr. Dawkins to look under the benches every day before we start sitting to see if there are communists there. I know that people used to look under the seats in Menzies' day. The Hon. Mr. Burdett is most fortunate (or unfortunate, depending on which way we like to take it) that the Government has announced that it will remit succession duties on estates passing to spouses. This set the honourable member back but, not to be outdone, he claimed that this was Dr. Tonkin's policy and that we were only adopting that policy. If the honourable member wanted to be honest, he would admit that the Premier, before the July election, stated that the Government would review this tax. It has done that. Before the July election the Premier stated that he would review the position.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Anyone can review the position all the time. It is the Government's job to do that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course Dr. Tonkin has said that he would abolish the duty, but he is in Opposition. The Government has made its decision in accordance with an election promise made before July, and since then Dr. Tonkin has jumped on the band wagon and said he would abolish succession duties—

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Minister give way?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not wish to make any point other than that everyone appreciates the fact that the Government has announced that it will abolish succession duties in relation to surviving spouses. I should like the Minister to say whether the Government intends to refund the money that many people spent in obtaining joint-tenancy titles in the moratorium given. Much money was paid and there was much expense involved in joint-tenancy transfers. Would the Minister like to comment on the matter of refunding the large cost borne by people in that respect?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: People did not have to do that.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: They were invited to do it.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It was in accordance with the Act at that time. Does the Hon. Mr. DeGaris suggest that, if bus fares are increased by 5c tomorrow, we should charge everyone the extra 5c for the number of times they travelled before the date of operation of the increase? Let us take the matter to its logical conclusion. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris knows that it is not possible to do what he suggests, and I assure him that the Government does not intend to do it, but through what the Government has done people will be treated much more lightly than they would have been previously.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Government must have changed its mind at the last moment, to introduce this policy.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is not right. The Government stated, before the election, that it would review the policy.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: And after the election you gave the moratorium, the amnesty.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and following that we also removed the succession duties. Let us get back to the statement put at its worst, namely, that we stole Liberal Party policy. Members opposite could not have put the policy into operation, anyway, but they were in Government from 1968 to 1970 and did not do a thing about it.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Minister give way?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Well, here is their policy in this document, and it is not in it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: A policy is a moving policy, moving forward all the time. You are in the past, going back to 1968.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is a moving debate, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Liberal Party policy moves every day, backwards and backwards and backwards. If members opposite are fair dinkum in asserting that it is Liberal policy to abolish succession duties, have they told us how they have been working on their Federal counterparts to have Federal estate duties removed? If it is their policy, can we expect the Federal Liberals to do that, or have the Liberals got separate policies from one day to another and from one State to another? I will believe the statement when members opposite can tell us that they have worked on their Federal people and got them to agree to lift estate duties.

When the Hon. Mr. DeGaris talks about one vote one value, he says that he has been advocating it for years and that it has been Liberal Party policy. However, when the Liberal Party has been in office, it has not done a thing about that matter. If that has been the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's policy, let him get up and say so independently. When he gets up as Leader of the Opposition in this place and says something, one must infer that it is Liberal Party policy—one vote one value. But what is his Party, or its Federal counterpart, doing about this? It does not matter what that Party's policy is, because it does not mean a thing once it assumes office. Although at the recent Commonwealth election the Labor Party got about 100 000 votes more than the Liberal Party, it won about only half the seats that the Liberals won. The Liberals talk about one vote one value, and the Leader says that he has been wanting this for years. Despite that, his Party has done nothing about it. It is obvious that he has got no say.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: What percentage did the Labor Party poll at the Federal election?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Let us have a look at the figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It was 40 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not care whether it was 40 per cent or 43 per cent: all I know is that it got more votes than did the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Put the two together.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: How can I put the two together? I am talking about the number of seats that the Liberal Party got. It is the Party that must be adjudged in relation to the number of seats it got. One finds that, although the A.L.P. received 3 313 004 votes, or 42·8 per cent of the poll, it got only 36 seats. However, the Liberal Party, which polled 3 248 136 votes, or 42 per cent of the votes, got 68 seats. Why should they be put together when the Liberal Party fought tooth and nail with the Country Party in some areas? But it gets worse than that. The National Country Party, which polled only 11 per cent of the vote, got 23 seats, or more than half the seats that the Labor Party got. Yet the Labor Party got nearly four times more votes! The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has stated what has been his policy all along. Why, then, does his Party not take more action instead of just speaking?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Twenty-eight per cent of the seats and 42 per cent of the votes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is so.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Minister of Health give way?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, I have heard the Hon. Mr. DeGaris explain the old story before. It does not matter on what basis an election is decided, as long as the Liberal Party gets its share of the seats! I want to hear more than words spoken by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris: I want to see an uprising by honourable members of the Liberal Party, to show that they do not like the despicable system that operates.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is not despicable: it is correct.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: How can it be correct when the Labor Party can get only half the number of seats that the Liberal Party got, especially when it got 100 000 more votes than the Liberals got? I suppose that is the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's idea of fairness. I move:

That the Council resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider an additional paragraph to be added to the Address in Reply.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I move that the following paragraph be inserted, after paragraph 2, in the Address in Reply:

3. We thank Your Excellency for the dedicated manner in which you have served the State during your term of office as Governor and wish Your Excellency well in your retirement.

It seems appropriate to add that to the Address in Reply, all members having spoken along these lines.

Motion carried; Address in Reply, as amended, adopted.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that His Excellency the Governor has appointed tomorrow, August 11, at 2.30 p.m., as the time for the presentation of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1973. Read a first time.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 28. Page 241.)

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In supporting the second reading of this Bill, I regret that the Government is apparently not ready to speak on it. This is not the only private member's Bill that is in this situation.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: This is not private members' day.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: This Bill was put on the Notice Paper with the Government's approval. The same point applies to the Water Resources Act Amendment Bill and the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill. The Government's silence on this important Bill is particularly distressing. Actually, this is the second time that this has happened to the Water Resources Act Amendment Bill. If the Government does not have the time, with its busy legislative programme, to consider private members' Bills, it should consider asking Parliament to sit for such a period that would make it possible for the Government to devote its time to private members' business. Regarding the private member's Bill in question, an approach was made to the Leader of the Government in this Council, who said that we could set down private members' business on the Notice Paper on any day; on Wednesdays it would receive precedence, while on other days it would be dealt with as it is being dealt with today—after Government business. The Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, the Water Resources Act Amendment Bill, and the Electoral Act Amendment Bill were all set down for last Wednesday, while debate on the Water Resources Act Amendment Bill was adjourned on the previous Wednesday. So, the Government had a week and the best part of a second week to consider the matter. It is therefore regrettable that the Government has not applied its mind to these matters, which have been properly brought before this Council.

The Bill now before the Council is a short, simple Bill, providing for the counting out of preferences in House of Assembly elections until there are only two unexcluded candidates. Its purpose is to provide proper statistics in connection with electoral figures in the future. This will take the guessing out of assessing election results. For example, to show how difficult it is at present to comment properly on past election results, it is commonly said that from 1936 to 1956 there was a gerrymander factor in this State operating in favour of the Liberal and Country League. It is difficult to assess whether or not there was a gerrymander, because of the large number of Independent candidates and uncontested seats. There is a view that only in 1944, of all those years, can it be established that there may have been a gerrymander factor. There is also a view that it can be established that in 1962 there was also a gerrymander factor.

The Liberal Party maintains that the net result arising not from the Electoral Commission's activities but from the legislation has been a 4 per cent gerrymander factor in favour of the Labor Party. At the Electoral Commission's hearings, Mr. Dean Jaensch and other political scientists said that it was not possible to assess what the gerrymander factor had been in the past and what the effect of voting patterns had been in the past, because the preferences had not been counted out and the figures were not there. The political scientists said that it was only guesswork.

If this Bill is passed, in future we will not be guessing, because we will have proper statistics. If this Bill had been passed long ago, the Electoral Commission would have had a proper basis on which to act. So that Parliament and the Electoral Commission may have a proper basis on which to act in the future, this Bill should be

passed to take out the guesswork in connection with drawing electoral boundaries and assessing voting patterns. It is wrong that there should be guesswork in this field.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You will take what you can get your hands on.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I hope the Minister will support this Bill so that we will know exactly what electoral figures mean and exactly what our masters, the electors, have said. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.50 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 11, at 2.15 p.m.