

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 15, 1971

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

QUESTIONS**TRANSPORT POLICY**

Mr. HALL: In the absence of the Premier will the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, give to the House a clear description of Government policy in relation to metropolitan Adelaide transport? The Minister of Roads and Transport has consistently refused, either because he will not give information or because he does not know Government policy on this matter, to reveal what the Government has in mind for metropolitan Adelaide transport. I have been approached by leading members of councils in South Australia who are extremely concerned because they are unable to initiate the necessary planning in their areas as they do not know whether or not the future of their areas will be affected significantly by Government plans. Not only are the efforts of the Opposition being negated by the Minister's refusal to give information but also Parliament suffers when it is denied information that it should properly have. The other evening, on a wellknown television programme, the Minister of Roads and Transport was referred to as an inert idiot because of his refusal to supply South Australians with the facts they require. This type of reference does no credit to the Minister or to Parliament. Therefore I ask the Deputy Premier to give details of plans which the Government must have for the development of metropolitan Adelaide transport.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, let me say that the Government has complete confidence in the Minister's ability to deal with this matter. If I remember correctly, only last Tuesday the Leader, in questioning the Minister, asked him to stop making statements about the metropolitan Adelaide transport plan, and the Leader's Deputy followed this by saying, "I want the Minister to make a statement."

Mr. Millhouse: I said, "a considered statement".

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This would confuse anyone as to what the Opposition wanted.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suggest that any statement made on this matter, either

in this House or outside it, will be made from the proper source, and that is the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Mr. Millhouse: When?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the Leader is so concerned about the overall plan or any aspect of it, I think it might pay him to be specific in his questioning of the Minister; maybe then he will get the information he is seeking. However, the Leader's critical attitude toward the Minister has certainly not encouraged the Minister to oblige him. I repeat, only to reply to the honourable member's question, that we have complete confidence in the Minister's ability to deal with this matter.

AIR POLLUTION WARNINGS

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister for Conservation say whether he considers that there is sufficient public awareness regarding air pollution potential warnings and whether greater use can be made of the news media to ensure that the public is satisfactorily told of these warnings?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am grateful for the way that the Bureau of Meteorology has co-operated and for the work it has done in relation to air pollution potential warnings. Evidence has shown that the public has responded extremely well to the warnings that have been issued, and the bureau has given me some interesting material to establish this. However, I consider that, as the announcements are not being made until 9 a.m., many people within the community who are anxious to co-operate with the Government on the matter find it difficult, if they miss the 9 a.m. news, to know whether an alert has been issued for that day. I have noticed also that the radio stations, which have co-operated in making an announcement at 9 a.m., have not followed up in further weather reports with information on whether an alert has been issued for the day. As a result, I have had further discussions with the Bureau of Meteorology, and these will be followed up with discussions next week, in the hope that we can arrange to have the announcements made earlier. Also, I hope we will be able to establish a constant pattern among the radio stations so that, when weather announcements are made each hour, the air pollution potential will be made known to the public. The only weakness in the system to this stage is the problem of persons being not clear about whether an alert has been issued, and I hope that, as a result of our discussions next week, this matter will be corrected.

ENTERTAINMENT TAX

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the absence of the Premier, will the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, say what the Government intends to do regarding the sections in Act No. 22 of 1971, which amends the Places of Public Entertainment Act, concerning entertainment tax? Yesterday, at the beginning of Question Time, the Premier made a short Ministerial statement in which he said that it had been decided that the Government should not proceed with collecting entertainment tax. That was a welcome announcement, I think, to all of the people of this State. It shows how well the finances of this State have been supported by the Commonwealth Government and that many of the things that have been said about State finances are not correct.

Mr. Jennings: Is that a question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Under the Act that was assented to on April 15, last Parliament enacted section 27a, which provides:

Subject to this section there shall be a tax in respect of public entertainment.

I am told that the result of the Premier's announcement has been confusion: that last evening many persons refused to pay the tax when they went into cinemas and other places of entertainment. Of course, whatever the Government may say by way of intention, there is still the obligation by law in this State to collect the tax. Nothing was said in the Premier's statement with regard to the repeal of those sections; it was merely said that the Government did not intend to proceed with collecting entertainment tax. This is not good enough. The position on this, even if not on public transport, should be made clear to the people of this State. I therefore ask the Deputy Premier whether on this matter he can now make a statement (and I hope he can) to clarify the situation and to let all concerned know whether this is to be repealed and, if it is, whether the repeal is to be retrospective to the beginning of this month, to yesterday or to whatever date it may be.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Premier said yesterday that legislation would be introduced during this session to repeal the legislation introduced last year in relation to collecting entertainment tax, and that legislation naturally will be retrospective. I am aware some confusion exists, but I point out that the people who were responsible for collecting entertainment tax under the amending legislation are no longer to collect it. There is to be no further collection of entertainment tax, and the people concerned will not be required

at the end of this month to furnish the return that they normally would have been required by the legislation to furnish. I hope that clears up the point for the honourable member.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Works clarify the present position regarding entertainment tax, specifically as it affects members of the public paying for admission to a place of public entertainment today? The Minister's reply has not left me entirely clear.

Mr. Millhouse: Anything but.

Dr. TONKIN: The Premier said yesterday that the proprietor of a place of public entertainment was no longer liable to pay the tax and need not furnish a report, and I understand this, but the Premier made threatening noises about proprietors who maintained the present level of admission charge. Therefore, basically what I and, I am sure, most other people want to know is whether a person going to a place of public entertainment today must pay the increased charges that came into effect when the Act became operative.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member would appreciate and as the Premier said yesterday, the price charged by persons providing entertainment for the public was not a question for the Government. The tax was imposed and it was then up to the individual proprietor of a place of public entertainment to decide whether to increase his costs. The Premier did say that, where proprietors who had increased their prices to cover the tax refused to lower their prices, he would have the Prices Commissioner investigate these incidents. The only statement I can make is that the tax that would have been payable to the Government by the person who owned the place of public entertainment is no longer payable.

Mr. Millhouse: By whom?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: By the person who owns the place of entertainment. That is the point.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the section in the Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has been told that legislation to repeal that provision will be introduced and the repeal will be retrospective. The honourable member knows that.

Mr. Millhouse: To when?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To July 1. As the charges are being made by persons owning places of public entertainment, we have no control over them and, therefore, if persons continue to charge the higher price the matter

should be reported to the Government immediately and we will have it examined.

EXTRADITION COSTS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General consider asking the Government to make a decision to the effect that it will pay for all costs of extradition procedures where it can be shown that a criminal charge is involved? A constituent of mine late last year purchased a car from a person who did not hold complete equity in that car. Subsequently, a hire-purchase company repossessed the car, and my constituent finds himself out of pocket to the tune of \$800. I have with me a letter from his solicitor which states that a conversation with a certain detective on June 18 last revealed that my constituent would have to pay the return fare for the police officer and the prisoner, plus overnight accommodation for the police officer. This would, according to the detective, amount to between \$150 and \$180. My constituent's point is that he is aware that he will be involved in civil proceedings against this person but, at the same time, he wants to make the point that the person committed a criminal offence, namely, fraud or misrepresentation. In this situation, he considers that there should be some onus on the State to pay for the extradition proceedings. I also ask the Attorney-General whether he will be so good as to take up this case if I furnish him with all the information.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Shortly after taking office I had occasion to consider the matter raised by the honourable member. I agree wholeheartedly with him that the State ought to be able to assume (and ought to assume) the responsibility for the cost of extraditing back to South Australia to answer for their misdeeds people who had committed criminal offences. I requested the Chief Secretary at that time to obtain some estimate from the Commissioner of Police concerning the cost to the State of changing the long-standing practice of requiring the individual citizen making the complaint to bear the cost. I do not recall the figure offhand but it was a substantial sum. Although Cabinet then decided that other matters had to take priority I do not think there can be any doubt about the correctness of the principle that the State ought to bear the cost of extradition in these circumstances. It becomes a matter of financial practicability and of arranging priorities. I should like to see the long-standing practice changed as soon as it is financially practicable to change it. In the

meantime, I shall look into this case if the honourable member will give me particulars.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My question deals with the Government's action regarding the m.v. *Philanderer*, the ferry running between Kangaroo Island and the mainland, which began operating and carrying passengers late last year. From time to time, I understand that, as a result of departmental action, the *Philanderer* has been prevented from running. I am not sure how often this has happened, but I believe that at present the vessel is not operating. Will the Minister of Marine say why it is not operating at present?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do so and, in anticipation of the question, I have a report. First, several letters have been written to the press about this matter and it has been implied that the Government has deliberately stopped the passage of this vessel because of the cheap fares and because it does not want it run on that basis. The Government, far from wanting to discourage the establishment of a commercial ferry to Kangaroo Island, would welcome any such development. However, it owes a duty to the people that any vessel employed on such a service shall be 100 per cent safe, shall carry all the necessary life-saving and fire-fighting equipment, shall be stable in all weathers and shall be crewed at all times by a crew that is both sufficient in numbers and proficient in seamanship.

To this end, before a vessel can engage in the carriage of fare-paying passengers it must pass a stringent test and examination by the Marine and Harbors Department surveyors and it is only on a declaration by such surveyors that a certificate of survey is issued, without which a vessel cannot ply for hire or reward without breaking the law. It is in the compliance with the requirements of the department's surveyors that trouble has arisen in connection with this vessel, the owner considering that many of the requirements were unnecessary. In an effort to resolve the situation I had the owner attend my office early in April and gave him four weeks in which to comply with the outstanding requirements, a list of which was in his possession. I further arranged that the requirements be explained to him in detail by departmental representatives the following day so that he fully understood them. This was done, but at the end of nine weeks there were still some outstanding items, particularly in regard to the propellers, one of which had

broken in service in the intervening period. As a result, I had no option but to detain the vessel until such time as the outstanding requirements were fully met. As soon as they are met, and there is now only one outstanding in connection with the fitting of proper propellers, I shall be happy to lift the detention order.

Backstairs Passage is one of the most dangerous pieces of water in this State, and as the owner wished to operate his craft in all seasons, all weathers and by night as well as day it was essential that this craft was up to standard in every particular. This passage is also heavily used by interstate and oversea shipping, and a ferry operating at right angles to this traffic, particularly at night or in fog, must be crewed by individuals well versed in navigation and the International Rules for Preventing Collisions at Sea. If the vessel had foundered in Backstairs Passage with 40 passengers on board while not carrying a certificate of survey, I am certain whose head would have been on the block, particularly if it then became known that the owner had constructed this vessel in his backyard.

The *Philanderer* has two propellers, one of which lost a blade in June. This cast some doubt upon the strength of the material and the design of the propellers, and a tensile test was suggested on a sample to be taken from the damaged propeller. This has been done and the metal has been found to be sufficiently near the required strength as to be acceptable (39 tons a square inch as against the requirement of 40 tons). The department is now awaiting confirmation of the design calculations, and these are expected tomorrow. All that the owner needs to do is to purchase and fit an identical propeller to the original one that failed if the design is confirmed as satisfactory, and if not, purchase and fit two new propellers of acceptable design. A summary of events since June, 1969, when the owner informed the department that he was constructing a vessel for big-game fishing on a charter basis, is held by me and can be inspected on request. If the honourable member wishes to read the summary, I shall be happy to make it available to him. As I have been informed that other people are using vessels to convey passengers to and from Kangaroo Island, I have asked the Director of Marine and Harbors (Mr. Sainsbury) to check this statement. Although he knows of no case, the matter has been placed in the hands of the Attorney-General. I am sure that all members hope

that it will not be long before the required propellers are fitted and this vessel can return to providing what I believe is a most useful means of transporting people to and from Kangaroo Island.

SAFETY CONFERENCE

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry report on the safety conference held last Monday at Barmera?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am pleased to report that a meeting of interested people in the Riverland area responded to suggestions made by my department early this year that a safety conference be arranged in that area. A local committee, mainly comprising leaders of local government in the area, organized the conference which was attended last Monday by about 130 people and which I had the pleasure of opening. Sir Donald Anderson, who lived and worked in the district before the war, was the principal speaker at the conference which concerned safety in the home, on the farm (particularly in respect to agricultural chemicals), during recreation (particular reference was made to activities on the river), and the safe use of electricity as well as safety at work. The main resolution from the conference, moved and seconded by mayors of two councils in the area, was "This conference recommends to the Riverland Local Government Association that a Riverland Safety Committee be formed". The purpose of the resolution was to enable continuing attention to be given to accident prevention activities in the district: it will be considered at the meeting of the Riverland Local Government Association next month. The Secretary for Labour and Industry, who gave the summing up at the conference, offered the support of the Department of Labour and Industry to the formation of any safety committee. The conference attracted considerable interest and was obviously successful. An exhibition of safety equipment, which was staged in conjunction with the conference, was open to the public last Tuesday, the day after the conference. I was very pleased to be informed yesterday that about 900 people visited the exhibition during the day, many of them being organized groups from primary and secondary schools.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE

Mr. COUMBE: In the absence of the Treasurer, will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Treasury how much is likely to be received this year (and, if possible, the figure for a full year) by the State Government as

a result of the payroll tax now becoming available to the State? At the same time, can he find out whether the Treasury knows yet how much will be received by South Australia from the Commonwealth Grants Commission this financial year, following the earlier interim sum received from that commission?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to get a report for the honourable member. He will appreciate that legislation will be introduced this session in respect of payroll tax. The legislation will involve an increase in the percentage of tax paid, but, as this provision must be enacted in concert with the other States, there will be a difference in the sum received this year compared to that received in a full year. The sum received will also be different from what was paid in this State previously to the Commonwealth, as there will be the increase in the rate. Until

the Commonwealth Budget is framed, we do not expect to know firmly the sum (if there is to be any additional sum) that the Grants Commission may make available to the State.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Treasurer, a reply to the question I asked last Tuesday about Government expenditure and amounts of money received from the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government accounts for 1970-71 have not yet been collated into functional groupings and I am not able to give the information in the form sought by the honourable member. However, it may be of some help if I give the relevant figures for the three major departments concerned. They are set out in the following table:

Department	Payments 1969-70	Payments 1970-71	Increase
	\$	\$	\$
Education.....	65,131,000	78,324,000	13,193,000
Hospitals.....	28,020,000	35,403,000	7,383,000
Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs . .	5,401,000	6,355,000	954,000

These departmental increases were respectively 20 per cent, 26 per cent and 18 per cent, and the three combined showed an increase of 22 per cent. In 1969-70 the taxation reimbursement grant was \$125,706,000. For 1970-71 the comparable figure was \$146,932,000, an increase of \$21,226,000, or about 17 per cent.

GREY WARD KINDERGARTEN

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to find out how many children of married nursing staff who work at the Royal Adelaide Hospital attend the Grey ward kindergarten? Also, is it still intended to establish a child-minding centre at the Royal Adelaide Hospital not only for the use of the children of married nursing staff but also for the use of children of paramedical and ancillary staff members?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain the information.

WOOL PROMOTION

Mr. RODDA: My question relates to what is being done to promote the sale of wool in South Australia. I have received the following letter from an angry and concerned housewife:

I was amazed on a recent shopping trip to Adelaide to find it almost impossible to buy woollen clothing for myself and my children.

These stores are all actively promoting synthetics despite the fact that machine washable wools stand up to the claims made, and the yarn has never been better. Is the Government aware of this situation, and are the manufacturers given any incentive or encouragement to use wool (a) as a superior product or (b) as, in my humble opinion, the only way of getting the woollen industry back on its feet?

Although I realize this matter is being dealt with, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether promotion can be undertaken at a State level to see that woollen goods are readily available to the public?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased that the honourable member has received a letter from an angry housewife and not from an angry husband. I shall be happy to discuss the matter with my colleague. As the honourable member realizes, this is usually considered to be a matter for the Commonwealth Government or for the national wool organization, but I believe that if the State can take any action in any way it should do so. No doubt the honourable member is watching closely the outcome of current Cabinet discussions in Canberra on the wool situation.

CALLINGTON HILL ROAD

Mr. BLTRDON: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have investigated the present

condition of South-Eastern Road No. 1, Callington Hill section? I have received the following letter from the Secretary of the South Australian Road Transport Association (South-East Division):

It is with some urgency that I have been instructed by my committee to write to you concerning the present condition of South-Eastern Road No. 1, Callington Hill section. The members of this division have for some time now expressed concern that the south-bound lane (up-track) of this section of road does not provide adequate room for vehicles which have broken down. A dangerous situation arises when vehicles overtake against oncoming downhill traffic. The executive body of this association has written to the Commissioner of Highways requesting that the road be widened, even if not bituminised, to provide for broken down vehicles to be towed to one side to enable the main roadway to be cleared. In his reply, the Commissioner said that the shoulder of the road lane had been sealed "and this will to some extent assist in moving a broken down vehicle off the through lane." He also said that the construction of a proper climbing lane was only being investigated and the inference was that no immediate plans were in hand to undertake such construction.

I understand that the Commissioner is aware of the complaints made by the association. Will the Minister initiate action to have work undertaken to solve the present problem?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get the information the honourable member seeks and bring it down for him.

SALISBURY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mr. GROTH: Can the Minister of Education say when land at Salisbury Downs that the Education Department owns will be developed? Children now residing in the Salisbury Downs area attend either the Salisbury Primary School or the Parafield Gardens Primary School. With the extensive housing development taking place in the Parafield Gardens area, on the western side of the Salisbury highway, the 1972 intake of school-children will be fairly high and, therefore, my constituents consider that development by the Education Department of its land by providing a primary school at Salisbury Downs would relieve the position at the Parafield Gardens Primary School.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to examine the problem raised by the honourable member and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

FLATS FOR PARAPLEGICS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Minister in charge of

housing, investigate the number of flats available through the Housing Trust for paraplegics and, if there is a waiting list for these flats, will he ask the trust to increase the number of such flats? The case of a woman who is waiting for one of these flats has been brought to my notice. She is in a hospital at present but she is capable of looking after herself if she can obtain a flat. The trust has told me that no flats are available and a person wanting one of these flats must wait until a flat is vacant. At this stage the trust does not have any additional flats being constructed. Simply with the natural increase in population, the number of paraplegics in our society will increase and, doubtless, persons who are capable of looking after themselves should be given the opportunity to do so. The only way that can be done is by making flats available, and I consider that the trust should examine this field. I ask the Minister to take the matter up with the trust.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I hope that the honourable member's prediction that the number of paraplegics in our society will increase in future is incorrect, and I am sure he does too.

Mr. Evans: Yes, but it will happen.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated and will bring down a report.

OFFICE OF PROFIT

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Attorney-General give the House any information about his legislative intentions on the vexed question of office of profit under the Crown, as it affects members of Parliament? Members have asked several questions in this House on such matters as the State Government Insurance Office, the State Bank and the Lotteries Commission in relation to whether, even if a member paid his premium or bought a lottery ticket, he could receive any money from the Government instrumentality, or whether he could have an overdraft at the bank.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have had the matter examined and legislation will be introduced this session to clarify the position regarding certain specified public instrumentalities.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether he has been able to arrange with the Public Examinations Board special consideration of the examination papers of students required to complete Leaving and

Matriculation examination studies without the services of a teacher? About three months ago a teacher at the Gawler High School gave notice of her intention to resign, because of pregnancy. Her final day of teaching was last Friday. This teacher had 26 teaching periods a week, and her subjects included Asian History (Leaving standard), Classical Studies (Matriculation), and Latin (at least first year). The students have been told that no replacement teacher is available, and an inquiry by the parents concerned (of whom I freely admit I am one) suggests that these students will be required to complete their studies in these subjects this year without teacher supervision. As we have reached this stage of the year, bearing in mind that the parents concerned have incurred expense associated with books, etc., for these subjects, it is impossible for the students to take alternative subjects with any hope of success. Because of their peculiar situation, I request this information of the Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the honourable member is trying to draw from this situation an alarmist conclusion that goes a little too far. First, I think he appreciates that where a situation such as this occurs the department tries to find a replacement teacher as soon as possible. I am sure also that the honourable member will appreciate that it is not always possible during a term, and in the middle of the year, to provide replacement teachers the moment they are required as a consequence of another teacher's resigning. Mid-year resignations have always been a difficult problem, and we are trying to adopt methods relating to the conditions of service and, by recruiting overseas, to minimize these problems. I will inquire about the position at Gawler, particularly about when a replacement teacher can be expected. The honourable member's presumption that the students concerned have to complete the whole year without a replacement teacher is wrong.

Dr. Eastick: I hope you're right.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the honourable member would do well in the world of today not to give currency to what can be alarmist rumours.

Mr. Gunn: What did you do?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Eyre, if he would care to cite an example—

The SPEAKER: The member for Eyre is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realize that, but if he cared to find an example to substantiate his statement I should be pleased

if he would inform me about it. We have more teachers arriving from overseas and a largish number will be arriving from Canada on July 29. I am not sure at present what other possibilities are open concerning Gawler, but I will inquire and bring down a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

PARINGA PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say when the minor conversion of a general purpose room at the Paringa Park Primary School will be commenced?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

YORKETOWN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Education say when it is expected that the new Yorketown High School will be completed and ready for occupation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Speaking from memory, I think the current position is that, provided funds can be made available, the new school is planned to be available for the beginning of 1974 but, as I am not absolutely sure of that, I will check it for the honourable member. However, I point out to him that, in relation to any of these projects, the proviso that funds be available is a critical one. I think he will appreciate that, whether he likes it or whether I like it, priority has to be given to those projects that involve providing education for the growing number of students attending our schools, especially secondary schools. It is recognized that the need for the partial replacement of the Yorketown Area School by constructing a new high school is indeed a real need and that the condition of the existing facilities is unsatisfactory. I can only assure the honourable member and the people in the area about whom he is concerned that we hope to be able to carry out the necessary work as soon as it is feasible so to do.

STOCKYARDS

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture why stockyards belonging to the Eyre Peninsula Stock Marketing Company, erected on land leased from the Government Produce Department, have been pulled down by that department without the company having been notified? These yards form part of the assets of a publicly-owned company and it is rather disturbing that a Government department should remove the yards without at least consulting the company before doing so. For the last

three years this company has been requesting a renewal of its lease, which had expired, but this has not been granted, and the company has been told by officers of the Government Produce Department that the terms of the old lease still apply. However, in view of this action by the department, the company is worried that it has no secure tenure of this land in relation to its assets. I should like to know also whether compensation will be paid to the company for the removal of these stock-yards and, in addition, whether a lease can be granted to the company as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report on the matter from my colleague and to bring it down for the honourable member.

MINING LEASES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Works say whether the State Government will make an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government whereby South Australian owned and controlled mining companies can survey land and search for minerals on land that is owned by the Commonwealth Government? A constituent of mine (a representative of a South Australian owned and controlled mining company) has been informed by the South Australian Mines Department that it cannot help him regarding the leasing of land owned by the Commonwealth Government. I understand that a French company has been unofficially drilling on this land. If I tell the Minister the name of the company involved and the location of the land concerning which a lease is desired, will he have the matter investigated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, most certainly.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works say what is the State Government's attitude to daylight saving? Great concern has been expressed to me by constituents, especially those who have small schoolchildren who have to travel long distances on school buses and also by primary producers, concerning the effect that daylight saving would have on the rural community.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Cabinet is still discussing this matter and the Minister for Conservation and Minister assisting the Premier will be going to Melbourne tomorrow to confer with the Chief Secretaries of New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and Queensland. Following that discussion, Cabinet will

further consider the question, but nothing firm has been decided as yet.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Local Government say when renovations will be carried out on the Garden Suburb institute? I had lunch today—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At the pensioners' expense.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I heard that dirty crack. I had lunch today at the Colonel Light Gardens Branch of the Pensioners' Association in company with the member for Mitchell, who is sitting behind the Minister, and his wife. In the course of the remarks made by one of the association's members, he referred with some regret to the absence of the Minister, but with pleasure (and I join him in this) to the presence of the Minister's wife. The member went on to say that when the Minister was at the Christmas Party in 1970 he promised that work would be done on the institute, which is a very old structure in a bad state of repair. I have already asked the Minister questions about it, and last year the Minister said in this House that work was to be done, that he had conferred with the Minister of Works and, I think, with the Housing Trust's architects and, apparently, more than six months ago he told the pensioners—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that work would be done, but nothing has been done.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am fully aware of the disgraceful condition of the Colonel Light Gardens hall to which the honourable member has referred. It is now a little worse than it was 12 months ago, but even 12 months ago it was in a disgraceful condition. I have tried to rectify this situation and have sought ways and means of finding the necessary finance. In this I have had the active co-operation of the Minister of Works.

Mr. Millhouse: Not very active!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It took the very active ex-Minister, now the back-bench member for Mitcham, 20 years and nothing was done on the hall; now he expects something to be done in 20 minutes. If the member is interested in getting a reply, perhaps he would care to listen without interjecting and I might be able to give him information that could assist him. However, if he is more intent on writing letters than in listening to my reply, I do not want to waste my time or that of the House. The Minister of Works made available his staff to

do the necessary survey work and estimating, and the whole project was at a stage where it was ready to proceed. However, further developments have taken place since then and, as I believe that they could well be in the best interests of the citizens, further action has been deferred temporarily until these matters have been clarified. However, as soon as they have been clarified—

Mr. Millhouse: Tell us what they are?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, because they have nothing to do with the House at this stage.

The SPEAKER: Order! Questions should be asked one at a time. When an honourable member asks a question, he must not keep following it up with interjections, because that is grossly unfair to other members who have questions to ask. I ask Ministers to refrain from answering interjections.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think I have given the reply to the question initially asked and, in view of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it at that. If the honourable member wants further information, he had better ask another question.

PARA HILLS EAST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether his department will consider the immediate purchase of an appropriately positioned lot of land facing Milne Road, Modbury North, so that access may be gained from this direction to the Para Hills East Primary School? The school committee has contacted me regarding this matter, namely, the need for an access road from Milne Road to the rear of the school buildings. At present, the only approach for vehicles is the short front drive that terminates at a distance from the school, and this means that any goods delivered to the school must be manhandled for the rest of the way. The committee is concerned that an appropriately positioned lot facing Milne Road could be built on, thus preventing the chance of an entrance road from that direction.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to inquire into this matter which, I think, is already being considered. The problem to which the honourable member has referred is peculiar to new schools established in expanding areas where subdivision development has not occurred in the area around the school so that the question of access roads for the school is not able to be finalized. I am not sure what I can do in this case,

but I assure the honourable member that, if an adequate solution can be found to the problem, it will be found.

DEEP SEA PORT

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question concerning a deep sea port in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The investigations of the Central Grain Terminal Investigation Committee are nearing completion and the committee hopes to complete its report by the end of August.

WESTERN TEACHERS COLLEGE

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister of Education may recall that, when I asked a question seeking information on the development and planning of Western Teachers College during the last session, he said that the department had not acquired the land, although it had access to it and planning was proceeding. Can the Minister now say whether the department has purchased this block of land at Underdale and how the planning is proceeding?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The block has not yet been purchased; compulsory acquisition proceedings are in train. Consideration has also been given to expanding the size of the area. Some highways are being constructed in the immediate area that will be of considerable advantage with regard to the college of advanced education. Compulsory acquisition procedures are always lengthy, especially when they are subject to legal dispute, as this case is; it is not possible at this stage to say when they will be complete. However, we will have access to the land when it is required. Planning is now proceeding on the new college intended for Underdale. We are fortunate that the previous plans for the additions to the School of Art at North Adelaide and the rebuilding of the Western Teachers College at Underdale were almost at an identical stage: at the stage of the first consideration of sketch plans, when the first attempt is made to set out in a more concise form the necessary requirements. So, as a result of the decision that has been taken to combine the School of Art and Western Teachers College on the one site, we do not expect any hold-up. The honourable member will appreciate that we have just appointed an interim teachers college council for the Western Teachers College. The Principal of the School of Art (Mr. Roberts), the Chairman of the School of Art Council (Sir James Irwin), and the Director of the Art Gallery (Mr. Bailey), who is a member of the School of Art Council, have all

been added. I intend also that once the new Principal for Western Teachers College is determined and there is a chairman of that council these two people will be appointed to the School of Art Council. In addition, I intend asking the staff at each institution to elect one of their number to the council of the other institution. I hope we will soon also be able to proceed to establishing a joint consultative committee between the two colleges so that joint planning not only with regard to buildings but also with regard to general policies can proceed at an early date.

KINGSTON BRIDGE

Mr. CURREN: As I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport for a report last week, can he now give that report on the progress of work on the Kingston Bridge and ancillary works?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thank the honourable member for giving me a warning that he would ask this question. Regarding the river bridge, there are apparently 24 composite piles, each 130ft. in length, to be driven on the Cobdogla abutment on the eastern side of the bridge; 12 of these piles have now been driven and, in addition, four girders have been assembled on the ground. The design of the river bridge specifies five piers. Test piles have now been driven for pier 2, pier 3 and pier 4. Test loading will be carried out on pier 4 soon. All pile driving is completed on flood opening bridge No. 1. Both abutments and wing wall have been completed and both piers have been completed. Pile driving is partly completed on flood opening bridge No. 2 and pier No. 3, except for the cross head. Six girders for the abovementioned flood bridges have now been manufactured and will be transported to the site soon. The new approach road on the western side (that is, the Waikerie side) of the bridge has been completed to sub-base standard except for half a mile adjoining the Sturt Highway, and the embankment on the eastern side has been completed.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday about applications under the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands states that 133 farmers have so far applied for rural reconstruction assistance. Seven of these applications have been rejected;

15 are in the process of being considered by the Rural Industry Assistance Committee; and 111 applications have yet to be considered by the committee. The Minister said that 16 of the applicants for assistance had applied for a protection certificate to stop action by creditors. Seven of these applications for a protection certificate had been refused. For the remaining nine applications for the issue of a protection certificate, the Rural Industry Assistance Committee had been able to negotiate with the creditors for the deferment of proceedings without having to grant a protection certificate while the committee processed the applications for debt readjustment under the scheme. The Minister said over 90 per cent of all applications had been for debt readjustment. Only six applications for farm build up have been received so far; 127 have been for debt readjustment or carry-on finance or both. The Minister said that it is obvious from these figures that a majority of farmers are more concerned with stabilizing their debt situation than with expanding their farm holdings.

The Minister said he was surprised at the small number of applications so far received. He realized that the scheme was in some ways restrictive in the nature of assistance available to farmers and that the application form was a lengthy and complicated document to fill in. However, farmers should not prejudge their own chances of obtaining assistance from the scheme, as this could lead to many farmers who may be eligible not receiving assistance. The Minister urged that all farmers who were considering applying for assistance should do so immediately. He says that he hopes that many more applications are forthcoming in the coming weeks as he feels that the number of applications received so far is not a true reflection of the serious financial position that many South Australian farmers find themselves in. If we are to convince the Commonwealth of the need to expand and improve the assistance available to farmers, the State must be able to put before the Commonwealth a comprehensive and detailed analysis of the financial needs of South Australian farmers. This can be done only if an adequate number of farmers apply for assistance.

LITTLE PARA RIVER

Mr. GROTH: In view of the publicity given to oil pollution of the Little Para River, can the Minister for Conservation say whether he has had the matter examined? Immediately north of the Salisbury railway station, alongside the railway bridge, oil is flowing from a small pipe into the Little Para River. Possibly

that pipe comes from somewhere in the Elizabeth council area. Constituents of mine have given this matter some publicity. Although they have tried to find out the source of this oil, as yet they have been unable to locate it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am aware of the problem, having seen a press report about it. I have discussed this with the Chairman of the environment committee who, I understand, has had his committee investigate the problem and has discussed it with the councils concerned. At this stage I have not received a report from the committee on the matter, but I will provide the honourable member with information as soon as it is available.

ORAPARINNA NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister for Conservation say whether any action has been taken to control vermin on the Oraparinna National Park in the Flinders Ranges? In June last I visited the ranger at the National Park as a result of submissions that had been made to me about motor cycles making noise and causing destruction in the various gorges under the ranger's control. I have read in the press since then that an additional ranger has been appointed to the Oraparinna National Park. I think this will meet with the approval of everyone, because at present the ranger is responsible for 119,000 acres of land. When driving through the national park I noticed a few rabbits and several foxes, which indicated that vermin numbers were increasing in the area. Some landowners in the area are concerned that, with the excellent season, these vermin may build up to large numbers. Can the Minister say whether the appointment of the additional ranger will help control the vermin?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I share the honourable member's concern about the problems of vermin in the Oraparinna National Park. The honourable member will be aware that it is not long since this area was dedicated as a national park. We were fortunate to have a house available immediately to provide for one ranger. However, because of the tremendous size of the area, it became obvious to us that an additional ranger was badly needed for this area and, in fact, in my view this will still provide us with only a minimum staff. The presence of foxes, rabbits and goats within the area and the damage they are likely to cause are matters of serious concern. Recently I have spoken to the Director of National Parks on these matters, and obviously there is a need for us to plan a programme

to control these things. The honourable member has also referred to the problem of motor cycles within the area. The question of motor cycles in the Flinders Ranges generally must be considered seriously. The lessee of the Wilpena Pound area has acted to ensure that motor cycles are not permitted on that area, and I have discussed the problem of motor cycles in the Oraparinna National Park and surrounding areas with the Director and will soon be taking action to ensure that motor cycles are either completely controlled in these areas or prohibited from entering them.

WOMBAT PLAGUE

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister for Conservation say what is the present position regarding the reported wombat plague on the property of Mr. G. Law, on the West Coast, and what action is likely to be taken in this matter?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I noticed a report last week that some wombats on the West Coast would be destroyed. I checked this with the Director of Fauna Conservation, who told me then that no application for a pest permit to destroy wombats had been made. It will not surprise me if such an application is made. If it is, an officer of the department will visit the area, examine the position and, if wombats are on the property in pest proportions, the issue of a permit will be considered then.

LAND TAX

Mr. EVANS: In the absence of the Premier, will the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, bring before Cabinet the possibility of extending section 12c of the Land Tax Act, which is a special provision to cover rural land? This provision was introduced originally to help people near the city who wished to stay on the land and work it as rural land by rating the land as rural land, not as, perhaps, potential subdivisional land. There was a five-year leeway: if a person sold the property within five years, he would have to pay back tax for a period of five years, on the basis of the potential subdivisional price for that five years. These properties are in the wettest part of the State and in the winter months, because of the cold and wet, productivity is low. One could argue that the people could sell out and get out. However, they wish to live there and act as primary producers. Many of them are in the water catchment area and their land has no potential now for subdivision, but in many cases the properties are valued at much more

than they would be valued at if the potential for subdivision had never existed. In some cases, the rating now for land tax and council rates is as high as \$2 an acre a year. I ask the Minister to examine whether this area can be extended further than that covered by the original proclamation so as to cover larger areas east and south-east of the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to have the matter examined to find out what can be done, and I will let the honourable member know.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Premier, say whether the land tax revaluation that has been announced will take into account the decline of incomes of primary producers in the Central Hills district or whether it will be based, as it was last year, on the few sales in the area that have mainly involved small 20-acre subdivisions and small properties sold to people in the horse industry? Last year, when the revaluation was made in this area, no reduction was made, yet in some areas there was a reduction of 40 per cent, the average reduction over the State being 30 per cent. However, as a result of the occasional sale or two in the Hills area, no reduction was made. Last week I was in a Hills township and learned that practically every wife in the district was working in a shop or at the nearby woollen mills. These people are in as much trouble as are those in the drier areas, yet they received no concession last year and, perhaps on the same basis, they will get no concession this time. The odd sale or two has been made at a ridiculous price to the man who wants to go to the area concerned and conduct a horse stud. In some Hills valuations, the assessment is five times higher than the productive value of the land in question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the honourable member will appreciate that we cannot carry out a valuation of land on the basis of income derived from it or on the falling income of those people who live on the land. He would know the system of valuation as well as I, and that system will be applied on this occasion. The revaluation is taking place because there has been a marked drop in land values over the whole State in the last 12 months or so. In the light of this, the Government considers that it is necessary to carry out a further assessment, the method of valuation being identical to methods used previously. However, I will

check with the Valuer-General to see that I am correct and, if there is any variation of what I have told the honourable member, I will let him know.

MUTUAL DENTAL AID

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General obtain for the House a report on the activities of the dental benefit organization Mutual Dental Aid, which is based in Sydney, and on the present status of South Australian contributors to that organization? Mutual Dental Aid has apparently refused to post a trust fund as required by the Benefit Organizations Act, and for that reason it has closed its office in South Australia. The company has told residents of South Australia that they can still claim, although the company is based in Sydney. There is some question about whether contributors are entitled to do this, whether they have any protection, and, in fact, whether they can do so legally.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain this information for the honourable member.

SAFETY SALLS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the continued use or extension of the use of safety sall signs as road safety devices adjacent to schools has been considered, and will he say what is the limitation on the distance from a school that they may be used? There is confusion about whether use of these safety salls will be permitted in future. I do not suggest that this necessarily comes from a Government source: it is only a problem in the minds of interested people. More particularly, people are becoming concerned because several schools are set back from a main road, with tracks leading to a crossing on the main road, where such a safety device could be invaluable. It is suggested that at present the regulations prevent the use of safety salls on the main road because the school is not immediately adjacent to that road. I should like the Minister to explain these features of this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The provision of safety salls is controlled directly by the Road Traffic Board, as are all crossings. Because of the facts associated with the question, it is probably desirable for me to seek details from the board. I will do this and bring down a report as soon as I can.

LERP

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister for Conservation confer with the Minister of Agriculture with a view to having steps taken immediately

to eradicate the insect lerp, which is attacking and killing red and pink gum trees in the South-East? I understand that the Minister has written to several councils in my district, and no doubt to councils throughout South Australia, stating that the theme for Tourist Development Week, September 20-24, will be "Grow trees and keep Australia beautiful", and requesting councils to encourage the planting of trees. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will look into the matter concerning the destruction, by the insect lerp, of red and pink gum trees in the South-East.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I assume the honourable member is referring not to trees growing in national parks in the South-East but to those growing generally in that area. I gather from his question that he would like the matter to be discussed with the Minister of Agriculture to see whether any information can be provided to people who own properties where this pest is prevalent. I shall be happy to discuss the matter with the Minister of Agriculture and to see whether we can provide the honourable member with any information about this insect and any treatment that may be used to eradicate it.

PYRAMID SELLING

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General obtain a report on the inquiries made into the firm Holiday Magic? Last session on many occasions I asked questions about the hardship caused to many families in South Australia in this regard. However, I see that this firm is still advertising on television and through other media and that it is still fully operating.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The pyramid selling system, which is operated by this company and some others, has been a matter of concern to me for some months and, as the honourable member says, questions were asked about it in the House last session. I can give an answer covering the activities of this company and concerning pyramid selling generally but, as it relates to a certain named company, I should prefer to give a considered and prepared reply. I will undertake to give a full reply to the honourable member in a day or so.

CEDUNA COURTHOUSE

Mr. GUNN: Can the Attorney-General say what progress has been made on the construction of the new Ceduna courthouse? This matter is causing great concern to residents and justices at Ceduna. The present conditions are shocking and totally inadequate, and—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. GUNN: —tenders for this work were called some time ago, but I believe no action has been taken since.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will ascertain the present position regarding that building and let the honourable member know.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Attorney-General say what action can be taken to prevent brochures advertising pornography being sent through the post? Recently, a constituent of mine received (unsolicited, I may say) through the post a brochure that is very nearly pornographic. The envelope was opened by my constituent's wife, and the contents caused her some distress. The brochure apparently originates from the Orbit Club, Grey Street, South Brisbane, and it advertises books, films and appliances that appear to be pornographic; if they are not pornographic, unfair advertising may be involved, because they certainly appear from the brochure to be pornographic. As this is not the sort of thing that many people want to receive in their homes unrequested, I ask the Attorney-General whether, if I pass this brochure over to him, he will have the matter investigated to see what can be done to stop this practice.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have already received complaints about the catalogue which I see is in the honourable member's hands and which I recognize from the catalogues supplied to me. I intend to draw the Postmaster-General's attention to the fact that this material is being sent through the post. I remind the honourable member that a few months ago a joint approach was made by the State Attorneys-General to the Postmaster-General requesting him to try to exercise greater supervision over the mails in this regard and, in fact, the post office took certain action with regard to private boxes that were being used in connection with distributing indecent matter through the post. Needless to say, it is virtually impossible to police the sending of this matter through the post, because the envelope supplied to me with a copy of the catalogue in question appeared to be an ordinary envelope; on the face of it, it gave no indication of the sort of material it contained, and I really do not know how the postal authorities can deal with this situation. However, I will certainly draw the Postmaster-General's attention to the matter. I also will draw the attention of the authorities

in Queensland to the fact that the brochure appears to have originated in Brisbane, but I think that is all I can do.

WAIKERIE GLIDING CLUB

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, say whether the Government has agreed to make funds available to the Waikerie Gliding Club for the construction of facilities to enable the club to conduct the World Gliding Championships in 1974? The club, which will also be conducting the Australian Gliding Championships in 1971 and 1972, desires to have certain of these facilities available so that oversea visitors may see the standard of facilities that will be available in 1974 for the world championships. In this way, the club hopes that it will get more competitors and visitors from overseas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Only this morning I signed a letter to Mr. Rowe, the club manager, indicating to him that the Government was prepared to provide \$14,000 as half of the cost of the administration building, \$7,000 towards the cost of the irrigation scheme for lawn, trees and the airstrip, and up to \$3,500 as a \$1 for \$1 subsidy for the building of a toilet block. Provision for those funds will be made in the Estimates of Expenditure for the current financial year.

COURT INTERPRETERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been waiting to ask a question of the Minister of Education, but he has left the Chamber. I have been waiting for some days to ask him my question. In his absence, I will ask another question of the Attorney-General and hope that I shall get a chance to ask my question of the Minister of Education before Question Time ends. Will the Attorney-General further consider the appointment, particularly in the Adelaide Magistrates' Court, of a court interpreter? The Attorney-General will be familiar with this matter. It has been suggested by Mr. Wilson, C.S.M. of the Adelaide Magistrates' Court, that there should be on the court staff for use in that court or in the 10 courts that now operate daily, and in other courts nearby as well, an interpreter who is a servant of the court. There have been occasions in the last few months on which matters could not proceed because no interpreter was readily available. However, there are police interpreters, but I point out to the Attorney (and I am sure that he will readily agree) that it is in some respects undesirable that those employed by the police should be used as interpreters in the courts as well. I understand that at

present if interpreters are required in perhaps the Magistrates' Court it is a matter of going to an agency. However, frequently interpreters are not available. (I see that the Minister of Education is now back in the Chamber.) That is what happened in the case that was publicized recently. There seem to be strong arguments in favour of such an appointment as I have mentioned and I ask the Attorney whether he will reconsider it if the matter has been closed and see whether such an appointment can be made.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The long-standing practice here has been for the interpreters who are Police Department employees to act where a matter is before the court. Generally speaking, I think this has worked out satisfactorily, although I can see that difficulties could arise in a case where the interpreter had been involved in the actual investigation of the matter before the court. A difficulty apparently arose on the retirement of the interpreter who spoke the Yugoslav language and certain other languages, and that led to the case to which the honourable member has referred in which certain defendants were, I think, discharged because an interpreter was not readily available. It is a little strange, because Mr. Mihailovich, the gentleman who retired, is available for part-time work and is very happy, as I understand it, to act in this capacity if contacted. Interpreters are available through an agency. Great problems are encountered in engaging interpreters to act as court interpreters, at any rate in the light of the volume of business in South Australia, because it is not a case of employing a single interpreter: there must be interpreters who can speak the principal languages spoken by migrants in this city, and that involves more than interpreters employed by the court.

I had this matter investigated by the Public Service Board following the incident to which the honourable member has referred and the board came to the conclusion that the matter would better be dealt with by hiring the services of outside interpreters when a police interpreter was not available. I have further discussed this matter with the Chairman of the board since that conclusion was reached. The matter is not closed, but at present I am not sufficiently informed to be able to say that interpreters ought to be employed by the courts. I can see the arguments for that view, but I can also see the considerable difficulty unearthed by the board's investigations. I shall be having further discussions with the Chairman of the board and with the Chief Summary Magistrate.

NORTH ADELAIDE BRIDGE

Mr. CUMBE: I seek information regarding the over-way pedestrian bridge across the railway line just north of the North Adelaide railway station, the bridge that adjoins the District of Torrens and the District of Spence. Is the Minister of Roads and Transport aware that this bridge has been closed for a considerable time? Can he say why it has been closed and whether it is planned to re-open the bridge for pedestrian use?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am grateful that the honourable member has told me that the bridge has been closed, because that had not been reported to me. However, I shall certainly find out why and what future action is proposed.

SCHOOL LOCKERS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Education take steps to reassure parents of students that sufficient numbers of lockers in working order are available for students at secondary schools? I have received complaints from parents about petty pilfering at secondary schools and I have been told that this has occurred because no lockers are available or because when lockers are available they are not in working order and cannot be locked. This has caused much inconvenience to parents of children who have lost expensive items of clothing. I should be grateful if the Minister would take any necessary steps to rectify this situation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inquire to see whether the position is as the honourable member has described it and, if it is, I shall consider what action should or could be taken.

MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Social Welfare place the matter of maintenance payments before Cabinet with the object of the Government's making the payments regularly to those who are entitled to them? Many deserted wives have had maintenance orders awarded to them but their husbands have not met the commitments regularly, and there is some reluctance by the department to carry out the necessary action to have the defaulters gaoled or compelled to pay. Often these women do not have enough money to live on and, because of the non-payment of maintenance orders, they find themselves in difficult circumstances. I believe this is one area in which the Government could accept responsibility. Although there is some bridging over between the Commonwealth and the State in some cases of maintenance, I believe the State

Government could take responsibility for making fortnightly payments to these women, also accepting responsibility for collecting maintenance payments from husbands. Although I recognize the difficulties involved, I think that members of Parliament should also realize the difficulty faced by these women, especially when they have young children. Such women cannot work and have no substantial income on which to exist. I ask the Attorney-General to raise this matter with Cabinet with the object of having his Government make these payments initially.

The Hon. L. J. KING: When I took office I also had the view that the honourable member has expressed. I had an investigation undertaken in the department with regard to the implications of instituting a system of that kind, but the difficulties were found to be insuperable. I had changes made in the system in the department that to some extent have met the difficulties of wives whose husbands do not pay promptly in accordance with findings made against them. However, a thoroughgoing change of the kind sought by the honourable member I find impossible to institute. It may be of interest to the honourable member if I prepare a reply setting out the difficulties that are involved and the changes that have been made.

SIR JOSEPH BANKS ISLANDS

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister for Conservation say what is the Government's policy concerning preserving the Sir Joseph Banks Group of islands in their natural state? Several islands in the group are currently declared as fauna and flora reserves, two main exceptions being Spilsby and Reevesby, the two largest islands, both of which are farmed. I understand that the Director of Fauna Conservation recently recommended that the Government should purchase these islands, turning them into fauna and flora reserves. In passing, I ask the Minister what stage this recommendation has reached. The current situation is that a drilling rig has been taken to Spilsby Island to explore for minerals. If minerals are found in commercial quantities on this island, how will this affect plans to treat the island as a fauna and flora reserve? These islands are unique in the State in many ways in that they are one of the few places where the Cape Barren goose is found in large numbers. What policy does the Government and the department intend to adopt in view of the conflicting interests of mining and conservation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: True, we are considering obtaining the complete group of these islands as fauna sanctuaries. I must confess that I am not completely familiar with the mining exploration referred to by the honourable member, but I shall be pleased to call for a report on the matter. I will examine the likely effect that any mining activities would have on our declaring these islands fauna reserves.

LIFESAVING CLUBS

Mr. BECKER: In the absence of the Treasurer, can the Minister of Works say whether the Government will consider increasing by 50 per cent grants to lifesaving clubs to enable those clubs to erect club buildings? I understand that State Government assistance to lifesaving clubs to enable them to erect club buildings has been a maximum of \$5,000 over the last 12 years. No financial assistance is given to lifesaving clubs to undertake additions to buildings to provide for gymnasiums and accommodation required for additional equipment. In preparing the next State Budget, will the Minister consider increasing this subsidy from \$5,000 to \$7,500?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know of no submission made to the Government by this organization. However, as the honourable member has raised the matter, we will examine it. I think he will appreciate that, if a 50 per cent increase is to be made in the grant to this organization, demands may be made from elsewhere. The Government must take that possibility into account, although my statement is in no way a reflection on the excellent work carried out by the organization.

SCHOOL PORCHES

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department has considered, in the case of porches attached to wooden buildings, as they often are, removing the wooden wall between the porch and the next room so that a larger space is available to facilitate the modern style of teaching? Several headmasters who are keen to adopt modern teaching methods have suggested to me that this would be a cheap way of providing a bigger area in which to carry out new activities.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Some consideration has been given to this general problem. With regard to wooden buildings, we have tended to concentrate on cases where a triple unit can be upgraded to provide an open-space area. If the honourable member

cares to consult the member for Flinders, that member will be able to describe to him the situation at the Kirton Point Primary School where a triple-unit building has been successfully upgraded into an open-space area. I have come across cases where teachers want to retain the porch area in these timber classrooms simply so that it can be used for storage, providing an area where coats and cases can be kept out of the general room. However, in view of the honourable member's question, I will see that the possibility he suggests is examined. My initial reaction is to say that I would prefer to upgrade double-unit and triple-unit wooden buildings, which are in reasonable condition and which have some life left, into open-space units.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say whether he knows of any general Government directive or Public Service Board regulation which prevents the employment, within the Government service in appropriate positions, of persons with disabilities such as blindness, varying degrees of spasticity, or an earlier history of epilepsy? A person who is spastic, who has successfully completed the Leaving certificate examination, and who has had experience in accountancy was indicated as being acceptable for employment in a clerical position, right to the point when, in finalizing a medical certificate, this very minor spastic disability was disclosed. At that time the probability of gaining employment was lost, and I ask the Minister whether there is a general directive, or whether this is a personnel officer problem at departmental level.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know of no directive that would prevent the employment of persons in the category the honourable member has mentioned. I do know that there is a requirement for a medical examination for permanent employment in the Public Service but I think that temporary employment can be obtained outside that provision. Because of the question, I will have the matter investigated and bring down a report. If the honourable member tells me the name of the person to whom he has referred, I may be able to confirm whether the matter that he has raised was the only matter that prevented the employment of the person concerned.

ANGLE PARK TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Education say how he intends to act in the

case of a repetition at that school, or at any other school, of the incident of last Friday at the Angle Park Girls Technical High School? I asked a question in identical terms of the Minister of Works on Tuesday, in the unexplained absence of the Minister of Education and of the Premier, and I said then that, as this was a matter of very great importance, I had no doubt that it would have been discussed in Cabinet, but the Minister merely said he was sure that the Minister of Education would be pleased to reply to the question if he returned on Tuesday, but the Minister of Education did not return, so I have waited until now to ask the question. The Minister has doubtless read the explanation and the question, in which I said that he was undoubtedly in a dilemma to some extent on Friday, because it could be argued on the one hand that he should meet those who come to see him and, on the other, that by meeting those who were defying school discipline and, to use a current term, partaking in a strike, it could be construed that he was encouraging this sort of conduct. Happily, this is the first time—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commenting in explaining the question, not asking a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is the first time, in my experience, that it has happened.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is an explanation. So that we all may know, both in this House and throughout the community, what the Minister intends to do if such circumstances arise again, I ask him the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member and a few of his Party colleagues were on strike and came to see me by way of a deputation, I should be pleased to have a few words even with them. The situation that occurred last Friday was one in which I judged that it was appropriate to see representatives of the students who had come all the way from Angle Park and to hear what they had to say on the matter, and I have no regrets about doing that. I do not intend to say precisely what I plan to do in the future should similar events occur. I hope they will not occur, and I do not think it would help the situation to make clear any plans that I might have. Further, by making plans clear one may very well provoke the very type of situation that one wishes to avoid. For the honourable member's benefit, I point out to him that on the occasions when his Party was

in Government, the present Leader received strikers who came in a deputation to see him.

Mr. Hall: From schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: From outside.

Mr. Millhouse: On this occasion—

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham never wants to listen to anything: he only wants to tell one about it. I have no doubt that the honourable member, during the short time that he was Minister of Labour and Industry, would have done the same thing. One judges the situation in the circumstances as they arise, and I think that that is the only sensible way one can proceed in that type of situation.

PROSPECT INTERSECTION

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport give me information about any recent development regarding the road-widening programme at the intersection of Main North Road and Regency Road? Because of the questions I have asked previously and also the progress that has been made to the stage where three of the four corners have now been rounded, can the Minister tell me of any new development regarding the fourth corner, which I realize presents difficulty and involves expense to develop?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The last few words of the member for Torrens are, I think, the key words and the understatement of the year: it involves expense for the Government. The architects have made a thorough examination of the situation, and the costs of acquiring the land and of making necessary building alterations are astronomical, to say the least. As a result, the Highways Department engineers have now done a further exercise and it seems at this stage that they have evolved a scheme whereby it will not be necessary to take the fourth corner and yet they can still achieve the desired traffic flow. I do not expect the honourable member to understand that, because, frankly, I cannot follow it myself and I am awaiting with interest to see the plan that has been evolved. The fact that the matter has now been raised gives me the opportunity to ask the Commissioner of Highways when this plan will be available and, in fact, whether it will provide the same traffic flow as would have been provided if the fourth corner had been taken. The matter is certainly not a dead issue—far from it.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you tell me of your decision in due course?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course. I shall be pleased to do so.

CHEST CLINIC

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say what arrangements have been made to relieve the appalling conditions under which the Chest Clinic is at present functioning and can he say when such measures will be implemented? It was reassuring to read in the press a statement by the Minister that the new clinic would be operating by 1973, but the statement seemed to imply that that was all that would be done. In the meantime it is urgent that the present public risk to health from pigeons, both dead and alive, be removed and that the other unsatisfactory features of the building should be relieved. I should be grateful, as would other members of the public, if action could be taken in this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a report on the matter and get a reply for the honourable member.

MIX-UP

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General give a report to the House on the mix-up that has occurred (I use that word advisedly)—

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 14. Page 72.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The Speech delivered on Tuesday is a stereotype document; it seems that the Government has taken an old speech off the shelf, dusted it, added a few words, dressed it up with the help of the excellent publicity staff at its disposal, and turned it out as a supposedly forward-looking plan for South Australia's development in the next 12 months. As I have said, it is a stereotype document, and one that gives us no real indication of what the Government intends to do. I believe the Government intends to pursue its policy of tying the knot more tightly around South Australians through Government restriction, although this is something which, of course, the Government carefully does not spell out

in the Speech. The Speech refers to amendments to the Industrial Code, but we are not told whether the Minister of Labour and Industry is to proceed, for instance, with his plan to remove the protection under section 91 of the Code and to substitute some form of compulsion.

After reading this Speech, which is nothing but a cloak for the inaction that has been evidenced so far, we are led to expect further restrictive moves, which are no doubt coming from Trades Hall through the Labor Party to the Cabinet room. We can expect more regulations in South Australia of the type now on the table of this House which tie up and destroy sections of the milk industry. More of those regulations will no doubt be introduced, despite what the Government would have us believe, as a result of the statements made in this innocuous stereotype document before us. One assumes from the Speech that Government is dormant in South Australia and that Ministers and back-bench members opposite are enjoying the fruits of office, sitting back and letting the State run itself with the help of those magnificent press releases that are used from time to time to deceive the public, as occurred in the first 12 months of this Government's office.

We find the Government at present in the hands of the Deputy Premier, as the Premier attends to the State's business outside Australia. I hope he visits us soon so that he can pay some attention to the drift in this State's affairs at home. I refer to some of the high-sounding phrases concerning social welfare which seem to indicate on the surface a concern for those less fortunate in the community. Let me say here how astounded I and other members on this side were on Tuesday to hear the ghastly attack on that wellknown and highly regarded institution in South Australia known as Bedford Industries. That ghastly attack was made by the member for Florey, who abused his public office to a degree that I have never seen exceeded in my 12 years in this place. It was a shameful attack which I know brought great indignation from his own Party adherents.

They should be indignant and they should be ashamed of anyone who speaks in this way of those institutions that do so much for the people in our community who are less fortunate. The member for Florey asked his questions in this House and the Premier said he would get a reply. After an investigation was made, a report was received from the Chief Secretary concerning the operations of

Bedford Industries, and I am pleased to know that the Director has ably answered the queries publicly raised concerning the operations of Bedford Industries. The Director has done this without the protection of the privilege that the member for Florey uses here in order to pursue what is obviously a family vendetta. It was only after the facts were dragged out in another place that the member for Florey publicly admitted that his son-in-law was involved.

Mr. Wells: That's not true.

Mr. HALL: I suppose it matters little to the member for Florey that he had some family reason to raise the matter in this place. What does matter is that an institution that maintains viable employment and rehabilitation facilities for 470 handicapped South Australians is denigrated in this place by a member who abuses his privilege. He ought to be ashamed that he has offered no public apology in the face of the Director's completely refuting the charges made in this House.

Mr. Wells: It doesn't satisfy me.

Mr. HALL: The member for Florey will never be satisfied, and I shall never be satisfied about his intentions until I hear a public apology to the people who give so much to South Australia through this training institution. This matter is of no little moment to those people employed at the institution or to those who support it either financially or through giving it work. Are we to understand that for personal reasons the member for Florey will risk losing the help received through this institution? Is this type of stand-over tactic (a phrase that I used in another debate yesterday) now being used on those who help others? It is fantastic that the remarks of the member for Florey should go without repudiation in this House, and I am sure that members of his Party will deal with him privately in their own way.

On my own behalf, and on behalf of members on this side, I congratulate the Director and all those concerned with the running of Bedford Industries. I unreservedly accept the explanations given in reply to the completely unjustified charges made against them, and I urge everyone concerned in this community to double their efforts to help that particularly valuable institution. I hope we shall never see this sort of thing repeated in connection with this institution, which is regarded so highly in the community. I urge members opposite to deal in their own way with their member who has abused the privileges that his electors have given him.

This so-called Government is responsible for a type of reverse-cycle operation, involving a provocation and then a revocation. Last Thursday in Executive Council the Minister of Roads and Transport approved regulations to alter greatly the laws concerning the towing of trailers in this State, a matter affecting thousands of private motorists in the community, and on Friday he revoked those regulations. He did this within 24 hours, and his public explanation to those who complained was that he did not know what was in the regulations. Is it any wonder that we cannot get replies from the Minister regarding transportation plans when he is so inept that he does not know what is in the regulations that he himself approves? It is unheard of that a Minister of the Crown should submit to Executive Council regulations that he has never seen.

Mrs. Byrne: It's happened before.

Mr. HALL: It has happened since. It happened yesterday when the Premier got up in this House and said that he would remove the entertainment tax. How long has the entertainment tax been operating? A recent subleader in the *Advertiser* states:

However, it is somewhat disturbing that, despite months in which to prepare for the introduction of the tax, the Government did not realize its untruthful nature until after it had begun to operate. At least this lesson should help ensure better planning in the future.

Will the Government say that it had no warning of the result of the imposition of entertainment tax? Why did it choose to ignore every warning given by the Opposition and yesterday admit shamefully that it was wrong? Why did it deny every warning given in the debate on that issue? I also cite the instance of rural land tax, but need I bore honourable members again to remind them of the opposition from this side over the implementation of the Government's rural land tax policy and of how we warned the Premier, despite our demand that land tax be abolished, that it would raise far more than the \$1,000,000 he insisted it would raise? He ignored the Opposition again and he has had to go to the public in the last few weeks and say, "The Government will get too much from land tax."

What does it cost to do these things? It costs something, and it is wasting taxpayers' money to be so careless and inept. Yet we can see again government by provocation and revocation as we go on: a Government that is dilly-dallying and shifting around like a juggler holding something on his nose that he

cannot control—an inept Administration that cannot even tell itself what to do, let alone tell the public what it intends to do. The public is asking for a definition of Government plans. The answer in the Governor's Speech is that we will have far more of these plans. The Government is going to set up body after body, so the plans can be adopted by the Government one day and rejected the next. There will be little future for the State under that type of management. Certain proposals in the Speech will cost money. There is also a reference to the end of the financial year. I do not intend to deal at any length with the financial aspects, which will be discussed in Parliament in the debate on the two financial measures to be introduced in the next few months.

One thing which is important and which is of central importance to the financial question is the expenditure in the Budget and Loan programmes. There is as yet no indication whether the Government believes it can maintain the very high rate of increase in expenditure allowed to it last year by the Commonwealth Government or whether the Government will try to repeat the 15 per cent increase in expenditure. The State's taxpayers will be anxious to find out what the Government's intention is in that particularly important aspect of our development and expansion. Paragraph 5 of the Governor's Speech deals with the Government's development of and involvement in industry and contains these famous few words:

The Government is actively pursuing its policy to promote development of industry within the State.

As I said yesterday, the Government is actively pursuing its policy, but it has not yet caught it. I hear hollow laughter from the other side, as one would expect from people who ignore the fact that nearly every industry with which the Government has been associated in its first year in office has been one that had been instituted in the State by the previous Liberal and Country League Government. The record outlined in the Speech of the Housing Trust's involvement and of other assistance to secondary industry is the record programme set up by the most recent L.C.L. Government. These are the results of the most recent aspect of expenditure on Wilkins Service and on the Nylex factory, which are large institutions and which have come to this State as a result of the direct negotiations I had with them. When we look over the successful record of the two years of government we had we find in addition, Sola, Krommenie, Texas, Iplex

and many other new and expanding industries that saw the State as a viable base from which to operate their enterprises to supply not only all of Australia but also overseas markets.

Regarding Iplex, I am reminded that it took us some time to find a suitable industry to put into premises that were vacated under Labor's previous management. May I warn the Government (but I know the Government will ignore the warning, because it has already proven that it is willing to ignore advice, then come back and find it is wrong) that, if it continues with its present industrial attitude, more factories will be empty under the Labor Government in the future, because enterprises will not only not come to South Australia but existing ones will pack up and leave. The record is there that they have done it in the recent past, and they will do it again under the mumbling type of inept leadership of the member for Stuart and the Minister of Transport.

They are unable to progress, especially where there are no defined plans and where there is an industrial attitude distinctly unfavourable to the policies of industry. If there is one instance needed of the ideological attitude of the hatred of success, it was given yesterday by the member for Florey, who distinguished himself for the second time this week when he attacked successful industry. He did not attack the failures, because he apparently likes them. He attacked success. If one looks through the criticism year after year, it is the success that annoys the Labor Party. Members opposite know that there are no votes for them where there is success. They prosper only by division and the creation of class hatred, much as they may deny it.

Yesterday, the member for Florey vigorously attacked industries that have done a great job in developing South Australia's employment potential and export markets. If the honourable member wants to continue in that vein and wants his colleagues to do the same, he will get a practical answer. If the honourable member turns to 1965-68, he will find what that answer is.

Mr. Hopgood: An Australia-wide recession.

Mr. HALL: It will be a State depression, as it was then. Figures prove it, and are beginning to prove it again. In March, 1970, there were 6,186 unemployed in South Australia. In April, 1971, the figure was 7,745. In May, 1971, it was 8,154. In March, 1970, it was 6,186, whereas in March 1971, it was 8,740. This will show the trend that develops

under Labor and there are now ominous signs that we are returning to the same conditions as we knew them between 1965 and 1968. I believe these signs will take a little longer to show up because of the especially good flow of industry that my Government established, with the consequent beneficial effect on jobs and enterprise. The benefits of this flow-on are still being felt. I assure members opposite that people in industry are extremely worried about the Government's attitude towards industry not only with regard to industrial strife but also with regard to the 35-hour week. If the Government wants to strike one effective blow against industry (as the member for Florey apparently would like to do), it can do this by successfully piloting the 35-hour week in South Australia. That will achieve effectively and quickly what the member for Florey spoke about yesterday.

Reference has been made in this stereotype, dusted-off sheet to schools. Apparently the Government will do what it can to increase expenditure on school buildings. I hope it will not upset the priorities for school spending that we established when in office. When we came back to office in 1968, we had to reverse the serious downward trend in expenditure on school buildings brought about by the Labor Government. In our first year of office we reversed the trend, significantly raising the expenditure on school buildings by 26 per cent, whereas there had been a decrease to a similar extent in the last year of the Labor Government. I give that example only as a warning to members to watch closely a Labor Government, making sure that it is not allowed to do what the previous Labor Government did. One thing that intrigues me is the way the Government escapes criticism from the teaching profession. There was a crisis in education that ended on May 30 last year when the Government was elected. The reason why this Government is not criticized by the teaching profession is that Labor members of that profession are very vocal. When we were in Government, the Labor Opposition, armed with letters from the teaching profession, bitterly attacked us, saying that we had reserved \$12,000,000 in the Loan Fund to cover past deficits and future problems. That was supposed to be a shocking thing to do. We were not spending on school facilities money that we had had in hand; we were denying South Australian children the facilities they should have.

Mr. Coumbe: Who was the spokesman?

Mr. HALL: He is now the Premier. In discussing this matter, the then Leader of the Opposition said:

In his decision to use Loan moneys as against accumulated deficits on Revenue Account, the Treasurer has made a decision which, I think, is quite wrong economically. It is disastrous to use Loan moneys of this kind as against an accumulated revenue deficit. I think one should avoid using Loan moneys against the deficit if one can do so, but what has the Treasurer done here?

He went on to point out that \$12,000,000 had been reserved. How much has been reserved by this Government? In May, 1968, there was in the Loan Fund \$8,761,000. In May, 1969, the sum was \$13,848,000. They are the sums that the Labor Opposition so strongly criticized inside and outside the House, with the support of its friends in the teaching profession. However, in May, 1971, the sum in the Loan Fund was \$14,329,000. What criticism is there abroad in this State of this Government's reserving this money for the same purpose as we reserved it, and that was for a good and sound financial reason? I have heard no criticism of this from the teaching profession. Therefore, the basis of the charge made against us when we were in office that there was a crisis in education was completely unfair when we see that there is an utter lack of criticism of the present Government, which is using the same procedures as we used, the sum involved being greater.

I now refer to the Premier's plan for a new hotel in Victoria Square. The Premier is adopting his international role at present. Whether he will be home on July 30, I do not know; he has been known to leave the State before when a certain type of activity is near. Yesterday's newspapers carried announcements of a big hotel to be erected in Victoria Square. No reference was made whether the Lord Mayor's planning committee on Victoria Square had been consulted. When I was in office, I remember providing \$6,000 or \$8,000 to help that committee plan and design an attractive and viable unit in that part of Adelaide. No reference has been made whether this proposal fits in with that plan. It is most pertinent that the Premier will apparently offer for this proposal a site which was acquired by our Government and on which was to be built a multi-storey Government office block in the most favourable situation. This site is convenient to other sections of the Public Service; it is aesthetically attractive; it is a site on which the problems of a closely built-up area can be solved; and it is accessible

to the public. The Premier will offer to private industry that site on which to establish a multi-storey hotel.

Apparently he is disregarding the fact that the South Australian Hotel will be demolished, and that a multi-storey hotel of international standard will be erected on that site without cost to the Government and to the benefit of the Government, as I am sure it will be a source of extensive revenue in the way of land tax at least. By the time this Government has finished its term of office, I am sure that many more taxes will apply. Apparently this site in Victoria Square, which was chosen on the advice of the Public Service to be the site of a new administration building, is to be hawked around to private industry, and I imagine it will be offered at a concessional rate. Public money should never be involved in this hotel. South Australia already has high-class establishments of this type and, as I have said, there will be a hotel of international standard on the site of the South Australian Hotel. As time goes by, other hotels will be erected by private enterprise.

There is not now and never will be a need for the Government to invest public funds in such a project, and there should not be any offer by the Government of valuable land to any outside interest at a concessional rate. It should remain a Government possession until it is needed and should not be offered at a concession. However, I fear that it will be. Previously I have seen the Premier act carelessly and recklessly with public assets, as he did regarding the West Lakes programme and the first indenture that was drawn up. That action was scandalous, as the member for Mitcham says, in its disregard of the public interest. If the Premier applies the same standard of operation to this matter, again the public will be the loser.

What is the choice in Government priorities? Are we to have a huge new hotel in a position that should be reserved for other buildings (but that is a little incidental at the moment) instead of new schools? Will the Government tell us this, or can the Government assure us that not one cent of Government money will go into any such project? I should like to be assured of that, and I suspect that the Government is planning to syphon funds that should be used for school and hospital projects, particularly schools, into a luxury hotel, which, of course, will not be used by those who want the facilities that are in such urgent demand to maintain the education standards of South Australian children.

As the member for Alexandra reminds me, the money has already been spent in the capital purchase of this block, and the interest charge accruing each year means that it has a higher value than when it was first purchased. We will watch very carefully from this side to see whether the Government misuses public finance in the way I have indicated it might. If it does, it can expect a pretty tough time from members on this side.

There are so many items of Government mismanagement that one must confine oneself to a small corner of the picture. However, I mention the announcement of the rail link to Port Pirie and the deceitful way in which this was made. One could remember, if one wished to go through a phase I think would be best forgotten, the early days of this Government. I have a report that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of July 4, 1970, under the heading "Shelve Rail Report Move", as follows:

South Australia's Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo, will push for the shelving of the Maunsell report on rail standardization in Port Moresby next week. Mr. Virgo leaves on Monday for a conference of Federal and State Transport Ministers at the Australian Transport Advisory Council. He said today the Adelaide to Port Pirie rail standardization scheme proposed in the Maunsell report would cost \$10,000,000 more than the plan prepared by the South Australian Railways Commissioner, Mr. Fitch. This money could be better used in standardizing the Gladstone, Quorn, Peterborough, and Orroroo lines as well as connecting several of the State's major industries. Mr. Virgo said the Adelaide to Port Pirie rail link proposed by the consultant, Maunsell and Partners, would be four miles longer than Mr. Fitch's plan. By converting the present broad gauge track, the costs of building a new standard gauge line proposed by Maunsell would be cut by about one-sixth.

That clearly demonstrated the opposition of the Minister and the Government to the Maunsell report. However, on June 30 of this year the Minister made a statement substantiating his case for accepting the rail link to Port Pirie, and it is reported as follows:

Mr. Virgo said the route to be standardized was that determined by the consulting firm Maunsell and Partners.

That, again is a complete reversal of administrative procedures and decisions by Cabinet. This Government simply cannot be believed; it will alter decisions a year apart or a day apart. Anything it says today is suspect. We simply cannot believe what we read or hear from the Government, and there are innumerable cases that go to make up this statement. I have listed four, and I could go on because

the list grows month by month as the Government continues in office.

In the early part of the article, the Premier is reported as saying that the concessions that South Australia gained included standard gauge connections to industry at Elizabeth, Woodville and Mile End. I applaud the connection of those places to the standard gauge complex, but then comes this comment:

"The Government, soon after it came into office last June, told the Commonwealth that the plan agreed to by the previous Government was unacceptable as it did not connect the State's heavy industries directly to the standard gauge," the Premier said.

That is a deliberately misleading statement of the type for which the Government is noted. It is deliberately misleading to the public, designed to give the impression that quite the opposite is the case from what are the facts of the matter. When the Liberal Government left office it told the Commonwealth Government it would not agree to the implementation of the rail link to Port Pirie until Elizabeth was connected to the complex. This was a point upon which agreement with the Commonwealth could not be reached, and my Government went to the election unable to announce that project. I can assure the House I would dearly have liked to accomplish that plan in the time at my disposal in office. We did our best to have the Commonwealth accept it. However, there was insufficient time to impress our case on the Commonwealth and we could not go to the people with that accomplishment added to the long list of our achievements.

It ill behoves the Government to come now with this misleading statement that it told the Commonwealth it would not agree to what my Government had agreed to. What would one call it—a mis-statement, a lie? It joins the other items for which the Government is noted in deliberately misleading the public, but in very carefully chosen language.

Any mention of transport I suppose must include the vexed question of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. Call it what you like, because the Minister has made enough statements to enable us to do that. We can call it a dial-a-bus system, an electric train service, rapid transit routes, anything we like, because the Minister has made statements to cover any eventuality. He has specialized, of course, in making announcements as alternatives to M.A.T.S. which have been in fact parts of M.A.T.S. I read in the *Financial Review* about the middle of the year a report that obviously originated from Government

officers in South Australia, that the Government was urging an alternative plan on South Australia, and that was the rail plan. Then the article detailed an exact replica of the rail plans in M.A.T.S. This was put forward as an alternative to M.A.T.S.! Could there be anything more deceitful than the Minister of Roads and Transport and the way in which he has handled this enormously important project in South Australia?

I repeat, as I have said previously in the House this week, that leaders in our community want to know what is planned for them, as they are unable to fulfil their commitments. They must know, if they are to give an account of themselves in local government or in business, and they must know whether or not to spend, to plan and to manage their affairs. They are unable to make a decision because the State Government will not make its decision. This House has been treated by the Deputy Premier as a joke, and with contempt. Today I asked the Minister for a definition of the Government's transport planning. I am not asking him to define the plan in detail because I know a Minister cannot carry that detail in his head. No man could. The reply I received was that last Tuesday I had asked the Minister of Roads and Transport to stop making statements. Is that reply true or false? My question of last Tuesday was as follows:

Will the Minister of Roads and Transport cease making conflicting and confusing statements about Adelaide metropolitan transport, statements that are undermining public confidence, and will he clearly define Government transport policy so that public authorities and individuals can plan properly for the future?

The Deputy Premier treats the matter with such contempt that he tells the House that I urged the Minister of Roads and Transport to say nothing. Secondly, the Deputy Premier said that, if we treated the Minister correctly and stopped insulting him, maybe he would give us a reply. Maybe! The Deputy Premier went on to say that the Minister might "oblige us"—is that the way he operates?—by giving information to the public. Is it our obligation or his obligation? It is the Minister's duty to inform the people of what is in store for them in the future. However, it appears that he will not do that. Before much longer he must present a plan that can be understood by those concerned with metropolitan planning.

I wish now to refer to our Premier, who has gone off to trade in the East. Because the Premier has involved himself, with other Government members, in international affairs, it

is pertinent that we should spend a few moments in considering where the Labor Party is taking us in connection with overseas trade. We have witnessed the shameful spectacle of the Minister of Roads and Transport publicly denying the use of our railways to our Springbok visitors. The Premier showed every form of hostility to a Government with which South Australia has about \$15,000,000 of export trade annually, a Government that takes from Australia more than \$70,000,000 worth of goods annually.

This Government, with unemployment figures that are 2,000 greater for March, 1971, than for March, 1970, has, in effect, said that it does not want to trade with South Africa, because it chooses to judge that that country is less responsible than other countries. As a result, the large amount of trade that I have referred to is in jeopardy. The same type of policy is being pursued by Mr. Whitlam in the international sphere. I wish to quote from the report in the *Advertiser* of the interview between Mr. Whitlam and Premier Chou En-lai. The portion I wish to quote commences with a reference to Mr. John Foster Dulles as an officer of the American State Department; it is as follows:

Mr. Whitlam: "He was officer of the State Department. Australia has only been attacked by one country in her history—Japan. Two of our cities were bombed. Territories for which we were responsible and still are were invaded. We fought the Japanese through the islands for three and a half years. So Australians at that time had a fear of the Japanese. They have the same fear of Japanese as I believe you people have now.

Mr. Chou: "Both of our people have similar sentiments."

Mr. Whitlam: "You have had a longer struggle."

Mr. Chou: "For half a century."

I suppose that when Mr. Whitlam is in Japan he will try to ingratiate himself with that country, which he insulted while he was in China. What is Mr. Whitlam putting at risk for Australia? What is at risk as a result of the reckless intervention by a Party that is not in Government and will not be in Government this decade?

Mr. Hopgood: Your lot lost the wheat shipments.

Mr. HALL: That is the type of inane comment that we can expect from the honourable member, who is completely ignorant of international diplomacy and the details of the wheat agreements with China. The honourable member should study the case before he interjects. Since Mr. Whitlam is choosing between China and Japan in the same way as Mr.

Dunstan has chosen between South Africa and the rest of the world, perhaps we should look at what is at risk.

In 1969-70 our exports to mainland China totalled \$125,000,000, whilst our exports to Japan totalled \$1,021,000,000. Our imports from mainland China totalled \$32,000,000, whilst our imports from Japan totalled \$481,000,000. Is Mr. Whitlam going to ignore these figures? Is he going to reject one country for the sake of developing trade with another country? What of Australian industry? He seems to reject readily little Taiwan and hand it over as a province to a country that has no leader of the opposition and does not subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That is easy for the Labor Party because, in its practice of dictatorial administration in this community, it finds it easy to put people in little boxes and tie them up by means of regulations. Perhaps the Chinese Government and Mr. Whitlam can teach each other a fair bit.

In 1969-70 Taiwan imported from Australia goods worth \$30,000,000 and exported to Australia goods worth \$15,000,000. So, it is most unfortunate that Mr. Whitlam and his group, now supported overseas by our Premier, are playing with the future of Australia in order to further the Labor Party's electoral chances. They think that the Labor Party's chances are being furthered, but I have other views and I believe that the Australian people will reward the Labor Party for its ignorance and its hamfisted handling of external affairs.

The Labor Party is placing at risk a tremendous part of Australia's future prospects, and it is doing so recklessly and without concern, just as members opposite have little concern for those whom they regulate, push around, stand over, and kick. When these little people protest, the Labor Party calls them names—"bludgers" was the term that was used. One could go on at great length criticizing the Government's elementary mistakes. I have dealt with only a small fraction of the Government's failures during its 12 months in office. We have seen change after change on minor and major scales, provocation and revocation—a reverse cycle Government. In accordance with traditional practice, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I realize that this is the second Address in Reply debate since the Government took office, and I look forward to the third one, which obviously will be the last that will take place under a Labor Government.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): We always look forward to hearing the Leader of the Opposition speak. During the recess he did not let us alone; from time to time we were treated to speeches from the Leader. We all recall the outburst during a television programme that gave rise to the Leader's being called the Chattanooga Shoe Shine Boy. As a result of the Leader's speech this afternoon, we may be able to invent another name for him. However, after listening to the Leader, I have decided to introduce a competition in this place. Honourable members are all aware that tomorrow we will receive a proof of the Leader's speech, and I invite all members to examine this speech carefully. I will offer a prize to anyone who can show me, in that speech, one constructive statement by the the Leader. The prize will be a scholarship to a set of lectures that will be conducted by the members for Spence and Elizabeth and me on the theory and practice of social democracy. In addition, we will throw in as an extra prize free admission tickets to the fourth test in Adelaide on the next tour by the West Indies cricket team.

I rather fear, of course, that we may not be able to award this prize, because we read in this afternoon's *News* that there is a great possibility that there will no longer be any tours to Australia on behalf of the West Indies. That will arise from the activities of those in this country who have aided and abetted the Springbok football tour and consider that it is in the interests of this country that the South African cricketers should tour Australia. I think we should name as those involved in this the Leader of the Opposition here, the Prime Minister of Australia, and the ham-fisted Premier of Queensland (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen), who seems to be intent on ripping his State apart, with declarations of emergency and so on.

Mr. Jennings: Did primary producers—

Mr. HOPGOOD: I should not have thought that any primary producer would be interested in the type of disruption that could occur as a result of these over-reactive moves by Mr. Bjelke-Petersen. If that is the sort of move that the Leader of the Opposition considers that this Government should take up when he asks us to act, I think it would be far better if we did not do anything. However, the competition still stands. The prize may be awarded if anyone can come up with one constructive suggestion that was offered to us this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition.

I would be failing in my duty if I did not congratulate my new colleague, the member for Adelaide, on his excellent speeches yesterday and his entree to this House. It not often falls to a new member to be asked to deliver two speeches on the occasion of his first speaking in this House, and I think we all agree that the honourable member acquitted himself extremely ably indeed, and we look forward to the many things that he will say in the coming years. We know that he will be here for a long time. The honourable member enters this House as a result of the successful Labor vote that he received in the State District of Adelaide, following the sad passing of our late colleague, Mr. Sam Lawn.

Little need be said about this by-election campaign. Mr. Wright, our new colleague, conducted an extremely good campaign but basically a Labor man was returned for a Labor district and the very slight fall in Labor support, given the reduced turn-out to vote at that by-election, can offer no possible source of comfort or solace to the Opposition. On the same day we also had the Legislative Council by-election for Southern District. This was an extremely uneventful contest. One or two of the Liberal canvassers got their districts mixed up and started putting out literature in the Brighton District, which they should have known was part of Central No. 2 District in the Legislative Council, but I guess these things happen from time to time.

I think I should say that I voted. I gave Mr. Cameron my No. 2 preference vote and gave his Country Party opponent my No. 3 preference, so I consider that I did my duty as an elector of the Legislative Council in casting my vote. What was interesting about the Southern District by-election was not so much the incidents of the by-election, which as I say was an extremely quiet contest, but rather the fallout afterwards and the statements by the new member of the other place, the Hon. Mr. Cameron, in tipping the can on a section of the Liberal and Country League and this peculiar body, the League of Rights. I congratulate Mr. Cameron on his courage, shall I say, in so tipping the can. I think more and more people in Australia should be made aware of this body, the League of Rights, and the type of evil influence that I consider it has on this community.

So great was the fallout from Mr. Cameron's statement that we even had Mrs. Anne Neill coming out of retirement to tell us all about her first-hand experience as an under-cover agent for the Australian Government. It is a

pity that the Australian Government so misused this lady in this position. She told us that for many years she was a card-carrying member of the Australian Communist Party but was acting on behalf of the Australian security authority. We were not told that she uncovered any dire plots to blow up Houses of Parliament or do anything else that might undermine the system of constitutional Government in this country.

The Hon. L. J. King: Do you think we should have under-cover agents in the League of Rights?

Mr. HOPGOOD: One wonders whether this may be so. Perhaps it may not be a bad idea to have one or two *agents provocateurs* in the League of Rights. What interests me about her is that she once said that the Communist Party told her that, but for her, this so-called front organization could not have existed for long. The interesting thing about this is whether this front organization was dangerous, because, if it was dangerous, then all Australian security was doing was providing this dangerous organization with a darned good office girl. On the other hand, if it was not dangerous, the good lady was simply wasting her time. Of course, we know the correct answer. The good lady was wasting her time and was completely misused by the Australian Government. I turn now to the subject of this debate, the Governor's Opening Speech. Paragraph 7 states:

My Government is aware that many problems associated with pollution, conservation and our environment, can be solved by sound town and regional planning.

Then there is a series of statements about the environment and protection of the environment, which I will not read now, because time is short. However, I wanted to take this opportunity to turn to the whole matter of the ecological crisis that confronts us at this time and, in doing so, I hope to be more constructive than was the previous speaker. One almost apologizes for raising this issue in this place, because we have heard so much about it recently, but I suggest that it seems that the message is not always getting through where it should be getting through. I suppose that it is significant that in a scientific age the apocalypse should be projected in scientific terms rather than in the poetic terms of earlier days, so it will be necessary for me from time to time in this debate to use certain scientific terms. By and large, they will be those that are fairly current and in popular use.

Perhaps the crisis that faces us can be shown in the way I will explain. There was a time when scientists were divided into two categories, one category comprising those who considered that we faced a coming ecological crisis and the other category comprising those who considered that we did not. That halcyon period passed and we entered a new period in which scientists were again divided into two categories, one category comprising those who considered that the ecological crisis was here and the other category comprising those who said that it was still coming. We now have a third phase, in which scientists are again divided into two categories, namely, those who consider that there is still time to do something about it and those who consider that there is not much time and that we should eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow the race will wipe itself out. That is the situation as seen by the experts in the field.

We understand the immediate ramifications of this ecological crisis. There are hundreds of millions of under-nourished people across the world. We have polluted air and water and seen the extinction of many species of fauna through the elimination of their habitat. The driving factors in this ecological crisis are population growth and uncontrolled development. I shall take up each of these topics one at a time. An article in a magazine last year gave much information about population growth; for example, it noted that in the period of the old and middle stone ages there was an annual growth rate in the world of the human population of about .002 per cent, and the human race had a doubling time of about 34,000 years. Coming forward to the period 1650 to 1750, we note that the annual growth rate had increased to about .3 per cent, so that the race now had a doubling time of about 230 years. If we come further forward—between 1950 and 1960, a mere decade—the annual growth rate had increased to 1.8 per cent: that is to say, the human race had a doubling time then of 39 years. From 1960 to 1970 the annual growth rate was about 1.9 per cent, with a doubling time of 37 years. In 1930 there were about 2,000,000,000 people in the world, but today, 40 years later, we have almost doubled again to arrive at 3,600,000,000. The extrapolations produced are frightening: it is suggested in the article that beyond the year 2,000 we see through a glass darkly. If the population increases indefinitely at the current rate, in 400 years there will be one square yard for each inhabitant of the globe, and in 5,000 years the earth will

be a ball of human protoplasm expanding into space at the speed of light. These extrapolations will not come true. It may be famine, it may be plague, it may be a nuclear holocaust, or it may be a set of rational decisions on behalf of human beings and their Governments to do something about it.

I turn now to the whole question of population and resources. It has been calculated conservatively that 10,000,000 people would be close to if not above the maximum number that an intensively managed world may support with some degree of comfort. This is not many more than the 7,800,000,000 that we are committed to by the end of the century, so we turn again to those dire predictions of men like Malthus and Hobbes. Malthus, after his experience in the British East India Company in Asia, came back and wrote a book in which he stated that whilst food supplies increased in an arithmetic progression population tended to increase in a geometric progression or, as we say today, exponentially. Therefore, there will always be a tendency by man to breed up to subsistence level. We may recall the words of Hobbes that man's life will always be nasty, brutish, and short.

Malthus and Hobbes have been out of favour for some time because they wrote just before the opening up of the great frontier lands in the United States, Canada, Australia and other places with a tremendous increase in agricultural production available at that time. These men were thought of as being old hat. Unless many rational decisions are taken, the predictions of Malthus and the statements of Hobbes will be only too painfully true. Are there any escape hatches or any ways in which it is possible for us to escape from this apocalypse? Three have been suggested: first, there is the green revolution, the so-called miracle grains that could considerably increase production. This is merely a chimera. All the green revolution will do is to increase the ecological instabilities that exist with each artificial monoculture, and will lead to the further deterioration and pollution of the environment.

It will have the effect that in certain regions, where hard decisions should be taken now, these decisions will be delayed, because for the time being the increased food production means that people can live tolerably. This is like the potato and Ireland. With the introduction of the potato from the New World to Ireland it was possible for that small land to increase its production considerably and have a much higher population. Finally, the breakdown came and in the great famines

of the 1840s and the 1850s in Ireland many people died and tremendous misery was caused because decisions that should have been taken were not taken and because the potato brought an artificial increase in population. Many people left Ireland at that time and brought their gifts to other places. Some went to the United States where they became policemen, and if your Deputy, Mr. Speaker, was in the Chamber, I perhaps could say that others came to Australia where they became Labor politicians.

In each sphere they have had great gifts to give to the places that have received them. I apologize for forgetting to make some reference to the member for Heysen: how could I forget his affection for the Emerald Isle? The main point is that a sudden introduction of a new crop seems to increase the capacity of an area and to increase its population: that is all right until nature catches up, and then it is found that the artificial growth that occurred in the meantime simply cannot be sustained.

The second possible escape hatch is food from the sea, and we hear much about this. This again is a phantasm, because the open sea is a biological desert. All seafood is poor in calories although rich in protein and cannot be expected to meet the energy needs of the future population. I quote the words of the expert Paul Ehrlich, when he said, "Food from the sea—a red herring."

The third possibility is the direct synthesis of food by sunlight to culture single cell organisms on some substrate, such as petroleum, although we will run out of that because it is a non-renewing resource. At present it is an extremely inefficient process, but one that may hold some hope for the future. In discussing this matter we should consider the question of biological engineering, something with which we should be concerned for the future. People are now talking about the transplanting of genes for nitrogen fixation from blue-green algae or bacteria to rice or wheat. We may think of the savings for India in not having to use nitrogenous fertilizer. In other words, the wheat fixes the nitrogen in the soil if this could be done.

Mr. Gunn: This is very interesting!

Mr. HOPGOOD: The honourable member is a primary producer, and one hopes that in some ways he will use these new processes. We would not want to see him going broke. A second possibility is an alga designed to take up sodium ions rather than potassium from seawater, so that we would then have a

creature that would need only sunlight to desalinate seawater. This is the possibility in which the member for Eyre should be concerned as he would not have to rely so much on the Poldia Basin. Industries based on micro-biological rather than on conventional mechanical or chemical techniques would have a much higher level of production, with much less pollution of the environment. But if these sorts of things simply mean further acceleration in development, then the basic ecological problem will remain.

I turn to the whole problem of population and land use. There is an interesting article about this by Lord Kennet in the *New Scientist* in January, 1971, called "When we run out of England." That gentleman, who is a well-known Labour man in Great Britain, points out that, in 1966, 8.3 per cent of the land surface of Britain was in urban use. By the year 2001, 11.8 per cent of the land surface of Britain will be in urban use. That means a 31 per cent of urban land take in 35 years for overall purposes, or 1 per cent per decade. The overall land take for subdivisional purposes will be one-tenth of an acre a person. If he is right, the total land surface of the United Kingdom will be covered in 300 years' time, or about 10 generations.

Life will become intolerable in Great Britain long before that. Already there are psychological signs of over-population. Would there be a conservationist today who would deny that the United Kingdom was already over-populated? Some even say that Australia is already over-populated. Lord Kennet in his article had some illuminating things to say about notions of property which will arise from population pressure. He says:

But that is not all. It is quite possible that rising population will soon again call in question the root of the whole matter: property. The old questions raised by the first land reformers and land collectivists will gain a new lease of life, and particularly the question that started the whole secular trend towards state intervention in property rights: can accumulation of capital and credit be the sole criterion to determine how much of a limited resource one man may procure and keep? That was the question first asked when the novelty was the accumulation of capital and credit. But in the so-called land market we are faced not with an effectively unlimited resource, not even with a resource which is limited in the sense that it won't grow faster than a certain rate, but with a resource which is limited absolutely and forever. And we have our novelty corresponding to the seemingly endless growth of capital and credit in the nineteenth century; our novelty is the seemingly endless growth of people. More money, more people, same amount of land.

He concludes with the statement:

Can money alone continue to determine ownership forever?

I turn now to the second point of my remarks—the problems connected with uncontrolled development. We might call most of the western private enterprise economies "frontier" or "cowboy" economies. We ringbark all the trees, we do away with all the indigenous population either by the rifle or by dropping boxes of flour laced with strychnine, and we generally rape the resources of that area. This is the sort of thing that has happened on the developing agricultural and pastoral frontiers of many countries, much to the regret of those people who come afterwards. It also happens throughout the whole of our industrial complex. We are tied into a linear use of resources which are dragged from the ground and are put through some sort of industrial process, and the end products are spewed out the other end, where they generate problems. Solving this whole problem of what we do with our linear use of resources, which is rapidly depleting our stock of resources, is the basic and most urgent problem before us in this age. Speaking of age, the newspaper the *Age* has had something to say about this but, before I turn to that, let me read what Professor Birch said in Australia some time ago:

... a single American accounts for more detergents, pesticides, radio-active substances, fertilizers, fungicides and defoliants in the rivers and oceans than are produced by a thousand people in Indonesia. One American is responsible for putting more carbon monoxide into the air than two hundred Pakistanis and Indians.

In other words, it is not merely a matter of population pressure: it is a matter of the extent to which resources are being depleted by basically industrial economies.

I turn now to an editorial in the Melbourne *Age* that deals directly with the Australian situation and the problems facing us. On May 20, 1970, the *Age* said this:

Within a generation four-fifths of the Australian population is likely to live in a handful of giant cities, led by nearly six millions in Greater Sydney and about the same number in Greater Melbourne. On present trends the quality of life in these megapoli will be all too predictable. For most of the year . . . the COH (coefficient of haze) reading for each city will be over four indicating the restricted visibility from smoke, dust and grit, unburnt hydrocarbons and the rest of the noxious brew that makes up photochemical smog. Children playing in the same streams that 30 years ago yielded fish and yabbies will, in 30 years' time, get only hepatitis. The noise nuisance, already extremely bad, will become more frequent, more pervasive and more severe.

The article concludes:

There's nothing like living in an industrial developing country.

I said at the outset that one of my excuses for reverting to this topic, which has already had so much airing in the press, is that it seems to me that the message is not getting through. A book by Mr. Derek Whitelock makes it clear how the message is not getting through to many people to whom it should be getting through. Let us take, for example, Sir Henry Bolte, our neighbouring Premier. I will quote his actual words:

We care about water pollution, but it isn't as important as a \$100,000,000 industry.

That is a quotation from the Liberal Premier of Victoria. I turn now to Mr. Charles Court, a former Minister for Development in Western Australia. We are told:

Mr. Court has frequently invited the capitalists of the world to invest their dollars in his quarry of a State and not to worry about moans from ratbag conservationists on the fringe.

That is Mr. Charles Court of the Liberal Party in Western Australia. I have already referred to Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's Government in Queensland, and I return to what Mr. Whitelock has to say about that Government:

But the *piece de resistance* came in June, 1970, when Comalco, prominent among the firms exploiting the Australian mineral boom and proprietors of the bauxite works at Wiepa, Queensland, offered several hundreds of shares at issue to six members—including the Minister for Conservation—of the Queensland Cabinet. The statesmen snapped them up, presumably reflecting that selfless devotion to the public weal merits the occasional perk. Next day on the stock exchanges Comalco shares rose by \$2.

Let us not be too hard on the Bjelke-Petersen Government. Let us turn to the remarkable statements we have had from the Commonwealth Government and also from local authorities. Let us take, for example, Mr. Hughes, the Commonwealth Liberal Minister, who was asked in Parliament the following question:

What laws exist in each State and in Commonwealth territory to control pollution; what penalties are there; what relevant prosecutions have been made in the last five years; and does the Government consider the existing laws on pollution to be adequate?

This was Mr. Hughes's reply:

My department does not have the resources to undertake that research. I am not aware what consideration is being given to these laws by the relevant Commonwealth and State ministers.

That is the Commonwealth Minister's attitude to it. Finally, since I promised something

from local government, we have Mr. Duggan from St. Kilda. Prince Charles went for a swim at St. Kilda and he said it was like swimming in "diluted sewage". What was Mayor Duggan's reaction to this piece of information from the Prince of Wales? He said that he was sick and tired and fed up with pollution, then revealed himself further:

When that crank came here he didn't have the brains to tell us he was going to St. Kilda, or we would have cleaned the place up.

Whitelock goes on to say that the imagination boggles at the thought of filtering the sea. At this point I would make 10 suggestions for immediate action on pollution and on the whole ecological problem in Australia. I do this without any particular prejudice or an attempt to involve either this Government or the Party I represent in this place, and in making these suggestions I realize that many of them are by no means original. This would be my decalogue concerning action on pollution in this country. First, I suggest a hard look and an immediate drastic reduction in the assisted migration programme; secondly, a nation-wide network of Government-subsidized birth control clinics; thirdly, a national survey (similar to the national survey on education needs) of the most urgent and grave examples of pollution and spoliation of the environment; fourthly, a Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization investigation into the ecological effects of pesticides currently in use; fifthly, the immediate end of scrub clearing as a taxation dodge; sixthly, the adoption of the concept of the conservation easement.

I pause here briefly to explain what this means from Stuart Udall's book *The Quiet Crisis*. In purchasing an easement on open land, the public agency acquires a right from the owner but otherwise leaves him full ownership, and the property remains on the tax rolls. The right might be simply that the land remain in its natural state. Usually, an owner sells the right but sometimes he may donate it voluntarily. In return for this landscape preservation, donors are protected against rising assessments that would force them to subdivide or sell. My seventh suggestion is the establishment of new cities based on the complete recycling of resources; the eighth suggestion is to subsidize local government conditionally on its forming a central authority to dispose of garbage through non-polluting incineration or land fill; the ninth suggestion is to have laws and/or tax disincentives to eliminate the unnecessary packaging of goods and non-returnable containers; and, finally, tax

incentives for the introduction of game ranching.

I suggest here the possibility of using both the kangaroo and wombat, both of which are more efficient for turning natural vegetation into protein than is the sheep, and also which do not have the same deleterious effect on natural vegetation, since they do not grub out roots and all. I turn now to the ultimate political implications of the ecological crisis. First, Jeremy Bentham's goal of the greatest good for the greatest number cannot be achieved. It is mathematically impossible to maximize two or more variables at the same time. I think my colleague the member for Peake would be able to illustrate this for us mathematically if we wanted him to do so, using partial differential equations. We must go for an optimum population so that, once achieved, its style of life can itself be optimized. Secondly, the cowboy economy must give way to the spaceman economy, based on the recycling of all resources. Thirdly, it is obvious from the foregoing statement that the free enterprise system has had it.

I have already referred to Lord Kennet's remarks in this respect with regard to our notions of freehold property. Flipping through the pages of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (May 1970 edition), which was devoted completely to society and its physical environment, we find some interesting statements from people not normally in the business of making political pronouncements. We find, for example, one writer saying that the present environmental crisis brings to the surface a public demand for collective responsibility (for protecting collective environmental property). In dealing with its environmental crises, American society may move towards a form of social and political organization long associated with the democratic left. Current demands for action seem to reflect a conviction that the aggregate of private decisions does not automatically ensure general welfare. This is the sort of thing that Socialists have been saying for many years with respect to assisting the disadvantaged in our community.

I hope that all people will be saying this in future with respect to the possible effects on the environment of uncontrolled industrial and other developmental activities, because the problem we have had in the past in convincing people about this is that there are people who profit from the present economic type of system. They do very well out of it and have

a vested interest in retaining it. No-one profits from a system that brings about the deterioration of the environment. We talk about freedom; the wealthy will lose their freedom to have grandchildren if the ecological crisis is intensified. The wealthy want to swim at beaches as much as do the poor; in fact, they have a much better opportunity to do so, because they have their own transport or live in the better areas close to the metropolitan beaches. My point is simply that if the sea is polluted it is as much polluted for the man who owns stocks and shares and who goes to have a swim as it is for the person who is on the minimum living wage. I believe everyone will soon wake up and realize that no-one at all has any sort of vested interest in the present *status quo*, whereas previously he thought he did.

I turn now to the whole problem of the extinction of our native species. Mr. Hans Mincham of the Museum has reminded us, in a delightful little book of his called *Vanished Giants of Australia*, that extinction is one of the most terrible words in our language; it signifies more than the death of every member of a species; it means the loss forever of something unique. Of course, in geological history, extinction is something that has been a normal sort of process. The dinosaur gave way to various forms of mammal: first, the monotremes and marsupials which still largely inhabit this country; then, later, in most places of the world they were replaced by the placental mammals. This country is fortunate in having been preserved as a museum at an early age, because of the rising of the seas at the end of the Ice Age which prevented a wholesale invasion of placentals. However, eventually the placentals invaded in the form of our ancestors, and we have upset a delicate ecological process. Extinction in the past has been normal but has occurred slowly and gradually over millions and millions of years, and the replacement of one form of dominant species with another is, in our day and age, being accelerated at a tremendous rate.

It is therefore possible to read a frightening list of animals that have become extinct in recent years. Listed in the *Advertiser's Saturday Review*, of May 1 last, are mammals, native to the Mount Lofty Ranges, which have become extinct, namely:

Brush-tailed phascogale (mouse); red-tailed phascogale; eastern native cat; tiger cat; banded ant-eater; rabbit-eared bandicoot; brush-tailed rat-kangaroo; lesueurs' rat-kangaroo; dama wallaby.

There is also a list of other mammals rare and uncommon, but here we are referring only to extinct mammals and not to birds, reptiles and various other types of mammal. In many cases, this extinction has occurred as a result of indiscriminate slaughter. For example, Mr. Whitelock suggests that about 70 per cent of the kangaroo population in central Australia was shot during 1961. More often, however, it has occurred as a result of the indiscriminate destruction of the habitat of these creatures. This is one reason why I referred to the whole problem of scrub clearing earlier when making my point. There is more I could say regarding the ecological crisis, but the tennis score board has reached 40/30, and there are one or two more points that I wish to make.

I now turn to the whole problem of the Vietnam war, of our involvement in the war and, in particular, the whole problem of persons who express their opposition to this involvement. I start off with the basic premise that any reasonable person, following the publication of the Pentagon papers, would have to assume that our involvement was very, very badly misconceived. Any examination of the Pentagon papers would make it clear that our intervention in this war was extremely ill-advised. Sir Robert Menzies came out of retirement in order to try to vindicate his honour in this matter. No-one suggested that he had in some way been dishonest as far as our involvement was concerned. What we have assumed is that he had been stupid, and this has been made clear by the publication of the papers.

The Australian Government and people and the American people have all been taken for a ride in this matter. The Gulf of Tonkin incident was something drummed up by the Americans, who provoked the North Vietnamese into retaliation and then used it for a gross increase in their commitment to that theatre of war. It is interesting, following the publication of the Pentagon papers, to find an astounding article in the *News* of July 6 from Ray Kerrison in New York. The article, headed "Calwell Vindicated", states:

Publication of the Pentagon papers may have seriously damaged Lyndon Johnson's presidency but belatedly it has helped vindicate Arthur Calwell. In the early 1960s, when it was fashionable and patriotic to champion the Vietnam war against the Communist menace, Calwell in Canberra was like the biblical voice in the wilderness. Then the Leader of the Opposition Labor Party, Calwell opposed the war with a conviction as passionate as it was genuine. He saw clearly the deceptions of the Johnson Administration, the public relations sham of the Manila conference, the trickery of the military leaders who espoused escalation

and the corrupt, unworthy succession of regimes in Saigon. In late 1964 and early 1965, the best speeches delivered in the House of Representatives came from Calwell on Vietnam. But few bothered to listen and the price Calwell paid for his beliefs was high.

These U.S. documents reveal that the United States of America went out of its way to provoke North Vietnam into attacking the American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 2 and 4. Mr. McNamara lied to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when giving evidence about the Tonkin attacks. General Paul D. Hawkins in Saigon directed the whole operation using South Vietnam commandos, Thai pilots and some Chinese nationalists. While Lyndon B. Johnson was campaigning against Senator Barry Goldwater on a peace programme for Vietnam (at least for no further escalation) his Administration in the United States was taking the vital decision to increase the commitment of the American Government in that theatre of war.

I now refer to the whole problem in a democracy of expressing one's opposition to such involvement. The year before last, throughout Australia the Vietnam moratorium movement was formed. Its intention was to draw into active opposition to our involvement in the Vietnam war all of those who were so concerned. Initially this had great success. However, following the Vietnam moratorium in September last year, it is clear that the Vietnam Moratorium Committee in this State, far from representing any kind of overweening committee for the anti-war movement, in fact has degenerated into a small political sect.

Many people who were concerned about this, following the September moratorium turned their attention to reviving the Campaign for Peace in Vietnam, which has always been the most articulate and best anti-war movement in any State of this country. That has been achieved successfully. A new constitution was adopted for this body. Dr. Neil Blewett, who is held in high regard by all sections of the South Australian community, was elected as the Chairman of this body, which then elected a council and an executive. Many people who are actively involved in Labor Party affairs are on the council of this body, and I refer, for example, to the Premier and his wife, the member for Spence, Mr. David Combe, who is Assistant Secretary of the Labor Party in South Australia, and to trade union leaders such as Mr. John Scott and Mr. Howard O'Neill. Also involved are Commonwealth members

Dr. Richie Gunn and Mr. Chris Hurford. On the other hand, the Australia Party has members involved in this body, and many people without political alignment are also involved.

This organization sought to try to reunify the anti-war movement in this State. Members believed that the Vietnam Moratorium Committee had turned its attention away from the problem of Australia's involvement in Vietnam towards the civil rights issue of the proper use of the streets. In so doing, it played into the hands of the Commonwealth Government, and the real losers of this change in attitude were the Vietnamese people, who were suffering from this brutal war. The C.P.V., of which I am an executive member, entered into a dialogue with various other anti-war organizations directed towards the holding of a demonstration on July 31 in the city which would be the largest anti-war demonstration that this city had ever seen. It would be extremely well organized and would aim purely to direct people's attention to the whole problem of our involvement in the Vietnam war. It would not in any way seek any type of confrontation with the Police Force and it would not do anything that would in any way alienate support from our cause.

This planning has reached an advanced stage, and the demonstration will take place. Unfortunately, the Vietnam Moratorium Campaign (and this is the point on which I base my comments about its being a small, dwindling political section) has seen fit to dissociate itself from this vast co-operative anti-war movement and to do what it can to stir up trouble. I want to make clear the nature of the V.M.C. It has no membership: any person can go to its meetings if he knows when they are to be held. There is no reason why the members for Heysen, Eyre and Mitcham should not be able to go along and speak and vote at meetings of the organization. There is no reason why Mr. Mark Posa should not be able to go along and speak at such meetings.

There is no membership: if a person knows when the meetings are to be held he can go along, and he can get other people to go along, too. However, these meetings are not widely canvassed. Putting a few notices on university notice boards is not the right way to give everyone a fair chance of attending meetings. This is the sort of thing that has gone on. The V.M.C. represents nothing and no-one! There is no reason why any-

one in its organization could not be active in some other organization that has as its aim opposition to our involvement in the Vietnam war. There are plenty of other organizations in which such people could be involved.

So, I make two appeals. First, I appeal to the V.M.C. to come to its senses, to stop this stupid skirmishing with the forces of law and order in this State, and to throw in its lot with the rest of us in the anti-war movement. I ask the V.M.C. to stop fighting with people with whom it basically agrees and I ask it to get stuck into the Commonwealth Government, which caused the problem in the first place by stupidly being thrown into the Vietnam conflict by President Johnson. Secondly, I appeal to members opposite and to the Liberal Party to become involved in the July march. I am willing to give the Liberal Party and members opposite the benefit of the doubt: I believe they are good people and are now ashamed of what their Government has done through the years with regard to the Vietnam conflict. I know that they know that our soldiers will not be in Vietnam for very much longer and that our present involvement is achieving nothing except slaughter and the wastage of important young Australian lives. I therefore suggest that they absolve the guilt of the Commonwealth Government by joining with us on July 31 in the march against the war.

I joined in the farmers' march last year with people who I suppose basically (although not overwhelmingly) would support members opposite. I joined in the farmers' march because I wanted to share in their cause. The member for Stuart and I marched together and had an interesting discussion on the future of industrial arbitration; some people must have thought that we were rather peculiar farmers, but we wanted to associate ourselves with their cause. I now invite the V.M.C., members opposite, and, at the other extreme, the League of Rights to involve themselves in the cause of those Australians who are in danger of losing their lives in Vietnam.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 20, at 2 p.m.