

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 20, 1971

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

QUESTIONS

COST OF LIVING

Mr. HALL: Because of the obvious failure of price control in South Australia to keep the cost of living adjustment in this State down to adjustments in other States, will the Deputy Premier institute an inquiry into the effectiveness of price control in South Australia? The Premier addressed the Australian Labor Party Federal Conference in Tasmania recently, and he was reported in the following terms:

He told the Australian Labor Party Federal Conference that price control in South Australia had kept price rises smaller during recent inflationary periods than anywhere else in Australia.

Yet today we have a report that states:

South Australia tops big national C.O.L. jump. The cost of living in Adelaide rose by 2.2 per cent in the June quarter—the biggest capital city increase, according to figures released yesterday by the Bureau of Statistics. The consumer price figures for the capital cities rose by an average of 1.7 per cent...

This, coupled with increasing unemployment in South Australia, obviously draws attention to the inflationary spiral in this State and, as I have said, the ineffectiveness in this case of price control to keep the increase in the cost of living in South Australia down to the increases in other States.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that, if the Leader had examined closely the reasons for the increase in the percentage in South Australia, he would have realized that it had no bearing on those matters that are under price control. He would realize as well as I that the increase was due to increases in hospital fees, bus fares—

Mr. Millhouse: Who controls those?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government controls them, but they are not subject to price control in this State.

Mr. Millhouse: Just to your own control?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A detailed breakdown into the sub-groups of the consumer price index shows that the factors explaining Adelaide's higher-than-average price rises in the June quarter of 1971, *versus* the March quarter, were the two matters I have mentioned.

Health services caused a .4 points rise in the overall index in Adelaide *versus* .1 for the 6 capital cities average, and fares caused a .2 points rise here *versus* no change in the all-States average: together .6 points Adelaide *versus* .1 nationally. The South Australian Government, faced with a sharply deteriorating budgetary situation after the full brunt of wage and salary rises was felt from January, 1971, adjusted upwards public transport fares, hospital charges and electricity charges in an effort to reduce the size of the 1970-71 final cash deficit. This was done earlier than it was done in other States. However, the increases will show up more severely in other States because, as honourable members will realize, they have increased fares and hospital fees subsequently. At the end of the next quarter this will show up in the increases that no doubt will occur in these States. However, in spite of this, for the year from June to June the national increase was 5.4 per cent for the six capitals, whereas South Australia's increase was only 4.9 per cent, which is well below the national average. It is interesting to note that Brisbane's increase was 6.9 per cent, and I believe there have been some rumblings from there this morning. The Leader will realize that matters under price control did not affect the increase in South Australia, which was affected by the matters to which I have referred. It is reasonable to assume that there will be fairly substantial increases at the end of the next quarter in other States that will not occur in this State because of our earlier action in these matters. I do not see any reason for inquiring into the effectiveness of price control in this State because of this happening: on the contrary, I am perfectly satisfied that price control in this State has been effective. Apart from meat and potatoes, the prices of which were slightly increased compared to those in other States because of seasonal conditions, most other food items were at a lower price than the prices in other States.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Deputy Premier, on behalf of the Government, make a statement about summer time? It has been reported in the last few days that the Eastern States intend to adopt an hour of daylight saving time. I understand that one of the Ministers attended a conference in another State on Friday, yesterday, or at some time, but I notice that Cabinet has been pretty tight-lipped about the matter, and that the only report in this morning's paper is that Cabinet had further

discussions without any decision being made and that no immediate decision was likely. One wonders what other information can be required before a decision can be made. One proposal I have heard mooted is that we should put our clocks forward an hour and put them back half an hour at the end of the period of daylight saving.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is permitted to explain his question but should not deal with hypothetical matters.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think it is hypothetical, but I accept that I went too far in my reference to it. Because this is a matter of great public concern and we want to know quickly what is to happen, will the Deputy Premier make a statement about the present situation and say when we are likely to have a decision?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member has explained, on Friday last the Minister for Conservation attended a conference in Melbourne of the Chief Secretaries from New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania, together with representatives of the Commonwealth Government and Western Australia. Cabinet did not have before it all the information it required. Honourable members would appreciate that this is not an easy question to resolve, as it affects people in many walks of life. However, sufficient information is now to hand (and it came to hand only this morning from a source that had not been previously contacted), and Cabinet will decide on this matter next Monday and announce its decision after the Cabinet meeting.

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Deputy Premier say whether this House will be given the opportunity to debate the question of the introduction of daylight saving or the conversion from Central Standard Time to Eastern Standard Time before Cabinet reaches a decision or before any proclamations are made on these matters?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have already explained to the House that Cabinet will make a decision on this matter next Monday, and the House will have an opportunity to debate the matter, because legislation would have to be introduced to give effect to whatever decision might be made. In addition, the honourable member and any other private member has the right to move a motion on the matter if he so desires, and that motion could be debated in private members' time.

KARMEL COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. CLARK: Will the Minister of Education investigate the possibility of making available cheap (or better still, free) copies of the Karmel report for the use of schools and school organizations that request them? Several schools and high school councils have contacted me concerning this matter. As the Minister will know, there is at present an intense interest in education, especially in the findings of the Karmel committee. As the House also knows, the funds available to schools are, to put it politely, not all that great, and it would be appreciated if something could be done in this regard.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My initial decision was to have a complimentary list covering about 500 or 600 copies. We provided a copy of this report to every member of the State Parliament and to every member of the Commonwealth Parliament; certain free copies were necessarily made available for officers of the Education Department; and, in addition, any group or individual who made a submission to the Karmel committee, whether oral or written, received a copy of the report. These, together with copies going to other State Education Department people and Ministers, resulted in a tally of nearly 600 complimentary copies. I am sure the honourable member will appreciate that there is a substantial cost in making available complimentary copies of a document of the size of the Karmel report. At this stage, no decision has been made on making free copies available to schools but, in view of the honourable member's question, I shall have another look at the matter and inform him when a decision has been made.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what progress is being made regarding the ferry service that the Government has announced it will establish to operate between Penneshaw and Cape Jervis?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the best way that I can describe the present situation is to say that reasonable progress is being made in relation to implementing the Government's desire in this regard. As the honourable member knows, we set up a Kangaroo Island Ferry Co-ordinating Committee, which was charged with full power to take those steps necessary for finally implementing a sea service between the mainland and Kangaroo Island.

This committee, which has been working continuously since it was established, has regretably run into a few problems that were not foreseen prior to its establishment, and much further examination has necessarily been undertaken. Hydrographic tests are currently being conducted and evaluated but, despite this, the committee is continuing with its work. It has made the necessary approaches to the Commonwealth Department of Shipping and Transport, and discussions have been held and designs considered which it is thought will be suitable for the type of vessel necessary for the crossing. I think the position is summarized in a letter that I sent to the Clerk of the District Council of Yankalilla. I interpose here and express my appreciation to the honourable member, who was good enough to telephone my office this morning to tell me that he would ask this question. A representative of the District Council of Yankalilla had a meeting with representatives of the District Councils of Dudley and Kingscote and corresponded with me, expressing concern about the apparent lack of activity. I replied:

A committee known as the Kangaroo Island Ferry Co-ordinating Committee is working on details of ferry construction and harbour facilities and is treating its task as a top priority. I expect to have a preliminary report from the committee soon and then I will be able to advise you of progress expected and a likely operation date. Apart from hydrographic surveys, most of the preliminary work is not being done on site and this probably accounts for the misconception that nothing is being done. However, let me hasten to assure you that we are pressing ahead with all possible speed.

That letter accurately summarizes the current position. I hope that the committee will soon be able to give me a report that I shall be able to take to Cabinet so that it can make the necessary decisions. Finally, I stress that all this work must be undertaken before the matter can be submitted to the Public Works Committee, as it will have to be submitted to that committee before anything further can be done.

BORDER MAPS

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Works raise with the Minister of Forests the desirability of having prepared in South Australia and Victoria identical maps of the areas up to 25 miles on each side of the South Australia-Victoria border? At a recent conference of councils it was pointed out that maps of these border areas did not coincide, with the result that difficulty had arisen regarding fire-fighting operations and defining council boundaries. Therefore, will the Minister ask

his colleague to raise this matter with fire-fighting authorities in Victoria and South Australia with a view to having uniform maps prepared so that people on both sides of the border will know what is the true position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that.

DOG REGISTRATION

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Local Government say what is the reason for the delay in supplying dog medals to councils on the due date? This matter was raised at the conference of councils which was held yesterday at Mount Gambier and which has been referred to by the member for Mount Gambier. The position is that, although councils receive the fee on the due date from the good, honest dog owners, they are unable to provide a medal. Considerable expense has been incurred in sending out these dog medals when they are available so that they can decorate these canine monsters, which are often in places that they should not be in. I understand the Minister's desire to save money by having the medal struck in another State, but, although the contractor's price may be lower, I am concerned that he has not been able to come up to scratch. Can the Minister say why these dogs are being allowed to go around so naked at this time?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although I have heard that there is a shortage of these registration discs, I am afraid I cannot give the honourable member all the information he seeks, but I will obtain it and bring down a report.

STURT HIGHWAY

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether he or his department is considering plans for by-passing the towns of Greenock and Nuriootpa by re-aligning the Sturt Highway? All members would know of the grave accident that recently occurred at Greenock. I apologize to the member for that district for asking this question. However, I am interested in the Sturt Highway, as many vehicles travelling from my district to Adelaide use this section of the highway. It is therefore of vital interest to me and to the residents of my district.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that all members on both sides would be unanimous in their desire to express their deep regret to the people of Greenock for the loss not only of life but also of property that occurred at Greenock as a result of last Friday's tragedy.

However, the situation concerning the accident is such that it would be unwise for me to say much about it at present. Although I have not the faintest idea of any arrangements that have been made, I would expect there would be held a coroner's inquiry, at which many of the points associated with the accident would arise. It would therefore be foolish of me to make conjectures on the information I have. Suffice it to say that as far back as 1967 investigations had been commenced to determine an acceptable route for the deviation of National Route No. 20 to by-pass these towns, which accords with the current trend in country highway construction. Considerable difficulties have been experienced and many objections raised. Also, innumerable public and local government meetings have been held. Despite this, we have still not yet satisfactorily decided on a route to be taken. Although the Highways Department has gone to unusual lengths to try to meet the desires of all concerned, regrettably the problem has not yet been solved. I hope that it can be solved soon so that a by-pass road can be constructed, thereby improving the travel facilities not only for people in the immediate vicinity but also for those in the district of the member for Chaffey, all of whom must use this road when travelling to and from Adelaide.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CUMBE: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware that the latest Commonwealth Government figures on South Australia's employment position (which I have not yet seen) are available, and will he bring down details of the percentages of employed and unemployed persons in each State, as well as details of the number of registered vacancies available?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Expecting this question to be asked, I have obtained the following information for the honourable member. Employment statistics released last evening by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service reveal a decrease of 179 in the number of persons registered for employment in South Australia during June. This represents a fall of 2 per cent for the month. The number of recipients of unemployment benefits fell by 11 per cent during the month, and at the end of June last year 1.23 per cent of the estimated workforce was registered as unemployed, compared with 1.52 per cent this month. This represents a rise of 25 per cent over the year. The South Australian situation follows the patterns evident throughout Australia. Seasonally-adjusted figures indicate marginal rises in unemployment

in all States, although compared with the position at the same time last year the employment situation has somewhat deteriorated. This is to be expected because of Commonwealth anti-inflationary measures. I am sorry that I have not the figures regarding employment and registered vacancies but I will get them for the honourable member.

EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education yet received from the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science an assurance that more money will be available for education generally and for the upgrading of school buildings in this State? Last month a crowded public meeting at the Norwood Town Hall showed great concern about these matters. At the meeting schools were well represented by teachers and representatives of school and welfare committees and after the meeting many of these persons interviewed members of Parliament, including members of the Legislative Council and, I am sure, the Commonwealth Parliament. Since that meeting I have visited schools in my district regarding works which, because of lack of finance, cannot be carried out fully. Many buildings are deteriorating and I assure members that this has been the position for years. The Commonwealth Minister must have been non-plussed by the large attendance at the meeting.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to comment now.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister of Education spoke so well that evening that I am sure he should have received some information by now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has referred to the Norwood Town Hall meeting attended by, I think, about 2,000 teachers and representatives of school committees throughout the State. I think most of those who attended that meeting were disappointed at the reaction of the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science, as leader of the Commonwealth delegation, regarding assistance for the States.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister has been asked a question and he shall be heard in silence. Interjections must cease. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members will recall that the national survey was undertaken soon after the Commonwealth Government announced assistance in the way of per capita grants for independent schools. That

survey commenced in 1969 and the six Liberal State Education Ministers at the time and the Liberal Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science agreed co-operatively to undertake this survey of needs of Government schools. The various Ministers agreed on the basis of the survey and conclusions of the survey were given to the Commonwealth Minister at a meeting of State Education Ministers in May, 1970, which was before the present Government in South Australia came to office. Since then, apart from requests by the Commonwealth Government for additional information regarding the capital building programme, the Commonwealth Government does not seem to have reached any decision of any kind. The people of South Australia, including, I think, the member for Torrens, certainly expected that the Commonwealth Government would take action consequent on this survey but, unfortunately, no action has been taken yet. Since the Norwood meeting the only correspondence that I have had with the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science relating directly or indirectly to what happened at that meeting refers to the Commonwealth Minister's intended visit to schools in South Australia consequent on my invitation. All I can report on that matter is that the Minister has agreed to visit schools in South Australia in conjunction with another visit, the details of which have not yet been determined. Consequently, no definite arrangements have been made on that matter. The Commonwealth Government has not made available any further information regarding the survey. I ask members, particularly those who attended the meeting at the Norwood Town Hall, if they feel strongly about the conditions in Government schools (as many of us do), to take up with their Commonwealth colleagues the need for action on the survey.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: To take up with you; you're the Minister!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Alexandra—

The SPEAKER: The interjection is out of order. The Minister must reply to the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am replying to the question. In my approaches to the Commonwealth Government on this matter, I have done everything I consider possible to get additional assistance from that Government. However, it has not been forthcoming. Members opposite are well aware that there seems to be a Party-political attitude adopted on this matter, and members opposite would help by supporting the case for

Commonwealth Government grants for education in Government schools, instead of adopting the kind of attitude they are adopting now.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You're just passing the buck.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not a matter of passing the buck at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We have an education problem of national importance. We have a horse-and-buggy Constitution which provides that education is the responsibility of the States but which gives the main financial power to the Commonwealth Government, and we have in office in Canberra a Government that does not seem to care about the standards of education in Government schools.

SWANPORT NAVIGATION

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Marine say whether his department has given the Highways Department authority to stop all or part of the navigation past the Swanport bridge site and, if it has given that authority, will the Minister say under what conditions such authority has been given? One of my constituents says he was told that he could not take his boat past that site because of the Highways Department's operations. When he inquired further, he was told that navigation at this point could be stopped for an indefinite period. I do not know whether the decision relates only to boats of a certain size and type, or to all craft.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of an instruction having been given or of a restriction placed on the area to which the honourable member has referred. However, I will inquire and obtain a report as soon as possible.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Lands to my recent question about the future use of the Islington sewage farm?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the development of the former Islington sewage farm is being planned in accordance with the recommendations of the Public Works Committee. No doubt the honourable member, as a member of that committee, will be familiar with them.

HIGH SCHOOL COUNCILS

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question, directed to the Minister of Education, deals with a matter under his jurisdiction as it refers to

high school councils. I ask your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House to enlarge my explanation of it.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It refers to high school councils.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is it?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I, like other members, have been asked not to make appointments in the usual form to high school councils, which has been the practice in the past, until the matter has been reviewed, and I think September was the date referred to. In view of this, what does the Minister intend to do in this matter? Does he intend to change the constitution of high school councils? If he does, to what extent does he intend to change it, and, more particularly, when will he make the announcement?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Even though the honourable member's question was clearly out of order because it contained all the questions he wanted to ask at the end instead of at the beginning, I will reply by saying that, following the recommendations of the Karmel committee's report it is intended that high school councils should be reconstituted. Under the previous arrangement high school councils were appointed for a three-year period, and the current period terminated on June 30 this year. At this stage I have requested existing councils to continue to operate for a further six months until the end of December, and it is intended that the new councils will be appointed for a term commencing on January 1 next year, so that the term of appointment will be on a calendar-year basis, not on a financial-year basis. This additional period would also provide the chance to consult the high school councils and technical high school councils and associations, the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and other interested organizations, about the recommendations they would make concerning the reconstitution of high school councils, and in what respect they would agree or disagree to the recommendations of the Karmel committee.

To refresh the memories of members, the committee recommended that high school councils consist of representatives elected by the parents and friends associations, staff members elected by the staff, and two senior students, one from the fourth year and one from the fifth year of the school, together with representatives of the local members and district councils concerned. The general flavour of the

high school council, in accordance with this recommendation, would be altered considerably from its present appointed character to an elected council. As staff and student representation is likely to be a matter of controversy, I believe that those already concerned with the schools should have the opportunity to make recommendations on this matter. The interregnum until the end of the year is to permit that to take place.

NUCLEAR FALL-OUT

Mr. SLATER: Does the Minister of Works consider that the increased radio-activity levels in the environment since the renewal of French nuclear tests in the Pacific Ocean pose a problem to public health? I understand that recent Engineering and Water Supply Department tests indicate that the radio-active fall-out is double what was previously experienced in South Australia. Therefore, does the Minister consider that dangerous radio-active particles may be present in the water supply, and can he say whether any precautions may be reasonably taken?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not believe that the radio-activity constitutes a problem in respect of public health. I have received a report from the chemists at the Bolivar treatment works. Whilst they record the radio-active elements of rainfall in this State (and it is true that, coinciding with the French nuclear tests, there has been a sharp increase) there has been only a relatively minor increase in the public water supplies and not to such an extent as to constitute a danger to public health. The matter is being watched closely, but I have been assured by my advisers that there is no cause for alarm as a result of increases that occurred at that time.

SWANPORT BRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport details of drilling and any developments at the new bridge site at Swanport, south of Murray Bridge?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Staff of the Highways Department is proceeding with the design work for this bridge. The department is also still investigating foundation problems, as considerable difficulty has been experienced in connection with the location of piers because of the unstable nature of the subsoils. Subject to satisfactory progress with these matters, it is expected that construction of the bridge will commence in the second half of 1973.

BANKSIA PARK SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education ascertain what action is contemplated concerning seepage and stormwater drains causing erosion at the Banksia Park Primary School and say when such action will be taken? The committee of this school has written to me concerning this matter. There was no evidence of erosion because of water cutting a channel through the school property until an area behind the Banksia Park Infants School was filled and sealed. Because of winter rains, trees are becoming undermined, and part of the southern boundary fence has been affected. This water is now flowing through the adjoining council property. Because of seepage, the oval is not being used as it should be, thus restricting the areas on which children can play. The committee has been informed that the matter has been referred to the Public Works Committee, but meanwhile, as no action is being taken, the water channels are getting deeper, so that extra expense may be involved in solving the problem.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to consider this matter.

RECOVERY GROUP

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Deputy Premier say whether, when considering the request for financial assistance made by Recovery Groups (South Australia) to cover the salary of a full-time worker, the Government will keep in mind the valuable work done by this organization? This group was formed in 1963 as a self-help community organization to help people who have been mentally ill and to keep them in the community by obviating the necessity for their returning to hospital. The services performed by the group have been of tremendous value to the community, and are of direct financial assistance to the Government by keeping people out of hospital. My reason for asking the question is to add a little emphasis to the request that has been made for assistance.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's question. In fact, recently I was honoured by a visit to my office of representatives of the South Australian organization together with a Sydney man whose name I cannot recall. I was most impressed with the outline of the function of the recovery group. If my memory serves me correctly, the Government has already taken a decision on the matter but, as I am not

certain what that decision is, I will inquire and let the honourable member know. However, I recall that a grant has been made.

GAWLER HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about staffing at the Gawler High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A new timetable has operated since Monday, July 19, so that the situation can be covered by the present staff. At no time was it planned that any students at Gawler High School would be required to complete their studies without teacher supervision. An additional teacher is expected to report for duty at Gawler High School on Monday, July 26. Continued efforts will be made to lighten still further burdens on the staff at Gawler High School. It has always been a problem in South Australia to find replacements that become necessary as a consequence of the mid-year resignation of teachers. I think members will appreciate that our main output of teacher trainees from teachers colleges occurs at the beginning of each year. At the beginning of this year, about 1,000 exit students from teachers colleges were available for appointment to primary and secondary schools throughout the State. During the year, however, the teachers available for appointment to the schools to replace those who resign must come from new arrivals from overseas, from re-employment of teachers previously employed in the department, and from relieving teachers who can be persuaded to work full time until the end of the year.

Since I have been Minister of Education, we have provided a direct financial inducement to teachers to work for the full year to try to minimize the extent of mid-year resignations, and there has been a reduction in mid-year resignations this year as a consequence of those actions. However, it is still a problem, and occasionally we will have periods when a certain school is without a teacher because a replacement cannot be found immediately. However, the honourable member (and the Gawler High School in this instance) may rest assured that, whenever anything of this nature occurs, all possible steps are taken to ensure that the position is covered adequately as soon as possible.

SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say what is the reaction of high school headmasters to the book scheme announced by the Minister last week?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although I have not had a formal reaction from high school headmasters, I spoke to a group of high school headmasters last Tuesday afternoon and answered several questions and criticisms raised by them relating to the new book scheme. True, there is a division of opinion among high school headmasters on this matter, although I believe that as time goes by, and as they see the benefits that can be obtained by parents through this scheme, the attitude of certain headmasters will change and they will come to support the scheme. This afternoon, I am meeting a group of high school headmasters, who could roughly be described as representing the executive of the Headmasters' Association, for further discussions on points they wish to raise concerning the scheme. I think that, as in the case of any new arrangement that is introduced, there will always be those who are not entirely happy about the change, and I think that is true on this occasion. However, I believe that, given time, the whole situation will settle down.

MORPHETTville PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education consider as urgent the re-asphalting of the Morphetville Park Primary School playground and surrounding areas, which are at present in a bad state of disrepair and, indeed, a danger to children and teachers? This matter relates back to a question I asked on October 15 last which was answered, in a way, on October 20, when the Minister of Education said that the matter would be referred to a firm of consultants within the next three weeks. This school is often visited by many people both from this State and from other States, including New South Wales and Victoria, as well as from Canberra, because, for one reason, it has an open-space unit that has been converted from a timber classroom; it also has a special class for handicapped children, and that class is operating well.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into the matter to find out what is the latest position, and I will inform the honourable member.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government intends to take early action to institute any recommendations in the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee? This report, which all members have seen, is a most comprehensive and voluminous document

which resulted from several years' close study of local government activities. I have been requested by councils to ask this question, because in their view their future planning may be affected.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is the Government's desire that the current Local Government Act be consigned to the incinerator as soon as possible and new legislation introduced. However, before this can happen, there must be an evaluation of the attitudes of those councils that have responded to the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee, and there is the colossal task of drafting and of carrying out other procedures to which I have previously referred, namely, informing local councils of the draft proposals, giving them another opportunity to look at them, introducing the Bill, and leaving time before it becomes operative so as to enable councils to make the necessary changes, and so on. Regrettably, all this is adding up to apparently something like three or four years. Therefore, because of the procedures that are being followed, the short reply to the question whether the new Act will become operative soon has unfortunately to be "No". However, I assure the honourable member that the task of redrafting the Local Government Act in accordance with the terms of the report is receiving top priority. The Government, however, has only three Parliamentary Counsel to undertake this mammoth job, and I am informed that the drafting will take about 12 months. Perhaps the Attorney-General will comment on that, but it is obviously an exceptionally big task. I would have expected more councils to respond to the report than have responded; I am disappointed that all have not replied. In the Upper House, only about half an hour ago my colleague has given one of the honourable member's colleagues in that Chamber some information about this. From memory, I think that about 50 councils have responded and about 12 have asked the Local Government Association to make submissions on their behalf. At this stage it appears that just over 60 councils have responded out of a total of 137. I am rather disappointed that some councils have not responded, but perhaps they are satisfied with the committee's recommendations as they now stand.

MARREE SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the Marree Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have been informed that the contractor could not proceed with the work at Marree in February because tanks were not available from the supplier. He returned to Port Augusta where he had a contract associated with the new school at Augusta Park. His work at Augusta Park is nearly complete, and he expects to return to Marree next week, provided that he receives delivery of the squatters' tanks.

ABORIGINAL RELICS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister for Conservation confer with the Commonwealth Government with a view to having certain areas within Lincoln Gap army camp made special reserves? I understand that within a certain area held by the Commonwealth Government there is an Aboriginal burial ground, which is estimated to be 60,000 years old, and a cave in which there are rare Aboriginal relics. If I give the Minister a map of the area, marked at the site of the grave and cave, will he undertake to investigate my request?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If there is a useful way in which we can approach the Commonwealth Government on this matter, I shall be pleased to do so.

POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry use his good offices to ensure that people on Eyre Peninsula are not again discriminated against by the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union, which is using stand-over tactics to prevent the delivery of mail by private bus operators? The stop press of the *West Coast Sentinel* of July 14 refers to the failure of members of the union to load mail on private buses, thereby denying the people of Eyre Peninsula their right to receive mail.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member will realize that, as postal workers are under a Commonwealth award, this is a Commonwealth industrial matter, the State having no jurisdiction to intervene in such a dispute.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOUSING

Mr. BURDON: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to my recent question about rental houses at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Housing Trust is aware of the housing demand at Mount Gambier, and in the last few weeks has provided for tenders to be called for a further 20 pairs of double-unit houses and 15 single-unit houses. At present there are 11 houses

under construction and a further 25 contracted for but not yet started. The trust last financial year completed 49 houses in Mount Gambier and the estimated completion rate should show a slight increase during 1971-72.

SECONDHAND DEALERS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to the question I asked the Premier last week whether the Government intended to amend the Secondhand Dealers Act? Last week, I may not have made clear that the secondhand dealers were not complaining that they could not do business on Sundays, as that is prohibited under the Act: they were especially concerned about public holidays, as it is on those occasions that they find they are at a disadvantage compared to other traders who operate in areas outside the metropolitan shopping district.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Cabinet has approved of the Parliamentary Counsel preparing a Bill to amend the Secondhand Dealers Act which, amongst other things, provides for an extension of trading hours in certain areas. It is not known whether this Bill will be available for the current session. In view of the honourable member's further explanation, I will see whether that aspect is covered in the Bill.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about Government finances?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: An estimate made by the Commonwealth Treasury indicates that if South Australia entered payroll tax from September next and taxed at the present rate of 2½ per cent over the present field it would receive about \$21,000,000 in 1971-72. If it exempted its own departments as may be expected, and local government authorities as the Commonwealth has suggested, it would receive about \$17,000,000. However, the Commonwealth would as a consequence reduce its grant to South Australia by about \$18,600,000 and the State would no longer have to pay tax to the Commonwealth of about \$3,750,000; there would in this be a benefit to the State of about \$2,150,000. The substantial benefit to the State would however arise from its being able from September 1 to raise the rate of tax from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent; and from this it may receive about \$6,750,000 over the remainder of the year and perhaps \$9,000,000 in a full year. If, as is possible,

the State does not enter payroll tax until October 1, its additional receipts for 1971-72 will be about \$6,000,000.

As yet the Prime Minister has not advised the amount of the special grant recommended for this State in 1971-72 by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. The figure for last year was \$5,000,000, and it is hoped that this year's figure will be rather larger. These grants for 1970-71 and 1971-72 will both be reviewed by the commission in due course in the light of the actual financial results of all States in those years, and adjustments may then be recommended.

WOOL PROMOTION

Mr. RODDA: Has the Deputy Premier received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week regarding wool promotion?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is doubtful whether any State scheme for promotion of wool could be carried out effectively. As the honourable member will appreciate, considerable funds are allocated for promotion by the Australian Wool Board, which is conducting an intensive campaign to promote the use of wool. It is important that the textile industry be encouraged to play its part in promoting the use of woollen goods, and the Minister of Agriculture has informed me that he personally would like to see the wholesale and retail clothing establishments concentrating on the sale of woollen materials, and placing more emphasis on the advantages of wool.

It is believed that the introduction of wool-rich blends and the announcement by the Australian Wool Board of a woolblendmark, in addition to the now well-known woolmark symbol, is a major advance in marketing that has the support of the Australian textile trade. Recently, there was a news item in which the Managing Director of one of the world's largest wool processing companies expressed the view that the wool textile industry should give a clear indication of its willingness to participate in financing wool promotion in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and suggested that it accept an additional levy on each bale of wool from those countries to provide a fund for promotion. Against this background it is the opinion that a State campaign would have little impact, and the results would not be commensurate with the effort required.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport tell the member for the area at what point on the existing railway line between Adelaide and Port Pirie it is intended to take off the standard gauge route to Crystal Brook? In reply to a question I asked last week, the Minister indicated that the railway line would join the East-West line at Crystal Brook. It has been difficult to obtain any further details of the agreement with the Commonwealth Government and, although there has been some doubt about it, the Minister said he thought the reply from the Commonwealth Government was such that he himself could determine the matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope I indicated to the honourable member last week that details regarding the gauge standardization were still far from being clearly and definitely determined. I said then:

I have referred to the connection of Adelaide to the East-West line, and it now seems fairly evident that this connection will be made at Crystal Brook. The actual location and other details are subject to phase 2 of the consultant study that is yet to be undertaken.

In his question, the honourable member said that I said the connection would definitely be at Crystal Brook, whereas I said it appeared that it would be there and that details must be determined. It is obvious that I cannot say where it will branch off and go to Crystal Brook or where it will arrive at Crystal Brook. Detailed work is currently being undertaken by the South Australian Railways, and further investigations will probably be carried out by consultants. All these details therefore have yet to be worked out. I hope that we will soon receive a reply from the Prime Minister. Regrettably, it is not available at this stage. Until the Prime Minister—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He has other worries!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Perhaps he has. However, this matter is of major concern to me, because we have achieved something for the benefit of South Australia as a whole, and I would like to see the work proceed as quickly as possible. I know that the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport (Hon. P. J. Nixon) shares that view. However, until a reply is received from the Prime Minister, the next step, which will be a conference between the Commonwealth Minister and me to determine the appointment of consultants and one or two other such matters,

cannot be taken. Thereafter, the agreement must be drawn up, the Prime Minister having indicated his preference that we should have a separate agreement rather than work under the legislation that was introduced by the Chifley Government in 1949. Despite all this, one still returns to the basic requirement: the Prime Minister has yet to reply to the South Australian Premier saying that what he has said is acceptable. Until that reply is received, this Government can go no further; nor can it give specific details of the yards and inches involved, as requested by the honourable member.

LINEAR ACCELERATOR

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say what is the present condition of the *Toshiba* linear accelerator currently in store because there is no building to house it, and is the monthly maintenance necessary to prevent its deterioration being performed at the expense of the agents or of the Government?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

FIRE BRICK

Mr. EVANS: Will the Deputy Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture to investigate the present sale of a fire brick that contains highly flammable material? This brick, which acts as a substitute for kindling wood in wood or briquette fires, burns quickly. Emergency Fire Service personnel in the Hills are concerned that, if these bricks are still available in the summer months, it will be easy for fire cranks, of whom there have been many recently, to set fire to one of the bricks and throw it out of the window of a moving car without having to stop, and that the brick will continue to burn under the hot conditions. These E.F.S. personnel are also concerned that it will be difficult to detect such offences this summer and in future summers if these blocks are used, and that it will be even more difficult to apprehend and prosecute the offenders. Will the Minister therefore take up the matter with his colleague to see whether the sale of these bricks can be stopped later in the winter so that they are not readily available early in the summer?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It may be that the Chief Secretary is responsible for such an investigation. However, I will take up the matter for the honourable member and let him have a report.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked the Premier last week regarding the appointment of justices of the peace?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member last week asked a question of the Premier, who, in his reply, set out correctly the practice that I have followed in appointing justices of the peace. It is not my practice to give reasons for the appointment or non-appointment of any person.

FLINDERS HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say why his department has failed to continue the sealing of the Flinders Highway between Talia and Streaky Bay, and will he say when the department will commence to complete the sealing of this section?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware that there has been any cessation of work on, the Eyre Highway.

Mr. Gunn: It is the Flinders Highway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Between which places?

Mr. Gunn: Between Talia and Streaky Bay.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know where Streaky Bay is but I am not aware whether work has been stopped, although I point out to the honourable member, as I think he knows, that most of the bitumen work is done in the summer months. It is not possible to do it in the winter months. I do not know whether the weather has anything to do with that.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Does it ever rain over there?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether it rains at Streaky Bay, but there are some wet characters over that way.

Mr. Gunn: This reply will look nice in the local press!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Well, I know that the honourable member uses the local press for political advantage whenever he and his League of Rights colleagues can do so. So that he may use the information in the press and so that on this occasion the press will be telling the true story, I will get a report and bring it down for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has implied that the League of Rights are colleagues of mine. This is in no way correct, and I ask him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. GUNN: The point of order was that the Minister of Roads and Transport implied that the League of Rights were colleagues of mine. This is not correct, and I ask that the Minister withdraw the statement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is not responsible for the accuracy or inaccuracy of Ministers' statements. Ministers are responsible for that.

SCHOOL BUSES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education tell the House whether, in his opinion, the school bus system is operating successfully or whether any alterations in the system are contemplated? Several applications are made for, in particular, variations in the routes of school bus systems, and in many instances an alteration of route does not increase the distance travelled or, if it does, it makes the service available to more people. Replies received from the Education Department suggest that, possibly, there is no elasticity in the regulation and in the way it functions at present. I ask whether the Minister has considered the matter in this light.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the best reply I can give the honourable member is that, as a result of the general principles that apply to the provision of school transport, Education Department expenditure under this heading increases by about 10 per cent, 12 per cent or 14 per cent a year. I think expenditure on school buses in the last financial year was about \$1,800,000. Regardless of whether that figure is accurate, we are committed to a substantial amount of money. Consequently, any proposals for alteration of routes that involve additional cost must be examined carefully. Certain general procedural guides have been adopted to determine whether route changes are justified, and I think the honourable member must appreciate that the procedures applied must apply not only in his district but also in areas where the extent to which buses travel is much greater, such as on Eyre Peninsula, in the North, in the South-East, and in the Murray Mallee. In addition, sometimes route changes involve changes in the times of starting of buses, and this can cause considerable problems, particularly if there are difficulties regarding the time at which children must leave home in the morning or return home in the evening if they use the bus in question. I know that many

applications made each year are refused as not being justified, mainly on economic grounds. One proposal that was refused only in the last day or so would have involved an expenditure of an additional \$15 a week for two children if it had been approved. I know that the honourable member has submitted several proposals that have been rejected on this kind of ground. If he is dissatisfied with any one decision and wishes to raise the matter with me again, I shall be only too pleased to examine the matter, but I consider that, because of the overall financial situation regarding education, the rate of increase in Education Department expenditure on bus transport is reasonable and that a faster rate of increase would only impinge on our ability to improve standards in other areas.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say whether the New South Wales firm Civil and Civic has been given contracts other than those announced in today's *Advertiser* under the heading "New South Wales firm gets school project"? Of course, the report refers to the Para Vista and Para Hills schools. I ask the Minister what is the cost of these schools and what percentage this project manager's firm in New South Wales will receive.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The reply to the first question is "No", and the reply to the second question is that it is not the department's policy to indicate the estimated cost of the schools at this stage, in case by doing so there should be any adverse effect on tender prices ultimately offered. The reply to the third question is that I will discuss the matter with the Minister of Works to find out whether we are willing to allow that information to be released to the honourable member and whether, if we are, it is to be made available on a confidential basis.

FLUORIDATION

Mr. CUMBE: As I understand that the metropolitan water supply is now being fluoridated, I ask the Minister of Works whether, if any, how many requests have been received from people in areas outside the metropolitan area for their water supply systems to be fluoridated.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To the best of my knowledge, no such application has been received by my department or by me; at least, I have not yet seen an application if one

has been received by the department. However, I will check with the department to see whether any application has been received by the Engineer-in-Chief, although I imagine that the application would come to the Minister rather than to him. If an application has been received, I shall be happy to notify the honourable member, and I will duly consider the matter. When I announced the fluoridation of the metropolitan water supply (including, of course, the water supply of townships connected to the system from the Murray River), I said that it was not the Government's policy during the life of this Parliament to fluoridate the water supply of any other country town. I would have to view any application in the light of that policy, although I imagine that, if a request was received, it would be viewed in accordance with an assessment of the wishes of the people in the area. However, I will have a look at this matter for the honourable member.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, see whether the report to his colleague of the committee considering wheat quotas can be made available to the House? A statement appeared in one of our country papers last week that the appeals committee had given the Minister of Agriculture a report setting out the number of appeals against wheat quotas made last season and also giving details of the numbers of successful and unsuccessful appeals. Although the article states that a report on this matter has been handed to the Minister, it does not give much detail of the report. Consequently, I ask my question to see whether it is possible for a copy of the report submitted to the Minister to be made available to members.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague. I thought that I had in my bag a report on this matter but, as it is not there, I will ask my colleague to comply with the honourable member's request.

PADTHAWAY SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Education say what progress is being made in connection with a new school for Padthaway?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will investigate the matter for the honourable member and bring down a reply.

PRAWN FISHING

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week about prawn fishing?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the decision to open all zones except zone E to prawning vessels was made by the Minister after discussions with the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation. It was done as a management measure, based on statistical returns of catches in the respective zones, to give a more equitable distribution of the then available resources of prawns in those areas. Zone E (St. Vincent Gulf) was excluded because prawning in that zone is restricted to smaller vessels using single rigs. The decision to exclude zone E was made by the Minister, and the prohibition of boats from other prawn zones into zone E is supported by the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation. The Minister is not sure to whom the honourable member refers when he speaks of "major prawn fishermen". The Minister did not receive any complaints from prawn fishermen operating in zones A1, A2, B, C and D following the opening of those areas. A request was received last week from a fisherman, who operates one of the largest double rigged prawn boats in the industry, to enter zone E, and this request was refused. Returns of catches up to the end of May show little evidence of any significant drop, and, even if the figures for June (when available) indicate any deterioration, this would not necessarily be because of the relaxation of restrictions. In fact, the opening of zones had the effect of increasing exploratory effort, and the Minister believes some new grounds were discovered. The honourable member can be assured that the situation is being watched very carefully.

MURRAY BRIDGE WELFARE OFFICER

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Social Welfare say when it is likely that a centre connected with the new Department for Community Welfare may be established in Murray Bridge? About 12 months ago the Minister was not sure whether and when Murray Bridge would have a welfare officer. Has he now any more definite information on this matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The matter concerning community welfare centres, their location, and in what numbers and at what time they may be located is still being considered.

Certainly, the ultimate plan involves establishing a community welfare centre at Murray Bridge, although I cannot say at present whether that will be practicable in the next year. However, I may be in a better position to give more information on this matter to the honourable member when the Estimates are being settled, as I shall then have a better idea of the finance that will be available in the forthcoming year.

ABATTOIR CAPACITY

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, provide details of the present one-year and two-year cattle-killing capacity at the recognized export abattoir in South Australia? The Minister will be aware that throughout South Australia there has been a considerable increase in the number of depastured beef cattle. If in the foreseeable future South Australia experienced an unfavourable season, as we have experienced in the past, the need to unload a large number of these cattle at any one time could, I believe, seriously affect our present abattoir capacity.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up this matter with my colleague, although the situation might be relieved if the member for Victoria got an abattoir going in his area.

RUTHVEN MANSIONS

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that the Chest Clinic, the subject of a question asked last week, is to be moved from the building known as Ruthven Mansions to another site. When this change occurs, can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has any plans regarding that ornate but terrible building? Has the Government decided what to do with it? As the building at present is quite unsafe, I should like to know whether it will be demolished.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, the Government desires to have the Chest Clinic established in a new site as soon as possible. Secondly, the Government has not finally decided what to do regarding the building referred to. Although the building will certainly not be re-used, the Government has not decided whether it will retain the property for further future use or for new development or whether it will dispose of it. We are still using it and will possibly continue to use it until June, 1973, which is when we expect to complete the new Chest Clinic. I will discuss this matter with the Director of the Public Buildings Department to see whether he has considered it.

MORATORIUM ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. Evans for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How much has the Government of South Australia paid in fees, salaries and other expenses attributable to the Royal Commission on the September Moratorium demonstration?

2. What expenses have been incurred but not yet paid?

3. What is the estimated total cost of this Royal Commission?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. \$75,093.

2. \$3,147.

3. \$80,000.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Evans for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government support the Universal Declaration of Human Rights either in whole or in part?

2. If in part only, what parts does it not support?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government supports the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

2. See No. 1.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption. (Continued from July 15. Page 120.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): First, I wish to pay my respects to the memory of the late Mr. Samuel Lawn, the former member for Adelaide. On my first day in Parliament, he rather amazed me by asking me whether I belonged to the dictator's Party or whether I would be a rebel. I learned to respect him for his honesty of purpose and firm belief in his convictions. I also pay my respects to the memories of other former members of Parliament who have died in the previous year. Although I did not know them in Parliament, I knew of their work. I recently read this quotation of William Harvard:

The greatest glory of a freeborn people is to transmit that freedom to their children.

I was pleased to see in the *Australian* a heading stating that the State would protect people's rights. However, what the Minister of Labour and Industry contemplates with regard to compulsory unionism is a restriction on people's

liberties, as are many other activities planned by the Government. We are living in a permissive society. Over the last year or so, with my support, Parliament has agreed to greater social liberties. However, what is now intended by the Government will restrict liberties unnecessarily.

Why is compulsory unionism necessary? If the average Australian believes that he derives some benefit from something, he will always pull his weight. However, fewer than half of the workmen (and the percentage is falling) belong to unions. Therefore, compulsion is demanded by union leaders. Why are unions not as popular as they should be? I believe in unionism, having been a member of the bank officers' association; I am now a member of the accountants' association. In the past, people have respected what unions have been doing, but what are they asking for now? The average person in the community at present wants greater education facilities, more hospitals and other social benefits. Gallup polls show that Australians put shorter working hours at the bottom of the list of what they want. However, against the will of the average Australian working man, the unions are demanding shorter hours. By a three to one majority, people have shown that they are against a 35-hour working week.

Even the Minister of Labour and Industry is worried. He said that the problem of looking after the children of women who went to work in industry was serious. It was stated that women with children had difficulty in finding employment, and that the Government was doing little in the field of child-minding, which was being left to private organizations. The Minister said that he thought that it was unfortunate that mothers had to go out to work, yet the same man is requesting that men should work five hours less a week. If that happens, there will be more demand for mothers to go out to work. At present, people are willing to work extra hours and even to work at weekends in order to raise the living standards of their families. Unions are not asking for what people want. The unions have opposed the tour by the South African rugby players. No-one disagrees with the policy of apartheid more than I do, although I believe that if we saw how that policy was working in South Africa we might think that it had some advantage in the short term. The attitude of the unions in this case represents another interference with people's liberties.

Most people in Australia want to see this team, but the unions say that this is not right, and meddle in someone else's business.

Perhaps that is what is wrong with the world today: too many people are trying to tell others what to do instead of putting their own house in order, setting a good example of a decent standard of living. The Minister of Roads and Transport is in charge of a railway system that makes big losses. He said that the people's railway would not carry the South Africans. Here is a petty dictator trying to dictate to the majority of people what should be done with their railway. That is how the right of people to do what they like is being protected. We all want more hospitals and better education facilities. Recently the Premier claimed that he had provided a greater percentage increase in the expenditure on these items than had ever been provided in South Australia's history, and that statement is correct, as I have verified. However, what the Premier did not say was that the additional money and more had come from the Commonwealth Government, which this Government derides, saying that it does not meet its obligations to the people in respect of education and other things. The total sum received from the Commonwealth last year was \$159,485,000, the sum received the previous year being \$128,803,000. Therefore, the increase last year was \$30,600,000, or a 24 per cent increase, which is 4 per cent more than the increased expenditure by the Government on education and other items. In addition to that 24 per cent increase, the Commonwealth has made other direct grants. This has happened during a period when the gross national product has increased by not more than 10 per cent. Of course, this situation cannot continue unless taxation is significantly increased. Whether the people do or do not require this is something that only the future can determine. There is no possibility of this State's receiving a greater percentage of Commonwealth assistance. Indeed, South Australia has received the highest per capita grant during this period of any other Australian State, a fact that we must face up to. It is impossible for one to expect expenditure to continue at this rate.

Everyone agrees that more education facilities should be provided. However, some people might say that more money should be spent on housing or on other services that the people require. Because of this, priorities

must be determined. The present Government has not increased expenditure on education, hospitals and social welfare as it could have done had its resources been managed more carefully. It could easily have spent more of the money it received from the Commonwealth Government on these services. Last year I was suspended for speaking about State finances; I hope that that will not happen again and that I shall be able to refer to them now.

Mr. Langley: You had the opportunity to withdraw. You didn't have to be suspended.

Mr. McANANEY: The Government Whip says I had the opportunity to withdraw. On that occasion, some members said afterwards I should not have been suspended. However, the Government Whip cracked the whip on that occasion, and I was suspended.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not reflect on a decision of the House.

Mr. McANANEY: The imposition of a growth tax the principle of which is correct is a change for the better, as the States will be responsible for levying impositions to meet public expenditure on certain facilities. This is indeed a good principle and one that the Government should adopt more universally. However, I doubt very much whether payroll tax is the best way for the State to meet its responsibility.

There is no reason why income tax could not have been shared between the State Governments and the Commonwealth Government. It is a non-inflationary tax which is based on the ability of people to pay. However, payroll tax is an inflationary tax levied not according to one's ability to pay but on the number of persons one employs. A wealthy company employing many people has to pay the same rate as does a struggling company that is hardly making ends meet. One could ask what net gain such a tax is to the States. If tenders for a school building were called only one day after the payroll tax was increased by 1 per cent, the cost of the building for which those tenders were being called would be increased, possibly by more than the 1 per cent by the time overheads were added. By levying a tax of this nature, the Government is merely increasing the cost of a project without increasing the facilities that the money will produce. I doubt very much whether the net gain from such a tax is as much as the average person thinks it is. It is therefore a bad tax for the States to impose.

It is argued that the States cannot levy income tax because it would remove the Commonwealth Government's control on the national economy. However, provided that the States spent only the amounts so received from such income tax levied by them, the process would not interfere with the national economy, and the Commonwealth Government could use other methods to control Australia's policies. For this reason, the Commonwealth and State Governments must come to some agreement on income tax, the fairest tax of all, which takes into account the ability of the individual to pay and which returns the greatest net benefit of any tax for the amount collected. For this reason, I oppose and will possibly vote against the payroll tax legislation when it is introduced, unless someone can advance a logical reason why such a tax should be levied and show how it is a good tax in the interests of the people of this State.

The system of accounting at the State level must be improved. We are now living in a modern world in which great improvements in techniques have been made. Despite this, we seem to have a horse-and-buggy method of accounting, the finances of all departments being pooled. As a result, when water rates are increased, a person thinks that his taxation has been increased. However, he is paying only for the increased cost of providing that service. Far better results would be obtained if all Government departments had their own balance sheets and if they charged according to the costs of the services they provide. In this respect I refer particularly to the Railways Department which, if it were operated on a commercial basis, would be a much more viable proposition. Because of past bad book-keeping practices, the Railways Department has not written off sufficient depreciation, and many of the assets shown on its books are assets no longer. Indeed, if the railways were closed, very little would be obtained for these so-called assets. I think the Railways Department should be told to pay its own running expenses.

Mr. Simmons: No concessions to primary producers?

Mr. McANANEY: Who gets the biggest subsidy from the South Australian Railways? The suburban and country passenger services do! Country freight services practically pay their own way. The honourable member, in his enthusiasm, refers to the primary producers. However, the biggest subsidy is paid on suburban passenger services. Action must be

taken to produce economy in spending. Our losses because of inefficiency and lack of incentive to make an organization function successfully involve us in large expenditure. I think most members recently received reports from John P. Young and Associates on value analysis, and this type of investigation could be introduced in the Public Service to determine whether we are getting value for money spent. Such an examination would be valuable to the State, because it would create a more efficient and less expensive service than that operating at present.

I pay an individual compliment to the public servants. When one contacts them personally, one finds that they are efficient and a good bunch of men. That is on an individual basis but, as a whole, the Public Buildings Department would leave anyone astounded if an outside body such as Youngs investigated that department. The savings that could be made and the degree of efficiency that could be introduced would improve the standard and status of the department in the eyes of the people. Recently I have heard that some applications that apparently got lost on a file about six years ago are now being attended to. I could take members to a school and they would be amazed at what has been happening there in the last two years. A new changeroom for children using the swimming pool has been provided but the swimming pool has not been renovated so that it can be used.

A deficit of \$25,000,000 next year has been suggested, yet savings could be made and the Budget balanced without reducing the standard of service given. This must be considered to try to achieve more efficiency. The Dartmouth dam question is extremely quiet at present. The Premier has claimed many times that we would not get any water from that dam until 10 years after its construction had been commenced. I admit that this year has been reasonably wet but, if the Dartmouth dam had been completed 12 months ago, the agreement would have come into effect in the first year after completion of the dam and South Australia would have been getting its additional quota by now. This postponement because of either the effort or lack of effort by the Government means that South Australia will be delayed for another year in getting water from the dam, and surely Government members who have delayed the construction of this dam must be getting cold shivers down their back.

Mr. Langley: Your Leader was going to build it himself.

Mr. McANANEY: Government members have no feeling for the people of South Australia and they hope that we do not get a dry period in which we have not the water that the Government should have provided. The subject of pollution is popular at present, and I think the member for Mawson jumped on the band waggon on that matter when he spoke on Thursday. In fact, I doubt that there is sufficient room on the band waggon for anyone else. Pollution is a problem and something must be done about it, but people often say, "Look at the pollution," when all they see is a haze. When I was in Cairns recently, I could see the haze extending as far north as the eye could see. It is good for people to complain about real pollution and I am pleased that something is being done about the matter.

Over the last 18 months or so I have complained about the policy regarding 20-acre subdivisions in the Hills district and I have said that each application to build there should be considered on its merits, but no notice has been taken of me. We have the ridiculous situation near Hahndorf that land has been subdivided for a motel. We wonder how big that motel will be. The position is that a person can buy 20 acres of subdivided land in the Hills and cover the whole area by building a motel there. More people would be on that area in a motel than if people were allowed to subdivide blocks of one acre or five acres so that their children could live near them. It is ridiculous to make a rigid rule: we should have something more flexible. The Government was not willing to introduce a rigid regulation that the department wanted introduced regarding Murray River frontages. Suggestions being made to councils, whereby each application will be considered on its merits, are a more satisfactory way of dealing with the matter. In that way, more justice would be done and we would have a common-sense approach rather than the present position in the Hills district.

I know that country people are in much difficulty at present. Their incomes are dropping considerably and their costs are continuing to increase. One of the biggest things facing us now is the need to solve this problem. The drop in income of country people means a drop in their purchasing power, and this in turn influences many industrial companies through lost job opportunities. We must get down to basic principles. Over the years I have opposed controls. However, there

are controls in other parts of the economy and interference in matters, and strong assistance is being given to secondary industries.

We could claim that additional wages granted by arbitration tribunals to the worker are subsidies that do not improve his standards of living. I am sure members opposite agree that we do not improve living standards merely by increasing wages. Mr. Hawke admitted before the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission that the percentage the wage-earners got of the gross national product did not vary very much over 10 years. This form of inflation is beyond the control of the primary producers. We must appreciate that the Commonwealth Government is now taking a more realistic attitude to tariffs, and this could tend to keep down costs in Australia. The basic problem is that farmers have become too efficient. Their numbers are declining but they are producing more and more. Many of them are endeavouring to make good this margin by producing more, but they are producing more only to sell it overseas at a loss or at a give-away price.

It is no good continuing along these lines. Immediately an industry is subsidized to make good a loss caused by producing more than it can sell at a reasonable price it is encouraged to produce more. It is a basic fact of life that, if we fix an artificial price or give a subsidy to this extent, we must introduce some form of control of production. It need not necessarily be introduced immediately: there may be over-supply at the time but, in the interests of those people engaged in the industry, if control of production is necessary, the formula for it must be determined at that time so that they can plan their future production. I have said this many times in the last few years and I think that what I have said has come to pass.

Three or four years ago the egg marketing plan was introduced, which meant an increased cost of eggs to the consumer in Adelaide. Then a hen levy was introduced to make good the losses overseas, so egg production, particularly by the big producers, has steadily increased. Instead of many small producers producing eggs on the family property, we now have about 100 producers producing half the eggs in South Australia—possibly all that can be eaten in South Australia. Now that industry is seeking control of production. We have already destroyed most of the small egg producers and built up the bigger producers. We now have the present ridiculous position

that there is a year's supply of egg pulp on hand. At present prices, it can be sold at 11c, and it costs ½c a month to keep it in cold storage. These excess eggs have been produced for no good purpose. The only way to stabilize the industry is to prune back production to the available market at reasonable prices. This goes for everything else, too. General Motors-Holden's is spoonfed with tariff protection, but if that firm produced more than it could sell on the home market at a payable price it would go out of business.

The same thing is happening in the wine industry. The new excise had some effect, but that is not the cause of the wine industry's present problem. The grapegrowers were given a guaranteed price, which tended to induce mainly the proprietary companies to plant more and more vines. When this extra excise was imposed, the proprietary companies increased their prices to cope with it, and they are now making bigger profits than ever. The co-operatives on the river have been depending on bulk sales to the bigger companies, but the bigger companies now have their own supplies and are not buying from them, so they are getting into trouble. A guaranteed price was fixed three or four years ago. If we had then determined what form of control of production would be imposed, it would have been for the benefit of the industry and the family producer and this would have brought about a balanced supply.

Mr. Simmons: Are you opposed to guaranteed prices?

Mr. McANANEY: Members opposite are always asking me questions; they never understand these matters. Anyone who studies the last 50 years' history of primary production in any State or country in the world will realize that what I have said is correct. The wool industry operated for years with no assistance. It carried the development of secondary industries in Australia. No member opposite can deny that. It performed a great service for Australia, and we have some responsibility for it now. It should receive some assistance.

If we are to subsidize an industry or increase the price above that at which we can sell its produce on the world's markets, there must be some form of production control. Where we have a surplus of wool, for example, and it cannot be sold, the producers should know what their future is. A subsidy of 40c will not force people to increase production (in some cases it will) but it will keep them in production where some were seeking to get out

of it and get into other things. With a 40c subsidy, they will stay in wool production. It is all right to have 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 bales of wool on hand in case there is a demand but, if we go on giving them an incentive to stay in wool production and there is no hope for wool in the future (I do not say that there is not), we are doing more harm to the industry than if we did not assist at all. Business principles must be applied. If the world is willing to pay a sufficient price, the producers will produce wool; but, if we subsidize something that has not a world demand, all we are doing is prolonging the agony and putting the State to much expense that could be avoided if we went about it intelligently.

It has been suggested that what I am saying is wrong, but the sugar industry has control of production and a guaranteed price. The wheat industry, similarly, has a guaranteed price and a flexible control of production. We have a supply of wheat on hand to satisfy any demand that may arise. I do not think the supply is big enough at the moment. At the end of every wheat season, we should have practically a year's supply on hand so that, if there is a drought, we will have enough wheat to sell. We used to keep about 20,000,000 bushels on hand, but when a drought occurred we would lose our overseas markets. We should be using business principles in our farming. It has been suggested that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics should determine each year what the primary producers should produce, and then offer advice. However, some farmers will produce more and some less, so this is not practicable. It should be determined what can be produced and sold at a reasonable price, because that is the only practical and business-like method that will enable farmers to have a standard of living comparable to that of the rest of the population and enable them to perform a useful function for the community.

With the building of the freeway through the Hills some effort should be made to bring about decentralization, particularly in country towns near or on the road to Melbourne, because there is a demand for goods from both Adelaide and Melbourne. Decentralization should occur in towns like Mount Barker and Murray Bridge, rather than let Adelaide grow beyond a certain size. A capital city should not be allowed to develop beyond a certain population (whether it be 1,000,000 or 1,500,000) at which crime and pollution can be coped with to a reasonable degree and amenities that are required by the people can

be provided. We should encourage industries to establish and develop along the railway line or the direct route to Melbourne. The State Government must consider providing incentives for people to go to these towns, and the incentives should be determined by circumstances. People may not want to live in Murray Bridge at present, but if an industry or two were encouraged to establish there the people would be willing to live in that town, because it would then provide the amenities to which they were accustomed. Perhaps after the first efforts were made to establish industries in such a town there might not be any need to provide incentives for people to leave Adelaide, and this might apply particularly if the town were situated on the route to Melbourne.

Transportation is one of the biggest problems we have to face in South Australia, and there is a definite need for a north-south freeway or a fast train service. The train services must be up to date: it is unsatisfactory to ask people at Elizabeth or Christies Beach to use a train that dawdles along, and there must be an express service to cope with the traffic, even if an extra line has to be built. Public transport is becoming less popular in South Australia: for the first three months of this year about 424,000 fewer passengers were carried on public transport in Adelaide.

Most people will not use public transport until the railway services are up-dated and both railway and bus services provide a faster service. Speaking on the M.A.T.S. plan last year, I suggested that the dial-a-bus service could be similar to an organized taxi service, and now I note that taxi drivers have suggested that this type of service should be investigated. It would be cheaper for four or five people to hire a taxi at Henley Beach than to use public transport, and much more convenient and quicker. As the member for Alexandra has said, we have to consider more than passengers in the city areas: there must be freeways for goods to be transported. Some railway lines have been closed, and possibly more will have to be closed in the future. For instance, the Railways Commissioner wanted the Strathalbyn line closed, as that would have saved \$200,000 a year.

Mr. Simmons: Did you support that?

Mr. McANANEY: I certainly did. As the member for the district, I believed that the line should be closed. If someone can show that he will lose by the closing of a line, he should be compensated. This possibly happened in regard to the flour mill at

Strathalbyn. However, there is an adequate and more competitive road service to the towns on this line. After it was decided that the line would not be closed, the Railways Department canvassed business people and members of the council in Strathalbyn and offered a substantial reduction in freight rates to a figure below the cost of the road transport. What happened? A month later, because the department could not obtain anyone willing to use the railway service, it withdrew the concessional offer and the old rates have remained. Why should such a line remain open when there is no prospect of any increased usage? Yet, we ask the general taxpayers of Australia to provide taxation to make up such a loss. Because the railway line has not been closed, increased expenditure on the freeway will be involved.

The Highways Department wanted to use part of the railway line for the new road from Strathalbyn to Mount Barker but, as the department could not use it, it cost more than \$200,000 extra to build the road on the old route. Such a railway line is a complete liability to the people of this State. The reason why the line was not closed was that the Transport Control Board failed to realize that there was a good bus service from Victor Harbour to Strathalbyn. That is why the Public Works Committee recommended against the closing of the line. If the Transport Control Board had done its job properly and realized there was a reasonable passenger bus service to Victor Harbour, I do not think the Public Works Committee could have left this line open.

A substantial loss has been made on the railway service north of Wanbi, and it will cost a large sum to rebuild it into a useful condition. The charge to this area was 17c a bushel for wheat. I recently did a little exercise that showed that if the farmers had grouped together and bought some semi-trailers with trays they could have carted it to Adelaide for 11c a bushel. Some farmers are in such financial difficulties that they could have driven the semi-trailers themselves and benefited from the wages involved.

I cannot see why we should retain railway lines that are completely uneconomic and valueless to the community. I do not mean to say that I am against railways as such, but there is something wrong with them if, on the longer routes, they cannot compete successfully with road transport. The money available for railways should be spent on improving

services on the longer routes, including routes to other States. In view of the substantial losses being incurred on suburban rail passenger services, surely money should be spent on improving such services to such an extent that people will be attracted to use them, instead of their being compelled to use them. It has even been suggested that travel on suburban rail routes should be free, but I doubt whether many more people would use them even if it was free, unless a better service was provided.

The Government is making no effort to stop the wastage of money that is at present occurring. When the Labor Government came to office in 1965 it set up committee after committee, but Parliament has seen reports from only a few of those committees. Now the Government is setting up committees to investigate committees; the procedure has even reached the tertiary level in one instance—the Government has asked for a report on a report on a report. The Government should ensure that members of committees are people with a dynamic approach. Perhaps in some cases some members of an original committee were incompetent and, later, experts had to be called in. Often, committees do not have personnel with sufficiently wide experience. Any committee should always have an accountant as one of its members. When the Government appointed a judge to determine the proper route for the moratorium march through the city streets, it was evading the issue. In reply to a question asked last year, the Premier said that the marchers had a perfect right to go where they liked and to sit down in the city streets, and he also said he had taken part in a march of farmers. However, when the Premier finds that his actions are unpopular, he appoints someone else to determine where the marchers should go.

Mr. Simmons: The Premier complied with the Royal Commission's recommendations.

Mr. McANANEY: The Government should govern. The leader of a Government should not incite young people to break the law: this is where the Premier got himself into trouble. Last week a university student was most upset; he said to me, "If young people have a complaint they like to march, but what happens? A nut like Medlin interferes with our peaceful protest." When I realize that a person like Medlin is employed at one of our universities, I wonder where we will finish. We must bear in mind not only the freedom of the individual

but also obligations to the rest of the community. I realize that universities believe that they should have freedom of expression and that they do not like interference from people outside (those are commendable sentiments) but, when a man like Medlin emphasizes one particular viewpoint and does not give both sides of the argument, he is failing in his duty to the people of the State, who, in the final analysis, employ him. Many years ago, when I attended university lectures, we had a Red lecturer. I thought he was all right for a while. Any 20-year-old may be influenced by the ideas of such a person (that is possibly good), but, if someone still believes those ideas when he reaches Professor Medlin's age, he is a hopeless case.

The Premier has abused the Commonwealth Government in connection with the degree of assistance South Australia has received over the past year, but I point out that this State received the greatest increase in Commonwealth assistance a head of population. In making his allegations the Premier was just playing politics. The Commonwealth Government cannot continue to increase taxation reimbursements by 24 per cent every year, because, if it did so, it would be out of step with the gross national product. At times Governments waste money and, if they adopted a more scientific approach regarding the money they are spending, increased allocations would not be necessary. I hope that in the coming year the Government will wisely manage its finances, but I do not know how it will do that. The Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, screamed last year when the previous Government retained some money in the Loan Fund; he said that it should be spent on educational buildings. He said that money was being allowed to lie idle, but what is he doing now? He has even more money in the Loan Fund. If the Commonwealth Government tomorrow gave the Education Department every cent for which it asked, I doubt whether another school would be built this year, because at present the people concerned are so far behind in regard to plans for buildings, etc., that there is a hitch.

It is all very well to say, "We want more"; the Government just would not be able to do any more. It is employing outside architects, etc., and when the Public Buildings Department approves a project it takes well over 12 months before the plans are finalized and tenders are called. The Government does not have the ability to spend the money available, and it does not have the courtesy to

respect the people who have provided all the money for its increased expenditure on education, hospitals, and social amelioration. Members on the other side cannot deny that; they are silent at last. They cannot deny a fact of life, especially now that I have given them the benefit of my great experience, having explained to them how the problems of this world can be solved.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I acknowledge the honour of hearing His Excellency's Speech on the opening of Parliament and regret noting the untimely death of former members of this Parliament, two of whom, in particular, were known to me. The late Mr. Rowe and the late Mr. Lawn were known to me and everyone as very fine and honourable men, and I join His Excellency in extending my sympathy to their families. Also, I note the retirement of Sir Norman Jude. Having met Sir Norman on the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I can say that I always found him quite a character (if I could use that phrase in a friendly fashion), a real gentleman, and someone from whom one could learn much when it came to the rough and tumble of politics. No doubt the place has changed somewhat for the retirement of Sir Norman.

I congratulate my colleague the member for Price on his election as Chairman of Committees of this Chamber, and I congratulate my colleague the new member for Adelaide on the excellent maiden speech he made in this House. In fact, I congratulate him on the two excellent maiden speeches he made, because I think it was somewhat of a record when he participated in a debate before moving the adoption of the Address in Reply. I confess that I am pleased and somewhat excited about the legislative programme set out before us by the Government. Although one could speak on several issues, I, like most other people, should like to limit my remarks to one or two topics that I consider to be of supreme importance.

The first of these is the whole question of industrial relations in our society. There is no doubt that we face a time of crisis in our industrial relations. This is not the first time in our country, or indeed in any other advanced country, that we have faced a time of crisis, but at this time it is confused or complicated by rapid technological and other changes. I was reminded of the difficulties of this area by the comment that the member for Heysen made relating to Professor Medlin, whom he described as some kind of nut,

indicating that he strongly disagreed with what Professor Medlin said. Frankly, I, too, strongly disagree with much of what Professor Medlin says, but it hardly conduces to helping people reach a reasonable understanding when we start a comment by describing our opponent as some kind of nut. It is just that sort of attitude that leads to the real difficulties in industrial relations.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to what I consider to be a most important contribution in this field of industrial relations. I refer to a preliminary address, given by Mr. Clyde Cameron, M.H.R., to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Labor Party Council in Launceston. Referring to the whole issue of industrial relations throughout the country, Mr. Cameron said:

The question is this: Which comes first—man or the machine? For our Party it comes down to this: Do we allow the industrial system to continue in such a way that a vast number of workers spend their working hours serving a blind, impersonal, industrial machine? Or do we plan to change that system so that man always comes first? Can we construct an effective policy to allow man to work in an industrial sphere where human rights, values and dignity always have priority? There is a choice. A Labor Government could let the system slowly evolve—with minor improvements in conditions and occasionally new concepts arising to quicken the evolutionary process. Or a Labor Government could actively plan an industrial system where great and rapid change takes place—a system where human needs are always paramount. I believe it is clear that great changes are necessary if a viable industrial system is to survive. More and more Australians see the industrial system of today characterized by the frustration and boredom of the assembly line, by a five-day 9 to 5 drudgery, by the lack of job satisfaction, by the mindlessness and dreariness of their working lives. We see large numbers of our young—and not so young—people questioning the industrialised society, some to the point where they “drop out” and make radical changes in their style of living.

They can no longer see the point in a meaningless production cycle which doesn't pay them enough, over which they have no control, within which they do not effectively participate and, ironically, often pollutes their environment. Although our crisis-ridden education system can take little credit, today's workers are more educated, more aware of the possibilities. We too have our own revolution of rising expectations—it is not confined to under-developed countries. Today's employees can see all too clearly the faults of the present industrial system: its gross inequities, its unfairness, its “profit above all” attitude which debases so many facets of the working day. Our new policy, I believe, lays the foundation for the reforms which are necessary. While it is not a blueprint for industrial perfection, it can set the stage for progress and change. It is a

policy which always places human rights and values first. It provides for the development of true human dignity in the workplace, with the emphasis on rights—always on rights, not on conferred privileges.

We must create a system where the lowliest worker can go right to the top and say, “This is my right—you cannot take it away.” Today, a worker could only do that under the protective umbrella of a powerful union with honest and trustworthy union officials to back him up. Australian workers of today and tomorrow, and the next century, must be given the right to full employment, to real economic justice and to the true freedom which comes from true security of employment and proper wage standards. These are the basic rights of this policy. From them spring all other rights and conditions within industry. From them too would spring great and important social and economic changes. There is a powerful desire throughout Australia today for perceptible progress—a pervasive “mood for movement”. Our people have aspirations which they can see no way of achieving in a system which grinds so slowly. Our people have visions of what could be. Unless we move now they have little hope of seeing those visions fulfilled.

Although it seems to me that, in this area, that is not a unique statement, it is a true and valid statement that highlights the real problem facing us. Almost whenever Parliament sits one question asked of Ministers relates to union or industrial upheaval in one of the State's large plants. Unfortunately, because of the way in which these upheavals and disputes are reported, the public often tends to get the impression that they are mainly the fault of the unions, but that is just not so. One-third of all industrial disputes are caused by lack of safety, health and welfare in industry. Honourable members know that at present we have a Select Committee investigating this matter. However, a further one-third of all lost working time comes about as a result of the often crude refusal of employers to investigate the valid complaints of trade unions about industrial safety, health and welfare. Sometimes it comes down not even to a crude refusal but to a positive inability to see any problem there at all. In other words, I suggest that ignorance on the part of employers can lead to much lost working time that could be avoided.

Secondly, the bulk of the rest of industrial disputes is characterized in two parts. One part comprises disputes that arise from an industrial move related to a court application; the other part relates to wildcat strikes in industry. Once again, I have noted time and time again that, if only the employers in the industry were prepared to place more stress on

conciliation rather than make a hard-line demand for arbitration, so much of our lost working time could be saved. I believe that a real plea must be made for education of the employee and employer groups who can assist in saving so much of this destructive lost time. I am not so foolish as to say that I lay the whole blame on employers; obviously there are occasions when wildcat strikes take place, usually without the knowledge, let alone the consent, of the elected union officials. This is a poor situation, and I do not support that sort of attitude. Contrary to the impression often given in the media, proper investigation of statistics shows that far too much of our lost working time is caused by employers rather than by employees.

What can be done in our industrial legislation in an effort to improve this situation? First, I suggest that a proper reappraisal of the role of the State and Commonwealth tribunals is essential. Members know well that in many fields of industrial matters I support State tribunals believing that, as they are on the spot and as their proceedings tend to be less cumbersome, they tend to solve problems in a reasonable way more quickly. Other industries, which are truly national in character, require the intervention of a national arbitral tribunal. It has been suggested that we can overcome the problem in this area by abandoning arbitration altogether, turning to a system of collective bargaining. An investigation of the way in which many groups of informed people look at arbitration as against collective bargaining suggests that people in the community see one system as being a replacement of the other. If anyone seriously suggests that we should substitute collective bargaining for our system of arbitration, and that person really understands the concept of collective bargaining as a system, I suggest that he is not only ill informed and preposterous but is also positively evil. I say that advisedly, because this would lead to the destruction of the trade union movement as we know it, of the Australian Labor Party, and of any protection for our already too large mass of low income earners.

I point out that, in the main countries that have collective bargaining (United States of America, Canada, Sweden, West Germany and Japan), the overall percentage of union membership is very low. For example, in Australia at present about 50 per cent of the work force belongs to an appropriate union, whereas in the United States only 20 per cent of the

work force belongs to a trade union. The system of unionism in the United States, Sweden, Japan and West Germany is characterized by this sort of approach. It is a narrow, sectional unionism that rejects socialism, democratic socialism and the responsibility of unions, in a wider sense, to the community. It looks after its selective membership well, but at a high cost and on the basis of continual direct confrontation with the employers. Therefore, I suggest that those who think that a system of collective bargaining is some sort of viable solution to our industrial problems are very wrong. Not only does it lead to the social evils to which I have referred (and members on this side believe that a system of employee representation is all important) but it also fails in that it does not produce any reduction in the number of strikes.

As an example, I pose the dispute in America in 1970 involving the United Auto Workers, particularly centred in Detroit. Before the dispute, the United Auto Workers had collected for a strike fund at a rate of two hours pay a month from each member. In this way, \$121,000,000 had been collected. The union then confronted the Ford Motor Company and the battle was on, the whole system of the battle being might against might. The United Auto Workers well knew that unless it had \$121,000,000 it would not succeed. In the same way, the Ford Motor Company knew of the existence of the fighting fund of \$121,000,000 and that it stood to face disastrous losses if something was not done. This type of direct confrontation is really a carry-over from what used to exist in Australia before the 1890's. To draw together the threads of what I am saying, I point out that already in Australia before the 1890's we had experienced collective bargaining, which was a disastrous failure. The labour strikes of 1890, involving the Shearers Union (later the Australian Workers Union) and the maritime unions, were completely inconclusive; all they achieved was a deadlock between the parties, with no advantage to anyone. We went on from there to produce in Australia a system of arbitration that has many faults (and I shall refer to those), but as a result of that system we have in Australia what I consider to be the greatest trade union movement in the world, because it is so outgoing. It is not merely a big business union system such as are so many of the American unions: it is a union system that looks out past its own members and, particularly, is willing to sacrifice some of its own benefits

so that the low-paid worker, the man with the small bargaining power, can be looked after.

In America, on the other hand, the collective bargaining of the 1890's is continuing and that country is in no better position now overall than it was in the 1890's. I know it is true that the united automobile workers, the united meat workers, and others can point to colossal salary increases and conditions of work arrangements, but I point out that this is a very small group of people indeed. Of a total work force of about 40,000,000 people, only 4,000,000 are in unions and only 100 unions represent those 4,000,000 people. The rest of the workers in the labour force are left to the wolves, and are treated as the wolves treat their prey.

Luckily, that does not happen in Australia, and I for one do not want to see it happen, and the Labor Party does not want to see it happen. However, what we do want to see is a fundamental change in our arbitral system so that, combined with that system, we will have some elements of collective bargaining. Put briefly, it amounts to this: we ought to update our existing arbitral system and add to it greater facilities for negotiation and conciliation so that, in one way (although it sounds cynical to say it), the best of both worlds can be obtained. I know that the member for Torrens, perhaps more so than some of his colleagues, knows that in industrial relations it is not always the logical that prevails; on the contrary, it is usually the illogical that produces the proper result. It seems rather absurd when we have a person making a demand for the best of an arbitral system and the best of a collective bargaining system but, when we weigh up the advantage to the community, I think it has some merit.

What precisely do I suggest? First, I suggest that the constitutional position of the Commonwealth and the States must be considered. As a federalist, I am pleased to see the sovereign power residing in the States, and I hope that the sovereign power of the States will not be whittled away, but, by the same token, I think we must admit that in certain areas, particularly in industrial relations, our system is so confusing and complicated that only those who are full-time specialists in the area can have any hope of understanding what is happening from day to day. Even those specialists from time to time find themselves out on a limb.

I put forward the following suggestions. Of course, these would require the co-operation of

both the Commonwealth Government and the States, but I believe that it is a matter that ought to be considered seriously, not on a Party-political basis but on a community interest basis. The first thing that needs to be done is to enable the Commonwealth tribunal, within its proper sphere of influence, to be able to arbitrate effectively inside all those areas. In other words, I say that the ridiculous system that now prevails of the costly service of logs of claims and notices of hearings, with all the inherent constitutional and legal difficulties, ought to be scrapped, and I suggest that, within its proper sphere of influence, the Commonwealth tribunal, on a simple application by a union in an industry, ought to be able to make an award that is binding upon everybody in that industry. I and the other members on this side (and, once again, probably only the member for Torrens on the Opposition side) know what happens when a union commences a Commonwealth log of claims. These big unions know that, if they have to serve about 70,000 logs of claims, having worked out in advance all sorts of ambit and constitutional problems and having arranged proof of all that and then proof of a further 70,000 notices of hearing, they are out of pocket by about \$150,000, and the case has not even started! The merits have not yet been heard. That is my first suggestion.

My second suggestion is that I think it is imperative that the Commonwealth Government and the States, the unions and employers, agree among themselves on what would be a fair delineation of interest between the Commonwealth tribunal and the State tribunal. Let me give a concrete instance of this. To me, it is obvious that the maritime industry must be a Commonwealth matter, because it obviously transcends State borders and in fact goes out of the territorial waters of Australia from point to point, and other industries that have the characteristic of interstateness also ought to remain with the national tribunal. On the other hand, there is a large group of industries (and I cite, for example, the mining industries inside States, the retail industries inside States, service industries inside States, the building trades, construction, and similar industries), which to my mind can be dealt with much better by a State tribunal.

The third thing I put up is this: that where we have a difficulty or an overlap between the two systems that I have suggested, we create a system by which, without removing the

sovereignty of the State body, we vest it with an agency power from the Commonwealth. This is unusual in Australia but it is not unusual in other federal systems and I see no reason why it should not work.

My fourth suggestion is that we ought to look for a greater emphasis on conciliation, and one of the ways of doing this is by, inside the system I have suggested, laying down basic standards that will apply throughout the whole of industry and having this done at national level. There I refer to the basic wage, the minimum wage, the working week, the working day, and such matters. Having laid down that basic minimum, let us look for a system by which collective agreements can be reached by unions and employers outside the system, if necessary by the appointment of mediators or arbitrators to assist. These mediators and arbitrators to whom I refer would not be personnel of the established tribunals but would be skilful people, accepted and trusted by each side to help both sides reach an agreement.

Having done that, let us be quite certain that, by whatever means we do it (whether by ballot or advertisement), the members affected agree. Having got that agreement, let us then register it, and at that point I feel quite confident that, without penal powers, that agreement will be honoured. I point out, as has been pointed out previously, that it is a very small minority of unions in Australia that has ever broken agreements and, whenever they have broken agreements, it has usually been because of very difficult circumstances, as, for example, in the recent storemen and packers dispute, about which I think some members opposite may know something.

Having, to my mind, excluded collective bargaining as being a proper alternative system, I suggest that the time has come for the Commonwealth and the States to get together to see whether such a system as I have outlined can be introduced. I think it would be a great thing for this State, with its Labor Government, through our Minister of Labour and Industry, to put forward these proposals in an endeavour to see whether we can get some commonsense treatment from the Commonwealth to try to implement some of the things that not only I but so many other people regard as important.

All that, of course, having been done, the fact of the matter is that the State legislation remains, and it is very important. It is important because of its sovereign constitu-

tional powers, and there is no question that, unless an agreement such as I have suggested is reached, a point of crisis may well come where the whole structure of the Commonwealth conciliation and arbitration machinery will one day be overthrown by the High Court. While there is no doubt that the sovereign powers of all the States are such that they can set up tribunals with far-reaching powers, the same cannot be said of the Commonwealth. However, I shall not digress into a long legalistic tirade on that.

I now turn to what, in my opinion, should be done inside our own State industrial legislation. I shall make some specific suggestions. In the first place, it is essential that a preference for unionists clause be introduced. Before I have perhaps a too strong reaction from members opposite, I say that all States (with the exception of Victoria and Tasmania, which are still on the pre-1890 system; they have only wages boards, not a system of compulsory arbitration) and the Commonwealth with a system of compulsory arbitration have a system of preference for unionists. In making that statement I immediately say that obviously there must be safeguards. I support the idea that a proper officer (I suggest an industrial registrar or an industrial magistrate) be empowered to grant exemptions to persons who, for religious or deeply held conscientious reasons, cannot bring themselves to join a union, though on the basis of letting them pay the union due, that part of the political levy to which they normally object being given over to charity. That is already provided for by Liberal Governments, and it works well and is liked by employers.

In the very large employing industries like General Motors-Holden's, Chrysler Australia Limited, other engineering concerns and many other fields of industry the employers themselves look forward to a system of preference to unionists. I do not see it as an evil, provided, as I say, we make an adequate safeguard for the man who honestly says that for a religious or conscientious reason he cannot bring himself to pay that part of the union contribution that relates to the political levy. I am sure that in a commonsense way something can be done. As Commissioner Winter, who was one of the finest and most respected conciliation commissioners in the Commonwealth system, said recently, "If only the two groups would sit down and look at these ideas, so many of them could be dealt with so well without the overriding emotionalism and hatred that goes with it."

Having dealt with that substantial topic, let me refer to several other things that need urgently to be dealt with. One of them was raised today—the proceedings that have been taken against the Transport Workers Union. This is not the first time I have been involved in proceedings taken at common law against trade unionists, and I have always been ashamed of these proceedings. They stem from the Taff Vale case in Britain in 1904. Immediately following the Taff Vale case, the British Parliament passed the Trade Union Protection Act, which exonerated the trade unions from the effect of such actions, for obvious reasons. They are that it is wrong that, while the conciliator or arbitrator or presidential member is attempting to get justice, in an unrelated court civil proceedings of a complex nature are going on. I interpolate, for the benefit of those people who support collective bargaining, that the procedures before the American courts are quite laughable. There, actions for conspiracy are taken, and on one occasion the united rubber workers faced a verdict of \$88,000,000 for damages for an unlawful strike. They paid it because they are very financial, like the United Auto Workers, but many others could not have paid. I point out, too, that these proceedings are most costly. There is no question of being able to go before a nice commissioner who understands what a person is talking about, who is in the field and who will bend over backwards to give that person a hearing. He is in the civil courts and, like any other poor devil there, he will be kicked around from pillar to post inside the list. He will get a hearing when they are ready to give it to him and, when he gets a hearing, it will almost certainly be on the strictest principles of law. Those who vaguely think of this sort of area as being a viable one should think twice. I hope that in the Industrial Arbitration Bill, which I think will be ready shortly, this will be a matter accepted by all sides as essential. We do not want these actions for conspiracy—not just because the trade unions do not want them but because it is no justice or credit to the employers who take out such proceedings.

We also need immediately action that will ensure that whilst on annual leave or long service leave workers will receive their average weekly earnings. I shall refer to this in another context relating to workmen's compensation. I hope that in the Industrial Arbitration Bill there will be adequate provision for average weekly earnings for employees on annual or

long service leave. I hope (and I think my colleagues on the other side of the House on the Select Committee would agree with this) that we can have an Industrial Arbitration Act that contains nothing about safety and that at the end of the Select Committee's inquiry we can have an industrial safety measure that will lead the world and be completely separate from the industrial relations part of the legislation. I hope that the House, in its consideration of the Industrial Arbitration Bill, will seriously and rationally consider some of the things that will be put forward but not the emotionalism and not the easily announced words like "rat-bags", "scabs", "bludgers" and all the other words that are bandied about.

I hope that in the Industrial Arbitration Bill we shall get some clarification of the position of the judges of the Industrial Court in this State. I make no secret of the fact, and never have, that I regard those gentlemen as doing a magnificent job. I am sad that they do not have publicly acknowledged to them, as do their colleagues in Queensland, New South Wales, Western Australia and the Commonwealth, the Supreme Court status to which they are entitled. They are clearly entitled to it. They only ever lost it because in 1930 Sir Raymond Kelly reduced his own salary by 10 per cent when he reduced the salaries of other workers during the depression. I hope the House will seriously consider granting to our Industrial Court judges the proper recognition of Supreme Court status. I am worried not about the money paid to them but about the status, because I like to believe (and I know it is quite right) that our State Industrial Court is regarded throughout the country, in company with the New South Wales and the Commonwealth courts, as producing the fairest, best and most advanced decisions of all our industrial tribunals. I hope that when that matter comes forward members will seriously consider it. I also hope that the whole question of the registration of unions can be considered and the problems solved in a relatively simple manner. Although this matter is rather technical, I suggest that the problems can be solved. Members know that many companies carry on business throughout Australia and, although they happen to be registered in Canberra, they are registered also as foreign companies in each of the capital cities. We have the peculiar situation where a union has a Commonwealth branch in this State registered under the Commonwealth system, and a State branch that is really, if

the truth be known, exactly the same body with the same books, rules and everything else, but is registered with the State tribunal.

One simple proposition I put forward is the principle of recognition. Let us recognize the existence of the union and its branches and have reciprocal arrangements between the tribunals so that each recognizes the other. Let us do away with the fantastic amount of litigation that goes on between the unions. It is a sad thing to me that more than half of all the money spent by unions in Australia in industrial matters is spent in internecine disputes about registration and matters that will not put one cent into the pockets of the workers involved. I suggest that by a relatively simple means something can be done to overcome this real problem. At the same time what would have to be done is to ensure that all the actions, powers, duties, and so on of the existing unions were validated. I make one simple suggestion in terms of amending the Industrial Code: the establishment of a bureau of industrial statistics. We know that the ordinary trade union cannot afford (much as it would like) to have proper research staff, which would consider the interests of its members in relation to comparisons of awards, movements in productivity and cost of living, and the rest of it.

I hope that, at a small cost, not an elaborate committee but one competent officer with perhaps one or two assistants could collate the relevant information so that parties going before a tribunal would be in a better position to put a fair case. Mr. Keith Marshall, Deputy Registrar of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, pointed out that not only were far too many of our industrial disputes caused by a pig-headed refusal to look at valid complaints of unions about industrial safety but also far too many were caused by the fact that, although the union had a good case, it could not produce the evidence to prove it. It could not drive in the nail on which the arbitrator could hang his decision. I hope that in this simple way something can be done to alleviate this situation.

I now turn to the Workmen's Compensation Act. I was proud when this Government introduced the new Act last session, and I was proud of the way the Industrial Court Judge, Judge O'Loughlin, started his duties. I start with a simple plea that the Minister will ensure that the workmen's compensation legislation in this State is no longer the mystery it used to be. Because there were no reports, unless you were

an expert in the field you could get halfway through a case and be told that, because of some decision of some judge that you had not heard of and because the case had never been reported, you were completely out of court. Let us start by having a young legal practitioner, or someone like that, to act as an editor to ensure that our reporting is right or that we are going in the right direction. That is a procedural matter, but my main point was foreshadowed by my colleague, the member for Adelaide. Although that Bill was passed only a few months ago there is one thing in it that is just not good enough, and that is that we have not achieved average weekly earnings whilst people are on compensation.

I point out, as is known to many members, that recently in New South Wales a case was conducted before the New South Wales Arbitration Commission in the building industry that dealt with a claim by building workers for a make-up pay in the award showing the difference between workmen's compensation and average weekly earnings. The result of the commission's inquiries was that the presidential member presiding granted the union's claim. What happened? Immediately a separate pool or insurance system had to be set up to ensure that the difference we are talking about could be financed adequately by the employers. That is not what we want to see happen in South Australia, because although they achieved their objective they also doubled the cost of administration.

I suggest that in the next few months throughout Australia many awards of this kind will be made, and if they follow what happened in New South Wales we will have a hell of a mess with insurance systems. I suggest seriously that every member of the community, whether employer, insurance company, and certainly the worker, would benefit if the Government introduced a Bill this session to amend the Act, but only in this respect. I do not suggest for a moment that it would be fair to introduce a substantial series of amendments that may change the whole nature of a Bill that was only passed a few months ago, but I suggest that the time is ripe to move an amendment to provide for average weekly earnings whilst the person is receiving compensation.

I do not have in mind anything to increase the lump sum, but I believe that this is a matter of great moral value and the incontestable right of any workman. That principle

has been upheld by commission after commission and also by the International Labor Organization, and I believe that this amendment could be made. As a result of the Workmen's Compensation Act, there was, in a sense, a new deal between the unions, the employers, and the insurance companies, and I believe that they were prepared to consider these things rationally. I believe that my suggestion would not only provide a much needed improvement and a much needed standard but also could do it rationally, and would reduce the administrative cost to the employer. I hope that during this session not only will we see a Bill to improve industrial arbitration but also we will see an amendment to the existing workmen's compensation legislation. I turn now to the related issue of workmen's compensation and accidents generally. This afternoon I received the report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Compensation for Personal Injury in New Zealand. By leave of the House I ask that pages 177 to 188 of that report be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable member seek leave—

Mr. Millhouse: No: it is only statistical matter, surely, that can be incorporated.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member enlighten the House about the content of these pages? Is it statistical in nature?

Mr. McRAE: No.

Mr. Millhouse: Why did you say it was?

Mr. McRAE: I did not say it was.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member say what pages he wants printed in *Hansard*?

Mr. McRAE: The pages give the conclusions and recommendations of the Royal Commission. They deal with recommendations on workmen's compensation and with the relationship between the workmen's compensation system and other actions for personal injury.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must quote the references he wants included in *Hansard*. Standing Order 138 provides:

Where a member, in speaking to a question, refers to a statistical or factual table relevant to the question, such table may, at the request of the member and by leave of the House, be inserted in the official report of the Parliamentary debates without being read.

If the honourable member wants the information included in *Hansard*, he will have to

disclose the information to the House, in accordance with the Standing Order I have quoted.

Mr. McRAE: I take it that, if the material is not purely statistical material, I cannot get it included in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr. McRAE: In connection with the requirements of a compensation scheme, page 177 of the report of the New Zealand Royal Commission on Compensation for Personal Injury states:

There are five essential principles which should be accepted by any modern system of compensation as follows:

- (1) In the national interest, and as a matter of national obligation, the community must protect all citizens (including the self-employed) and the housewives who sustain them from the burden of sudden individual losses when their ability to contribute to the general welfare by their work has been interrupted by physical incapacity.
- (2) All injured persons should receive compensation from any community-financed scheme on the same uniform method of assessment, regardless of the causes which gave rise to their injuries.
- (3) The scheme should be deliberately organized to urge forward their physical and vocational recovery while at the same time providing a real measure of money compensation for their losses.
- (4) Real compensation demands that income-related benefits should be paid for the whole period of incapacity and recognition of the plain fact that any permanent bodily impairment is a loss in itself regardless of its effect on earning capacity.
- (5) The achievement of the system must not be eroded by delays in compensation, inconsistencies in assessments, or waste in administration.

Not only does the report say that workmen's compensation ought to be dealt with in the same way as we dealt with it in 1971 but it also says that all actions for personal injury ought to be dealt with in the same way. That is the point that I want to make. I hope that in the lifetime of this Government systematic legislation will be introduced that will provide that all accidents—motor vehicle, industrial, workmen's compensation, etc.—will be dealt with by the same informal tribunal on the same basis as we now deal with workmen's compensation. I consider that to be essential, and I ask all members to read the New Zealand Royal Commission's report.

Regarding the prevention of industrial accidents and disease and the rehabilitation of the injured, I believe that it is just not good enough only to provide for good systems of compensation for those who are injured, be it by road accident or by industrial accident: what we must do is to stop the industrial accident in the first place, to prevent diseases in the first place, and to see that the rehabilitation of the injured is of the highest standard. We are attempting to do that by means of our Select Committee in its inquiries from many witnesses. I believe that we can achieve the aim that I have set out.

Members may be surprised to know that more working time is lost in this community through industrial accidents than through strikes. No fewer than 10,000 industrial accidents, each causing one week's loss of ability to work (or more), occurred in South Australia; the number of hours lost in that way is far greater than the number of hours lost through strikes in this State. It is imperative that we set up a system of industrial safety that will give us access to statistics and research; in that way we will know that our legislation will be at the highest level. We must also ensure that proper training standards are provided for our inspectors. Because of the complex constitutional difficulties between the Commonwealth and the States, we must ensure that we delineate the functions of each of them. We must demand that, while the Commonwealth Government is not constitutionally in this field and cannot be, priority be given to Commonwealth funding to enable us to look to the rehabilitation of workers.

Not only should injured workers be rehabilitated but also the unfortunate type of person whom every member knows—the unemployable person. Given the courage, the determination and the skilled personnel, more can be done for such a person than is being done at present. In the process, by all these means, we can make ourselves far more economically viable and a far happier community and we can establish a system whose industrial relations can be second to none, but it depends at all times not on haphazard guesswork but on careful research, planning and scientific techniques. Unfortunately, our whole system has “grown up” like Topsy, and it is not good enough to let it go on in that way. The Government has the policies that can produce dramatic improvements in all these areas. I only hope that, when the legislation is introduced, it will be looked at closely on its merits and

that members will display the same humanitarian approach that they displayed last time, particularly in relation to workmen's compensation.

Many other items of legislation foreshadowed in His Excellency's Speech will effect great improvements. None of that legislation is of greater importance than the legislation to amend the Juvenile Courts Act. I applaud the Attorney-General for his decision to introduce that legislation, which will remove a scourge that I, as a legal practitioner, often saw: I have seen children being treated like criminals and herded together in the old railway building in King William Street. They have been crowded around by hardened criminals, their parents in distress, welfare officers, etc. That was a disgraceful and sickening thing for any legal practitioner to see. Judging by his previous standards in these matters, I am sure that the Attorney-General will introduce legislation that will get rid of that.

I also hope that the legislation will lead to a more enlightened approach by the Judiciary, and I hope that in future we will not have peculiar statements made in the press by some members of the current Judiciary. I am afraid that what they have said harks back to the penal or colonial days. A person is wrong if he adopts the philosophy that says that one can label a 16-year-old person as a hopeless case. I do not believe that we ought to abandon anyone, but we certainly ought not to abandon a person at the age of 16 years or 18 years. I believe that, by a realistic assessment of both the industrial and social policies that the Government is bringing forward, there can be a great advancement for the people of South Australia. I congratulate the Government on its efforts, and I look forward to the legislation to be introduced into this House and to the opportunity that we shall have to speak to it.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): If I were to walk down Jetty Road, Glenelg, at 3 o'clock in the morning in my pyjamas, blowing a whistle, I would be arrested; but if I were to walk down Jetty Road at 3 o'clock in the morning carrying a placard saying “Paint them black and send them back”, nothing would happen. This is exactly what we have seen recently in the case of neighbours of a certain motel in my district who were disturbed at all hours of the day and night by people protesting against the arrival in South Australia of a certain rugby team. I remind the people concerned

that no-one protested when the South African women's bowling team visited South Australia 18 months ago.

Mr. Langley: We didn't know they were here.

Mr. BECKER: Why is there discrimination now? I have never known the member for Unley to refuse people an opportunity to play cricket in South Africa, so it will be interesting to know what are his views on the proposed visit of the South African cricket team.

Mr. Langley: Who selects the team?

Mr. BECKER: As the member for Unley has accepted the hospitality of the South Africans in the past, I do not think he is in any position to rubbish anyone at this stage. Why should not certain others in the world enjoy the game of cricket? As one who believes in the principles of the freedom of man, freedom of initiative and individuality, acceptance of responsibility, and the fact that democracy depends on self-discipline, obedience of the law and the honest administration of the law, I wonder what His Excellency meant when he said that this Government planned to introduce a certain number of law reforms. We wonder for the first time whether the laws relating to disturbing the peace and to loitering will be removed. We know that it has been the intention of certain Government members to see these laws in South Australia removed.

Mr. Coumbe: Including the Premier.

Mr. BECKER: We know it is the Premier, and here is his chance. If he removes these laws, all I can say is, "God help South Australia." When we consider democracy and what is happening in South Australia, it is interesting to note that in 1846 the first union in South Australia was formed, known as the Tailors Union; and shortly after that a union, known as the Bootmakers Society, was formed among bootmakers and shoemakers, and that organization still operates today. In 1848, the miners at Burra formed a union, and this was closely followed by the formation of a similar organization in Moonta and Wallaroo. Affiliated with the miners' societies was a political association that was formed in 1866 to oppose the policy of assisted immigration and generally to place the whole matter concerning labour before the public, especially at the time of municipal and Parliamentary elections. Therefore, we see that the Australian Labor Party has hardly changed from those early days.

One is amazed to hear statements to the effect that the Labor Party does not take any great interest in municipal elections, for we know what has been the position for many years, dating back to 1866. The unions themselves more or less formed the Labor Party to look after the political ambitions of the trade union movement. As one who has been involved in the white collar unions, having served as Vice-President and President of an organization for five years and having been a member of the Federal Executive of that organization, I have always believed that it is desirable to achieve 100 per cent membership within our association. Having devoted all my spare time to union activities, I thought it was only fair and reasonable that everyone concerned should join and be part of the union in question, but we could not achieve that.

Neither the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission nor our employers would allow us to have compulsory unionism, yet the function is the same as that of the Parliamentary institution. By helping someone, a person often helps the majority who may not even have voted for or supported him. It is rather disturbing to find for the first time that the Shop Assistants Union is making a concerted effort to build up its membership. Indeed, I do not deny the union the right to do this, because I know that the Secretary of that union has worked extremely hard over the years and has battled, as some Government members have said, under great difficulties. However, I do not approve of the tactics that have been used to induce shop assistants in South Australia to join that union. One is horrified to discover that, once people have joined the union, they are being asked to sign a pledge that at all future Commonwealth and State elections they will vote for the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Langley: Name the person!

Mr. BECKER: I know members opposite think this is comical; I did not myself believe that any organizer of that union would openly canvass people working in retail stores in South Australia and insist that they sign such a pledge. However, I find this is one way in which the Labor Party is trying to kid the young people of this State into voting for it in future.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Name the person who is doing it! Name him if you can! You haven't got the guts to name him!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Langley: You heard it on the grapevine.

Mr. BECKER: I hear nothing on the grapevine; I always check my facts. Members opposite seem to be as horrified as I was to think that someone is doing this. The young people in South Australia will wake up to this intimidation, and the Labor Party will lose more support than it gains. It is high time that this sort of thing was brought out into the open and that the young people were told that, at the next State election, they are not compelled to vote for the Labor Party but that they may vote for whichever political Party they wish.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've been reading up on the League of Rights.

Mr. BECKER: Do not worry about that. It is high time that someone spelt this out, telling young people in South Australia what is going on.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It would be nice if we got some truth for a change.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know it's all lies.

Mr. BECKER: I object to the remark that I am not telling the truth. In his speech in this debate, the member for Florey attacked the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and its profits, saying that it was the greatest alligator commercially in Australia. Later, he said that it had raped the country. The Secretary of the Australian Council of Trade Unions has made a similar statement, saying that the B.H.P. Company has been raping Australia. When we consider how many people this company employs, how much expansion and development it has contributed in South Australia, and how much it pays in taxation, I think Australian workers would be in trouble if it decided to sell its assets and invested in a locally based finance company, whereby it would be able to pay a higher dividend. If it did that, 53,904 people would be out of employment, as that is the number it now employs. I agree that the company's profit of \$68,500,000 is considerable. However, if members are thinking of criticizing this company and its profits, they should first look at the following article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, July 10, commending the company on its profit:

The consolidated net result was shown to have risen by 19.3 per cent. However, in a swing away from normal practice directors have come out with two sets of figures to

throw light on the group's dependence on oil and gas for a continued uptrend in earnings. But for oil and gas activities, the group would have sustained a \$11,880,000 fall in net profit instead of the \$11,100,000 rise actually achieved.

In other words, had it not been for oil and natural gas, the company's profit would have been down almost \$12,000,000. Honourable members may say that the company received the benefit of the Bass Strait oil field, but I remind them that this company and Esso Standard Oil (Australia) Limited have invested over \$400,000,000 in the Bass Strait project to search for oil and natural gas, discover them, and effect commercial production. It is expected that another \$100,000,000 may have to be spent within the next year or two years, and that it will take 20 years for the B.H.P. Company to get back its initial capital outlay. When we consider that this company had to raise \$200,000,000 in Australia at competitive interest rates, I think we can say that it is entitled to be proud of its record of development.

Unions have had more than their share from this company. For example, with regard to the Bass Strait gas field, the company undertook to hire a pipelaying barge to lay 66,000ft. of pipe from Sale out to its oil rig. This was estimated to take three months to lay at an estimated cost of \$45,000 a day. What the B.H.P. Company and Esso did not count on was that nine unions were involved in this work, and they had a ball; they took 15 months to lay the pipe, and it cost \$1,300,000 extra. This is an example of the industrial sabotage that takes place.

Mr. Clark: The company still did all right.

Mr. BECKER: It made a profit, but it would have made more and would have achieved more if it had not been stood over on this one project alone. The member for Florey also referred to the increase in the price of steel. The article in the *Advertiser* of July 10, to which I have already referred, also states:

Furthermore, B.H.P.'s steel output in the past year turned downward for the first time in 23 years owing to industrial disputes.

That is not a good record. After 23 years its production was reduced as a result of continued industrial disputes. That is what commerce must expect in this country today. Eventually, the unions will bite the hand that feeds them; overall they are letting down the workers they represent.

The member for Florey referred to the Adelaide Steamship Company. Its increase in profits has been the result of diversification forced on it over the years. This is the first time that its profit has returned to a reasonable level since 1959. As there were moves to take over the company in 1959, it was forced into re-organization and reconstruction of its capital so that this South Australian company could be maintained in South Australia. However, this is another industry that has been plagued with industrial disputes. The Chairman's report states:

In 1969, when operating at peak capacity, the yard, in addition to substantial subcontracting work, provided direct employment for about 1,000 people in South Australia. As a result of the reduced level of activity now prevailing the work force is reduced to no more than 450.

I believe it is still subject to wide fluctuations. The Myer Emporium Limited was also attacked by the member for Florey for making excessive profits. However, that firm employs over 20,000 people throughout Australia. Can we afford to lose these industries? Why should we kick organizations and companies that are prepared to contribute something to Australia? These organizations fill a need, and unions should be careful about what they are doing.

This afternoon a question was asked about the parents and teachers meeting at Norwood on June 16. With other members, I have done my homework on these matters. Various teachers and parents have presented me with petitions, as they presented them to other members, suggesting that certain projects be undertaken at their schools and that certain needs in education be fulfilled. I wrote to the Minister of Education informing him of these requests and asking him to say how and when these requirements would be attended to. Typically, he wrote back acknowledging receipt of my submissions, and that is all he did. I thought I would come back at him by asking him for an explanation, because that was what I had asked for. I shall refer to the letter I received. It shows honourable members the typically blatant and arrogant attitude of the present Minister of Education. We heard about there being a crisis in education. When the Labor Party was in Opposition we were told there there was a crisis in education, and there has been a crisis, too, since Labor has been in office, but the Labor Government now says that the crisis is the fault of the Commonwealth Government. The letter from the Minister of Education, dated July 16, states:

I refer to your letter of June 25, 1971, concerning the needs of schools in your electorate. Many of the points raised in your letter of June 21 have equal applicability to other schools in the State. So far as these matters are concerned, a general policy statement is being prepared which can be issued to all schools and members. In addition, my office staff are examining the many letters we have received so that particular problems of each school can be examined and reported on by professional officers of the department. This procedure is being adopted so that the valuable time of professional officers is not swamped by the voluminous number of points which have general but not specific applicability. You may not be aware or understand that one purpose of the meeting held in the Norwood Town Hall on June 16 was to acquaint local members of Parliament of the difficulties being experienced by schools, so that they would be in a better position to argue on behalf of their schools for financial assistance from the Commonwealth following on the conclusion of the national survey. I hope that you will, if you have not already done so, take up with your Commonwealth colleagues the particular problems of schools in your area.

This is the typical ballyhoo that we are getting from the Minister. He has done nothing about the problems. He has just wiped the matter overboard, as usual.

Mr. Clark: Did you go to the meeting at Norwood?

Mr. BECKER: Yes, I did.

Mr. Clark: If you heard a Minister (not our Minister) speaking there, you would realize the position. Have you ever heard such a thing!

Mr. BECKER: I think it is also appropriate now to comment on the Government's "on and off" entertainment tax.

Mr. Clark: You didn't want it on, and now you don't want it off. What do you want?

Mr. BECKER: During the debate on the Bill to impose this tax, I said that the tax would not last for long. I think the only way in which we can sum up the Government's action on entertainment tax is to say that it was like a stripper's dress, put on to be taken off. The Governor's Opening Speech mentions the Government's concern about boosting the tourist industry in South Australia, and I should like to tell the House of a recent development at Glenelg, where 150 business people have pledged between \$12,000 and \$15,000 to promote tourism and the development of Glenelg. I do not think any member of this House could be critical of this effort by the local business men: I think it is a commendable effort. Here is a chance for the

Premier to assist in the promotion and development drive that Glenelg will undertake. In the year 1969-70 the Australian tourist travel industry earned \$2,395,000,000. It is hard to assess how much was received in South Australia.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. BECKER: It was estimated that between \$1,500,000 and \$2,000,000 was spent by tourists in Glenelg last year. It is difficult to estimate just how much is spent by them in South Australia each year but one of the big problems facing the tourist industry in South Australia is encouraging South Australians to see South Australia first. Everything should be done to promote this idea within the State. We want South Australians to know all about their own State so that, when they travel to other States and overseas, they can become worthy ambassadors of South Australia's tourist industry. Therefore, I am moved by the Glenelg tradesmen who raised between \$12,000 and \$15,000 and will spend that in 12 months to promote Glenelg. The State Government should be thankful that this group of people is doing that, because we often hear the cry "There is not enough money for this" or "There is not enough money for that". There should be plenty of money for tourism and its promotion.

The South Australian Tourist Bureau will make a handy profit this year. It should, because the trips undertaken by the Premier and other Ministers to other States and overseas should result in good commissions for the bureau, and should handsomely increase its profits. Of course, the State is paying for it: it is merely a matter of transferring it from one department to another. However, the Tourist Bureau should receive an increased income. Looking at the effect of tourism on Australia as a whole, we find that the income from tourism is greater than the earnings from wool exports. Tourism represented 8 per cent of the gross national product last year, and it is still growing. Therefore tourism should be treated as a rich uncle instead of a poor relation.

I have the greatest admiration for the Director of our Tourist Bureau and his staff when we witness the shocking conditions under which they work in their temporary premises in King William Street. For some time the Government has been saying it intends to build a new Tourist Bureau. The construction of a new building was announced the other day and I sincerely hope that the building is erected with

the utmost urgency so that visitors to this State can see that we have a building worthy of accommodating the staff and of showing off what we have in South Australia—that it is an attractive building. It should encourage people to go inside and browse around to see what we have here.

In Sydney one would walk past the branch of our Tourist Bureau and hardly notice it. It is a shocking building in a gloomy spot; it is not in the main area where most of the other Tourist Bureaux are established. One must be realistic: it costs considerably more to build a tourist office in New South Wales, and particularly in Sydney, than it does here. Even so, if we are to endeavour to encourage people to come to South Australia from other States, we must have the accommodation for our representatives in those States. So, while the Premier is globe-trotting and making statements that are continually embarrassing to the Commonwealth Government, we sincerely hope he will return with ideas to upgrade our tourist offices in the Eastern States.

No matter what has been done or is being done by the Government, and no matter what has been done by business interests to encourage tourism in South Australia, one wonders what the effect will be of the ban placed by the Minister of Roads and Transport on the use of our trains. When purchasing a ticket one could expect that the first question the ticket seller would ask is whether one is a racist or a South African. This attitude, however, could damage our image not only in Australia but also overseas. If we adopted this attitude, anything spent on promoting tourism in South Australia would be used for a lost cause.

The Government and Government departments must adopt a realistic attitude in order to encourage tourists to visit South Australia. In addition, one would have thought that by now the Glenelg tram line route would have been beautified, because this tram service is classed as a tourist attraction. One would consider that the Minister would have ensured that the Glenelg trams would be painted: it is a long time since they were painted, and nothing has been done to make them more attractive. I hope that the Minister will purchase some paint in the next few weeks and repaint the trams to make them more attractive, and also to consider providing conductors and drivers with a more attractive uniform instead of the nasty-looking blue one they have to wear. I am sure that a more

suitable material and colour could be found for a more appropriate uniform to be used on this service.

I believe that the business people of Glenelg are to be complimented on what they are trying to do. Another section of the community affected by the tourist industry is that comprising people providing accommodation. It is estimated that in Australia an extra 2,600 rooms will be needed between now and 1975 to accommodate overseas tourists, without allowing for any increase in tourist activities in Australia. Most of our hotels are very good, but many are lousy. The State Government should try to upgrade the standard of accommodation provided by hotels, although we do not have problems with most of the motels. The Government's plan to build a hotel in Victoria Square is realistic, but I think the Premier should try to encourage developers to build large hotels that have conference rooms. I should like to see South Australia become the conference convention city of Australia, and the Premier and the State Government should concentrate their efforts on this aspect, rather than have the Premier popping overseas to see his mates in various countries.

Hand in hand with tourism goes development, and in the last few months we have seen a development that is new to South Australia called property syndications. A person can purchase a small share in a property development, and almost overnight we have seen numerous companies formed. I have considered some of these companies and the various ways that they have presented their brochures, and it is clear to me that now the Government should form an institute of syndicators to lay down guide lines for these property developers. In this way syndicate operators and investors would be protected. Syndicate development companies should continue to flourish because real estate syndication is an excellent way of encouraging new development in South Australia. Such development has taken place in the Glenelg and West Beach areas in the last few months.

His Excellency's Speech deals with the Fore-shore and Beaches Committee. We have been told that a Director of Environment will be appointed under the Minister for Conservation. Here again one can criticize the Government and the Minister for their failure to release the committee's final report. The committee, which was established late last year and met almost weekly, handed down an interim report

before making its final report. After the storms during the Easter weekend and the Anzac weekend much pressure was put on the Government; I asked it to consider financially assisting the seaside councils whose areas had suffered much damage during those storms. It was only after that pressure had been put on the Government that those councils received financial assistance, which, of course, was not sufficient. Ironically, the Government was informed that winter storms were expected at about Easter and during the Anzac weekend and that further storms were expected in August and September, but we still have not seen the committee's report.

Mr. Harrison: Are you blaming the Government for the winter storms, as some other members blamed a previous Labor Government for a drought?

Mr. BECKER: No, but I am blaming the Government for its failure to release the report and for its failure to implement its recommendations forthwith. If those recommendations are not implemented the Government and the seaside councils will be involved in much greater expense later. The question will arise whether we should have a series of groynes along the beaches to prevent erosion, whether we should adopt one of the recommendations of the Culver report that sand be dumped so that it can be washed up the gulf, or whether we should adopt the overseas system of having portable groynes, thereby building up the quantity of sand on the beaches.

My constituents and most people in the metropolitan area are very much concerned about the siting of the Adelaide Airport. I recently attended a special public meeting organized by the Anti Airport Noise Association, at which meeting the following resolution was unanimously passed:

To the Premier of South Australia: This meeting of the Anti Airport Noise Association seeks an assurance from the South Australian Government that no land at present under the control of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust under the provisions of that Act will be resumed by the South Australian Government to enable the Adelaide Airport to be extended over such land.

The Mayor of Glenelg (Mr. Derek Noble) seconded the motion. The crux of the matter concerning the proposed extension of the Adelaide Airport is simply that "the Commonwealth Government shall not acquire either by agreement or by compulsory process land which, under the laws of a State or Territory of the Commonwealth, is dedicated or reserved, or is

vested in trustees, as a public park or otherwise for the purposes of public recreation". Section 38 (1) of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, under the heading "Power of Resumption", provides:

If satisfied that the land to be resumed is required for any purpose which is deemed by the Governor to be a public purpose, the Governor may by proclamation resume any of the land transferred to the trust by the Treasurer pursuant to section 29. Upon any such proclamation being made the land to which it relates shall cease to be part of the reserve and shall be deemed to be Crown lands.

Therefore, in my opinion, the Anti-Airport Noise Association is correct in assuming that Executive Council has the only say concerning this land. If that land is acquired by the State Government and handed over to the Commonwealth Government, part of our environment will be seriously affected: it will take in the Glenelg Baseball Club playing area; it will force the West Beach Recreation Trust to close eight holes of the Patawalonga nine-hole golf course; it will necessitate the filling of the Patawalonga or piping it under the runway; it will necessitate redirecting the south-western suburbs drainage scheme; it will necessitate rebuilding Military Road, now a two-track road, into a six-lane or eight-lane highway, coming across the area south of Anderson Avenue, which borders this land; it could necessitate acquiring several houses in Glenelg North; and it will certainly result in increased aircraft noise in that locality. The Minister for Conservation, who should be greatly concerned about this matter, has made no statements on it and has done nothing about this proposed takeover by the Commonwealth Government. The Minister is, of course, sitting back waiting for everyone to do the work, and he will then select the time when it is politically expedient to say, "Yes", "No" or "Bad luck"; he is sitting on the fence. One cannot understand his attitude to this matter, because in May, 1969, the Minister, as the member for West Torrens, said that he was greatly concerned at the noise impact on the whole of his district, and he said, in addition:

Of course, the planes pass over built-up areas, and quite often. I now live at West Beach, north of the airport, and I am not bothered by the noise. However, when I lived on the Anzac Highway at Plympton, which is certainly a built-up area, you had to stop speaking on the telephone when a jet went over. The house would also shake.

True, most residents at West Beach are not affected by the noise at this stage but one would expect the Minister, as the former mem-

ber for the area, to do something about the proposed takeover of this land and to prevent further extension of the Adelaide Airport.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I think that at that time I was saying you should go to the Commonwealth Government and take up this matter.

Mr. BECKER: I am quoting the Minister's statement that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on May 3, 1969. The Minister has had his chance to do something but has done little. I should have expected the Minister, who should be concerned with our environment, to do something.

Mr. Harrison: What have you done—made promises!

Mr. BECKER: Not only that: we have carried out considerable action, research, and so forth. Members opposite may rest assured that I have the support of residents in the area, who wish to protect their environment. If the Minister is not prepared to do anything at least they can look to me to do something on their behalf. The argument about the airport has gone on for many years. There are always sceptics who say that the houses came after the airport, but no-one told anyone not to build or to buy there. It is ironical that the Housing Trust and the War Service Homes Commission built houses in the area. Therefore, no argument can be put forward that residents should tolerate the noise nuisance in their environment. Clearly, the choice is either that the people move away from the area or that the airport is moved. As my constituents and I believe that the airport must go, we need the help of the Minister for Conservation to ensure that our environment will be protected in future. The Minister has the opportunity to do something, and it is high time that he acted.

Recently reference was made to the appointment of a Minister of Sport and Culture. When I suggested this in the Address in Reply debate last year, I was told that the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, was looking after these matters. However, we now find that many amateur theatres in South Australia are struggling. One that comes to mind is the Q Theatre in Halifax Street, Adelaide, which has battled for 12 months to establish itself. At this intimate theatre, which accommodates 150 people, many first-class productions have been presented. The theatre management approached the Government for assistance or advice, but it has had no reply. That is the treatment the State

Government is giving amateur theatre in South Australia. Currently the Q Theatre is presenting a play called *The Dinkum Bambino*; no doubt the Minister's advisers do not want him to see this play. This high-class production has been written, produced and acted by South Australians and, believe it or not, rights to the play have been sold overseas to the motion picture industry. In this case a group of South Australians, which is trying to build up amateur theatre in South Australia, is receiving no encouragement from the Government. What is the Government doing to encourage amateur theatre and culture?

It is interesting to read that New South Wales has established a Ministry of Sport. Unfortunately, the problem now arising in our schools is that there is less sporting activity than there has been previously. One of the reasons for this is the tremendous pressure on teaching staff. We would expect the Education Department to try to help in this field by encouraging more sporting activity in our schools. As we do not have sufficient playing fields or open spaces, perhaps the Minister for Conservation can stir himself up and provide more playing fields in future. Now that the crisis in education is over, perhaps the Minister of Education can help to encourage sport in our schools.

I am greatly concerned at the mounting deficit that we expect; probably additional taxation will be necessary to balance the Budget. One wonders just what the State Government is doing to try to curb the deficit. Some time ago, I heard that the Public Buildings Department was summoned by the Premier's Department to do certain work. When an officer of the Public Buildings Department was sent out in a truck to obtain three quotes for this work, he drove around the city all day to get them. That is fair enough; that is the normal business procedure in private enterprise. However, one cannot help wondering whether it was necessary to send an officer of the Public Buildings Department in a truck around the metropolitan area to obtain a quote to have something chrome-plated for the Premier's Department at a cost of 75c. That is pretty careful budgeting and pretty careful management on the part of the State Government and the State Premier!

I have often advocated that janitors should be appointed to our schools to assist in protecting Education Department property. The cost of our school buildings and the equipment

in them runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars. Vandalism is on the increase in some parts of the metropolitan area, yet these schools are left unguarded for a considerable time during the day as well as throughout the night. It is about time something was done in this respect. I am sure that janitors or caretakers could look after our schools, and they could be employed on some other duties during the day.

In our schools today, if a fuse is blown the staff is not permitted to repair it; it is necessary to get someone from the Public Buildings Department to carry out that repair. Also, on one occasion a drain at one of our large suburban high schools was blocked. The person who was looking after the lawns said he thought that the drain had been blocked by two tennis balls. A teacher at the school was told that he was not to attempt to clear this drain and that he had to contact the Public Buildings Department about it. Two men from that department then came to the school in a truck to clean out the drain. After examining it, they had their cup of tea while they decided where they would cut a big hole in the lawn in order to repair the drain. While they were doing that, the gardener, who had made up his mind that he was not going to have his lawns cut up, obtained a long piece of wire and poked it down the drain, whereupon the two tennis balls popped out. One of the Public Buildings Department's men then said, "That's very nice; we have been allocated 1½ days to clean this drain; now what are we going to do?" They then sat there for the whole day. If that is how we administer this State and try to curb the cost of running it, goodness knows what goes on in the financial affairs of the State generally. It is about time a closer look was taken at some of the activities carried out by our departments.

We could also look closely into the question of public health. There has been much press speculation recently about what is going to happen to our abortion law reform. One of the most alarming suggestions is that the figure of 1,350 abortions for the first 12 months is actually more like 13,500. It has been suggested that many medical practitioners are not filling in the forms, that they find that a certain questionnaire in respect of those forms is very difficult to police, and that the records are therefore difficult to compile. It is also said that there are some who are even prepared to run the risk of a fine. Apparently,

there are certain ways in which this legislation can be circumvented and it is a shame to see this happening.

When one looks at the Government's proposed legislation, as set out in His Excellency's Speech, and the law reforms that could come, one wonders just what is going to happen to South Australia. To sum up, we must go back about 200 years to 1775, when Charles Dickens made some comments on life that appear to be as remarkably appropriate today as they were then. He said:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times. It was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness ... It was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness. It was the spring of hope, it was the winter of Despair. We had everything before us, we had nothing before us. We were all going direct to heaven, the other way.

When we consider what has happened in the first 12 months of office of the present Government, I see where we are going. Doubtless, it is appropriate that there should be an eleventh commandment, stating:

Thou shalt not criticize a Socialist Government, a Socialist Premier and his Ministers, for if thou dost, thou art banished from the State for the rest of thy life.

Will that be the attitude of the State Government? We have evidence that, if one criticizes a Minister or the Government, one is attacked and attacked. What hope is there for the future of South Australia? Let us get back to the proper and commonsense administration that we have had under former Liberal Governments. If the present Government cannot carry on what former Liberal Governments have planned, it is high time it stepped down and let us get back in office to see that South Australia is properly administered.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion. I join other members in conveying my sympathy to those persons mentioned in the Governor's Speech who have passed away since the House last sat. I refer to the Hon. Sir Collier Robert Cudmore, the Hon. Colin Davies Rowe, Mr. John Lancelot Cowan, and, of course, Mr. Samuel James Lawn (the former member for Adelaide). I and other members convey to the relatives of those former members our deepest sympathy.

First, I compliment the mover of the motion, the new member for Adelaide, on the content of his speech and on the capable way in which he delivered it. I also congratulate him on his election as member for Adelaide and trust that his parliamentary career will be long and

successful. The Governor's Speech indicates the continuation of the progressive legislative programme that the Labor Government has pursued following its election to office in May, 1970. As mentioned in the Governor's Speech, the Government will continue its policy of promoting industrial development, the tourist industry, and the expansion of the housing programme, and awareness and action on problems associated with pollution, conservation and our environment. These are all part of the Government's intention to continue its legislative programme in the interests of the citizens of the State.

In addition, the Governor's Speech indicates that in this session industrial legislation will be introduced to make proper provision for the welfare and safety of persons employed in industry and commerce. This afternoon the member for Playford dealt with the industrial aspects of the Government's legislative programme during the last 12 months and also referred to future legislation. Therefore, I will not cover that ground again.

Legislation on consumer protection, dealing with used car sales and door-to-door sales, will also be introduced. Many of my constituents have approached me regarding consumer protection particularly in relation to used car sales. I do not think I need go into great detail, because I know that other honourable members have probably had the same experience with their constituents in respect of the problems associated with used cars. In the interests of the citizens of the State, I hope the forthcoming legislation will cover this aspect.

These are matters that successive Liberal Governments have continually and blatantly avoided, yet in his speech the other day the Leader of the Opposition, in a tone of what I may describe as outraged indignation, criticized, though with an obvious lack of enthusiasm, the Government and described the Speech by the Governor as a "dusting off of the shelf" and a "stereotyped document". The Leader seemed to me to show a lack of enthusiasm. I can understand that, for he has continually to look sideways and possibly behind him to ascertain who is breathing down his neck for the leadership of the Liberal Party in South Australia. Probably this is because the Leader, on his own admission in this House, has led his Party into political oblivion for the next 12 years—and maybe longer.

The article, which is headed "L.C.L. pauses for reflection", deals with the internal problems of the L.C.L. I do not wish to go into

that in detail; the press knows the situation better than I do and the colossal blunders of the Commonwealth leadership, both past and present, about Vietnam, the F.111, oversea trade and, of course, the latest—the situation in China. That will cause L.C.L. members to reflect, and no doubt all the citizens in Australia will reflect on the credibility of the Liberal and Country Party coalition and its ability to govern this country.

Mr. Clark: Did you hear McMahon when he heard Nixon was going to China?

Mr. SLATER: No, I did not, but I saw a recent press article by a leading Australian authority on Far-Eastern affairs, Bruce Grant. He had this to say:

For Australia, a notable aspect of Mr. Nixon's announced visit to Peking is how foolish it makes Mr. McMahon. Last Monday Mr. McMahon came out with a slashing attack on Mr. Whitlam's talks with Mr. Chou En-lai, in which he said Mr. Whitlam was isolating Australia from our friends and allies and Chou was trying to denigrate our greatest ally, the United States. Chou even told Mr. Nixon how to run his Administration, Mr. McMahon observed. "What an impertinence to the leader of the United States, and it is not likely to be forgotten by the American Administration." Despite Mr. McMahon's urging, Mr. Nixon has forgotten. Indeed, as we now know, his emissary Dr. Kissinger was in China last weekend (while Mr. Whitlam was there) arranging, no doubt among other things, the invitation by Mr. Chou to Mr. Nixon. Mr. McMahon's unnecessary and purely political speech now makes him look foolish on two counts.

Mr. Keneally: Is that the McMahon that the Leader of Opposition speaks of so highly?

Mr. SLATER: Yes. The article continues:

First, he is evidently not well informed on American tactics. Secondly, his political judgment is at fault, for one did not have to know that Dr. Kissinger was in Peking to sense the movement of American policy, so that while anti-Peking rhetoric is still safe enough for rallies of the Democratic Labor Party it is irresponsible for the leader of the party in Government. Mr. McMahon now stands not simply as a Prime Minister who has been unsuccessful in reaching an accord with Peking, which is not necessarily to his discredit, but as a politician leading his Party astray, which is serious.

The failure of the Commonwealth Government to alleviate the plight of the rural industry is yet another indication of its failure to come to grips with an important problem.

Mr. Gunn: What has your Government done to help the rural industry?

Mr. SLATER: The awakening of the rural community to its plight has been demonstrated in the recent Legislative Council Southern Dis-

trict by-election by the vote obtained by the independent Country Party candidate against the Liberal and Country League candidate, and this indicates the discontent that exists in the rural industry with the Liberal and Country League.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Did you know that the League of Rights has taken over on the West Coast?

Mr. SLATER: I have heard that, and perhaps the member for Eyre may confirm it. The Leader's undue criticism, and that of members opposite, of the legislative programme of the Labor Government has a pretty hollow ring. We are concerned with all sections of the community, and I trust that that concern will be the keynote of the Government's future policy. This was instanced in the Governor's Opening Speech.

I turn now to a lighter matter, but it is one in which I have a considerable interest and one that I am sure is of interest to other members. It has been referred to recently in the press and described as undue aggressiveness or the killer instinct in junior and schoolboy sport. The contention has been made that too great an emphasis is placed on winning—that there is too much aggression and too much emphasis on winning at all costs—rather than playing the game for the sake of the sport. Whilst one could not condone unfair tactics or undue rough play, I believe that the dampening of spirit, the determination to succeed, and the desire to perform well could have, in many aspects, a deleterious effect on the attitude of young sportsmen and sportswomen, who in future may desire to represent their State and country in a sport.

Mr. Hall: You believe in free enterprise, do you?

Mr. SLATER: I do in that regard: I believe in free enterprise, and my Party believes in it—

Mr. Hall: I congratulate you.

Mr. SLATER: —in its proper place. The nation has been fortunate in the past in having great sporting ambassadors who have competed overseas with great credit to themselves and to Australia. I suggest that this country would not have had this sort of representation in international competition had not the individual had the determination, the courage, and the dedication to train from an early age and to succeed in his sport. The Evonne Goolagongs, the Kerry O'Briens, the Famechons, and the Sharon Goulds of the future need to have

these characteristics developed and encouraged at an early age. Every consideration should be given to junior sport, not only by sporting clubs but by organizations, the public, and the Government.

We had situations in the past when Commonwealth Games teams and Olympic teams competing overseas have suffered from some financial difficulties, and they should have been assisted by the Commonwealth and State Governments. I note with alarm the recent decision of the New South Wales Education Department to abandon sporting activities in high schools. That is a step in the wrong direction that was made presumably because of the shortage of teachers. However, students have protested about the decision and most teachers do not agree with it. Sporting bodies generally have expressed their concern at the abandonment of sporting activities in New South Wales high schools.

A conference of high school headmasters in Adelaide recently decided that it would be disastrous if sport in schools were completely discarded. I do not agree with the statement of the member for Hanson that not as much sport is now being played in schools. On the contrary, I believe that more sport is being played in high schools and primary schools now than ever before, and that is a good thing.

The conference of headmasters further recommended that sport should be looked at in terms of aim and achievement. I believe that competitive sport does not create bad losers; if an individual is a bad loser, that characteristic has resulted from something inherent in his psychological make-up. The contention that competitive sport creates bad losers presupposes a frame of mind that is likely to cause them to lose anyhow.

Let us not deter young sportsmen and sports-women from developing the techniques and the psychological attitudes needed to enable them to compete against opponents in other States and other countries. In the body contact sports, including boxing and Australian rules football, a positive psychological attitude is needed. Although technique and skill are the only requirements in some other sports and physique is not the important factor, nevertheless a determination to succeed is still required. If competition were taken out of sport, we would see the disappearance of sporting activities. Sport and physical education are integral parts of any student's education. It is open to doubt as to whether Australia should be considered a sporting nation;

perhaps we should be labelled a nation of sports watchers. Nevertheless, in view of the facilities available to sportsmen in this country (in comparison with those available in other countries), we have achieved remarkable success in the international sporting sphere.

Opportunities and encouragement should be given in this direction by all sections of the community, including the Government. Such encouragement would be beneficial to the youth of the nation and the nation in general. The National Fitness Council, on which I am the Government representative, is continuing its excellent work of promoting physical recreation for all age groups.

Mr. Clark: And all colours.

Mr. SLATER: Yes. Grants to the council by the Commonwealth Government and the State Government have greatly assisted in promoting an awareness of the benefits of physical education for people generally. However, Governments should make much more money available so that everyone can compete in whatever sport he chooses with the best possible facilities. I believe that this is an important aspect of national welfare and that the health and physical well-being of the individual should be assured.

I challenge the member for Hanson regarding the remarks he has made about the Shop Assistants Union and his contention that that union is forcing people, once they become members, to vote for the Labor Party at Commonwealth and State elections. I challenge him to prove this to the House. I believe that he has been misled by incorrect information that has been conveyed to him on this matter. I challenge the honourable member to submit evidence to prove that this practice is being carried out. He made several extravagant statements in his long speech but this was probably the most extravagant of them all. I challenge him to substantiate the allegations that he made concerning the Shop Assistants Union.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): First, I thank the member for Heysen for speaking this afternoon when I was not able to speak, having taken the adjournment last Thursday. I appreciate his being prepared to speak earlier than he expected to speak. In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I offer my congratulations to the new member for Adelaide and my sympathy to the relatives of those members and former members of Parliament who have died since the last

session. I refer especially to the family of the late member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), who had been in this House ever since I had been here. He preceded me here, and I was very fond of him personally. I do not think we ever said a good word to each other across the Chamber, but outside the Chamber the story was rather different, and I very much regret that he is no longer a member of this House.

I had expected to speak immediately after the member for Mawson, who spoke last Thursday afternoon. As I did not do that, I intended to say nothing about his speech until I was prompted to do so by one of the remarks of the member for Gilles, who has just spoken and who gave qualified support to private enterprise. The most significant remark made by the member for Mawson in his speech was that private enterprise "has had it". He said this in the midst or at the end of the exposition of his policy on conservation concerning this State and, as I say, I think it was significant; I think it was revealing; and I just wonder how it was received by Government members, bearing in mind the fact that the Premier, who, I believe, has the same outlook as that of the member for Mawson (after all, I believe the Premier is one of the member for Mawson's supporters), is out all the time looking for industries to come to South Australia, and these industries are controlled by private enterprise.

Mr. Hall: He will need some to replace those that are leaving.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. If the member for Mawson is going to say such things, he had better be careful that he does not prejudice the future of this State at a time when the Government is trying to do two things: first, to be a Socialist Government; and, secondly, at the same time trying to woo private enterprise. Coming now to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, I was disappointed indeed, as was the Leader, because there was little, if anything, in that Speech that we did not already know. During the last few months several announcements have been made, some of which were repeated in the Speech. I recognized several matters in those sections contributed by the Attorney-General and the Minister of Social Welfare as being matters I had had in hand when in office: the licensing of bailiffs and inquiry agents, and so on. I doubt whether that Speech contained one new item.

I remind the Ministers of this place that the function of the Governor's Speech in opening a session of Parliament is to set out

the legislative programme for the coming session. Either the Government has run out of steam or it did not bother, for one reason or another, to reveal what its programme would be. One of the functions of Parliament is to thrash out the great issues of the day. Although I do not agree with many of the things said by the member for Gilles, and although some of them were irrelevant to the work we do in this Parliament, at least he touched on a number of these issues, but the Governor's Speech did not contain one thing that had any significance for us.

Each of us can make his own list of the issues concerning us today. I suppose that some items would be common, whereas others would not be on every list. Some of the things that I believe are of greatest importance at present are questions of law and order and the right of dissent; the whole future of our system of Government; the pros and cons of the Springbok tour and the actions of the present Government in relation thereto; the whole field of Commonwealth-State relations, financial and otherwise; the problems being experienced in rural industry; and the social revolution in the attitudes of the younger members of our community. Those are some of the things which to me are of the greatest importance, but none of them was referred to in the Speech, which got the treatment it deserved by appearing on page 10 of the *Advertiser* of the next day. That sort of action by the Government will further reduce public interest in and respect for the Parliamentary institution.

This evening I do not have the chance to canvass all the issues to which I have referred, but there is one aspect of the first of those issues about which I do want to talk for a while, and that is the report of the Royal Commissioner on the September moratorium demonstration. This is the first opportunity members of this Parliament have had to debate in this Chamber what happened before September 18, what happened on that day, and the results which have followed from that. Because of the appointment of the Royal Commission, we alone of all South Australians were debarred from debating these matters. I wonder why we had a Royal Commission. I wonder whether the sole reason for the haste of the Premier and his Ministers to appoint a Royal Commission was simply to prevent the embarrassment that the Government would have felt at that time had those issues been debated freely in this place. If that was the

reason, it was a pretty expensive way of avoiding a debate. Today, in answer to a question I put on notice, I received information stating that the estimated total cost of the Royal Commission was about \$80,000 to the people of this State of which over \$75,000 had been paid and \$3,147 was outstanding. Why that has not been paid is anybody's guess.

Now what have the people of this State got for the expenditure of this very significant sum? On the day on which he issued his report, the Royal Commissioner had the very great courtesy to arrange to send me a copy. I had it on the afternoon on which it was presented to His Excellency the Governor, and I much appreciated Mr. Justice Bright's action in sending it to me. Any criticisms that I may make of the report I make with very great respect to him, and realizing that he was bound by the terms of reference which were carefully framed by the Ministers of this Government and which the Government would not consider enlarging when we suggested that they should be enlarged.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you mean to suggest that, if the terms of reference were not satisfactory to Mr. Justice Bright, he would still have been willing to go on with the Royal Commission?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I think he was given a job to do and that he had to do that job within the terms of reference laid down for him, and by His Excellency the Governor. We tried in this place to have those terms altered, but the answer was "No." We wanted to do what should have been done: to enlarge the terms so that the responsibility of the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and me would be before the Commissioner—matters on which he could make findings. However, that was not acceptable to the Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Any matter—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish the Minister would be quiet. Some time after the appointment of the Royal Commission, I took part in a discussion with the Attorney-General at the Adelaide University on the subject of law and order and the right to dissent, and in the course of his paper, which I had the pleasure of criticizing (that was why I was asked), the Attorney-General said he hoped that one of the jobs to be performed by the Royal Commissioner would be the formulation of a code of conduct for demonstrations in the future. When I spoke, I doubted whether it was possible for any one man to do that (so far, it has escaped the wit of man to do

it), and I was not very well received by that gathering when I did cast doubt on it. The Attorney has since had his paper published in the February number of *Issue*, and this is what he hoped we would get for the \$80,000 that has already been spent by the Government on this, except the \$3,000. He said:

I may summarize my conclusions as follows: the present law with regard to the right to dissent is haphazard and unsatisfactory. It makes the legality of a citizen's action depend to a great extent, especially in the exercise of the proposed right of free assembly, on the arbitrary and perhaps even capricious decisions of public officials.

Whether he had in mind the Commissioner of Police at that time, I do not know. He continued:

My conclusion is, therefore, that there should be a thorough examination of the existing law with a view to reformulating it in a manner which will perhaps secure safety, freedom and justice for all the citizens of the community under modern conditions. This, as I see it, is the important part of the task of the current Royal Commission.

Well, if that was a part of the task of the Royal Commissioner, it was not carried out, as anyone who looks through this report will see, and I do not blame the Commissioner for that. I do not believe that it was possible for anyone to do that. Certainly in his report he has made some miscellaneous suggestions for alterations of the law. With some of those I respectfully agree, and with others I respectfully disagree. However, the greatest weakness of the report, in my view, is that it does not sheet home the Premier's responsibility in the moratorium controversy in South Australia. I want to say something about that, because this is the first occasion on which I have been able to speak freely on the matter in the House. I consider that the part that the Premier played in this matter was a most disgraceful part and that he deserves the censure of all South Australians. Certainly, most South Australians would censure him for it. The Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, had taken part in the earlier moratorium demonstration held in May. While the arrangements for the September demonstration were being made, he went overseas. Incidentally, I regret that he is not here now, as I am speaking about him, but one can hardly be blamed in this place for speaking about the Premier in his absence, because he is so seldom in the House these days.

Anyway, he went away while the arrangements were in train and when he came back he found that his Party, the Australian Labor

Party, had dissociated itself from the moratorium demonstration because of the lack of co-operation, the refusal to co-operate with the police. He then publicly tried to tell the police to give in. and then, just as the demonstration was beginning, he flew out of the State to Sydney, leaving to others the responsibility which, as the first Minister in the Government, should have been his. I think that sums up the Premier's part in this, but let us go into it in just a little more detail. I can see that the Minister of Education is itching for me to do so.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I can tell the Minister that I have references to the rather voluminous evidence given before the Royal Commission to which I intend to refer to back up what I have said. In more detail, why do I say that the Premier's part in this matter was a disgraceful one? First, I refer to his statements in this House, and I say that he misled the House in several ways when he spoke here on this matter. Why do I say that? It is a serious thing to say. Members will recall that the Premier quoted from a letter that the Commissioner of Police had written to the Chief Secretary. He quoted part of that letter in the House on Thursday, September 17 last, and it is at page 1454 of *Hansard*. Before he started the quotation from the letter, he said:

I have received from the Commissioner, through the Chief Secretary, a letter which includes the following paragraph:

Then he quoted the last paragraph of the letter but omitted to say that it was only the last paragraph. If he had quoted the whole document, the public of South Australia would have placed on it a very different interpretation from that which the Premier's quotation placed on it. I invite members to look at pages 161 and 162 of the Royal Commissioner's report to see the letter in full, so that they may appreciate just where the Commissioner of Police did stand. The letter was quoted only as to one paragraph here and the Premier did not make it public before it came out during the Royal Commission hearings.

As I said at the time outside this place, what the Premier said in the House undoubtedly encouraged those who were taking place in the moratorium demonstration to defy the law and the directions of the police. That, too, came out in evidence of at least two witnesses. I have the references here and I hope that I can find them quickly, in case I am challenged on this. It came out in the evidence of a man named Muirden, who is still, I understand, one

of the Ministerial press secretaries. This is what Mr. Muirden said, as reported on the last line on page 3322 of the evidence:

A. I was shouting words to the effect, "Who is the Premier—Dunstan or McKinna?" I repeated that several times with perhaps minor variations but that was the theme.

Q. Why did you shout that out?

A. Because I saw at that time the unfortunate confrontation at the intersection as being the climax to a particularly bitter week and I saw it in those terms that the police had stopped the march . . .

He thought at the time that the police, and not Professor Medlin or whoever was in charge, had stopped the march. The evidence continues:

. . . that in fact the Police Commissioner was running the State and not the democratically elected Premier and I was very upset about the situation.

Q. To put that in its context were you aware of some apparent request by the Premier to the Commissioner of Police about the handling of the events of that day by the police?

A. Yes, I had followed these public debates fairly closely during the week.

Q. Did you believe that the Commissioner of Police had refused to accede to at all events one request by the Premier?

A. Yes.

The other witness who was also in the box was a 19-year-old law student named McQuade. His evidence, at page 1658, is as follows:

A. Well, I had read in the paper that Mr. Dunstan had tried to persuade Mr. McKinna to divert traffic around the intersection. I thought that this was a sign they would do so, if they were diverting traffic around the march, which it seemed they were doing to me, they would also divert it around the intersection.

Later, he said (and he is now giving an account of the actions of Professor Medlin, who himself refused to give evidence before the Royal Commission):

Q. Did you see Professor Medlin do anything or hear him say anything?

A. Yes, I heard him and saw him speak over the loud speakers. He said something to the effect of "Three cheers for the A.L.P., they've done it for us" which I thought indicated that the police were diverting traffic around the intersection, and later on, I suppose 10 or 15 minutes later he again got up and said that the direction to move had been given but we were not going to go or some of us were not going to go, something like that.

It is no good suggesting that what the Premier did in this place was not an encouragement to those who took part in the moratorium demonstration—because it was. Of course, it cut directly across what was said by three of the other Ministers—what, for instance, had

been said by the Chief Secretary in another place on August 27 in answer to a question by the Hon. Mr. Hart:

Apparently, the honourable member does not have the faith in a certain authority under my supervision that I have. I have every confidence in that authority to see that the city will be free of interference and that peace will be maintained, and I never issue instructions. The Minister of Roads and Transport, who was the President of the A.L.P., made a statement, which appears at page 149 of the Royal Commissioner's report, in which he said:

The A.L.P.'s support of the moratorium has always been conditional upon the activities being conducted in a peaceful and non-violent way. Despite the fact that the Moratorium Committee planned that the activities should be conducted in a peaceful and non-violent way its decisions were rejected by a general meeting last night and accordingly, the A.L.P. regrettably has no alternative but to disassociate itself and its members from the Demonstration planned for September 18. The A.L.P. strongly asserts that people should have the right to use peaceful demonstration as a means of opposing bad laws and other decisions by Government, provided that the exercise of this right is tempered by consideration for the rights of other citizens.

The Acting Premier (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) according to the Royal Commissioner at page 144, had said:

At about the end of the first week in September the Acting Premier (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) was reported in the *Advertiser* as having said that he did not consider that people should sit down at a busy intersection and that he expected moratorium organizers to advise police in advance of their timetable and it would then be up to the police to deal with the matter.

That was precisely what the moratorium people were not willing to do, and yet when he came back to South Australia the Premier had the hide to call the Commissioner of Police to his office, in company with the Chief Secretary, and tell him what he should do. I have the Premier's own evidence here as to what he told the Commissioner of Police he should do.

Mr. Hopgood: You notice that he has not tried to hide it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should jolly well hope he did not. He tried hard enough at the time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you going to tell us the Commissioner's finding on this matter?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will.

Mr. Hall: This is a limited finding: he did not get Medlin's evidence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At page 3535 of the transcript of the evidence the Premier said that the meeting was perfectly amicable. He suggested in the course of it that a certain constable (whose name appears but I shall not repeat it) should be taken off duty and should not be allowed to be on duty at the place where the demonstration was likely to go, because he incited people or something, or those who were likely to be taking part. At page 3536 the transcript of the evidence states:

Taking all the circumstances into account, it was the view of the Government that the wisest course would be to deny them confrontation, if that was possible, so they would not get what they were after. Our view was that it would be wise for the police to immediately develop alternative traffic plans, depending on where these people sat down at the intersection.

It is all there at about that reference, for those who want to read it. Incidentally, the Premier said it was the unanimous wish of Cabinet that he should interview the Commissioner of Police and tell him these things. Later in cross-examination, after we had had the public rejection by this Government of the Commissioner of Police and therefore of the Police Force, the Premier admitted that it was a matter of very fine judgment whether the occupation of an intersection should be allowed or not. On page 3558 he was asked by Mr. Jacobs about factors that the Commissioner had taken into account, and the transcript states:

Q. You do agree, do you not, that these were very valid factors for the Commissioner to take into account?

A. Certainly.

Q. You agree that the starting point is that the Commissioner of Police must enforce the law?

A. They have the duty of enforcing the law.

Q. You agree that there is a reasonable area of discretion?

A. Yes. I think in every area of law enforcement this has been exercised, and I think it goes from the most junior constable in the police station, up to the Commissioner.

Q. You would agree, would you not, that it is a matter of judgment in each case as to how the discretion is to be exercised?

A. Certainly.

At page 3560 the transcript states:

Q. You took the view on this occasion that to accommodate the occupation of an intersection in circumstances where there had been no prior collaboration with the police would not lead to any escalation?

A. Yes.

Q. I think it is fair to say that the Commissioner took the other view; he took the view that he had to draw the line, in the circumstances, to enforce the law.

A. Yes.

Q. You would agree that it is a nice matter of judgment by either party?

A. Yes.

Q. What I want to suggest is this: you yourself regard a situation in which the police are kept wholly in the dark, as unsatisfactory?

A. Yes, very unsatisfactory.

Yet, in spite of that he had been willing to come into this House two days before what was obviously going to be a very serious disturbance that would put the Police Force to the utmost test, to repudiate the Commissioner of Police and the Police Force, and to do it by quoting one paragraph only from the Commissioner's letter. The Premier has said much about the comparison between what happened here and what happened in Victoria. If one reads Dr. Cairns's extensive evidence (I have it and I can make it available to any member who wants to see it), one sees that in Victoria it was Dr. Cairns's considered view, and it was acted on, that the police should be informed at all times of the plans of those who were demonstrating and, in fact, they were so informed.

The police told the demonstrators how far they could go and where they could not go; as a result of that, the demonstrators actually changed their plans so that they conformed to the requests of the police. Yet in this State the Premier wanted the police to give in to the demonstrators by keeping away if they occupied an intersection. That was the position, and I believe it was absolutely disgraceful—the more so since it came from the Premier of the State. In case any member doubts what I have said about the interview between the Premier and the Commissioner, I shall quote from Mr. McKinna's evidence. At page 680, in referring to the Premier, Mr. McKinna is reported as saying:

He required the police role to be that of keeping the peace, preventing any assault on the demonstrators, and protecting life and property.

Mr. McKinna then referred to a constable who the Premier said should not be on duty at the time. Mr. McKinna is then reported as saying:

I agreed with him on most things but there was not agreement on ... I agreed with all his suggestions except permitting the demonstrators to occupy a city intersection for an unspecified time.

Mr. Payne: The Melbourne police allowed that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have already covered that. If the honourable member cares to read Dr. Cairns's evidence, I will give it to him.

Mr. McKinna then sets out eight reasons why he was not willing to accede to the Premier's request. I was going to say that it was also the Chief Secretary's request, but I do not think the Chief Secretary played a very significant part in the interview. After that interview and before the Commissioner wrote the letter, he went back and discussed the matter with his senior officers. At page 683 Mr. McKinna is reported as saying:

It was unanimously agreed that the police should act in accordance with the law and not permit an intersection to be occupied, as that would be capable of provoking breaches of the peace.

I could quote many other things if there were time and if members had the patience to listen to them. All these things show a most reprehensible outlook by the Premier and disgraceful conduct as a result of that outlook.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Has it occurred to your little mind why it was wise to avoid a confrontation?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is most extraordinary that since then (and public opinion was very strongly against the Government at that time) we have had one other demonstration (and another is coming on July 31), and we have seen a complete reversal of attitude by the Premier on this matter.

Mr. Clark: Is he still wrong?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question is not whether he is still wrong but whether he now agrees that he was wrong at that time. What did he say in June, after the Government had referred the matter to His Honour Judge Muirhead? What he said was in complete contrast to what he said before September 18. The following is a quotation from the *Advertiser* of June 26:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said by telephone from Launceston late yesterday afternoon, "The Government must maintain the rights of other citizens to go about their business, and I urge those involved in the proposed demonstration to co-operate in the entirely reasonable proposals which the Government has adopted."

He has fallen out with his erstwhile friends, Professor Medlin and others. This is what a Mr. O'Hair said in the *Advertiser* on June 28:

The mood of the meeting was very critical of the Government's unwarranted intimidatory action against the anti-war movement.

That, too, was in contrast to his "Hurrah for the A.L.P." out there on September 18. It is amazing how these people who fight for peace fight among themselves. Let us leave

that sorry demonstration for a moment; we are going to have another one and we have had one in the interim,

Mr. Hopgood: Hear, hear!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wonder whether the member for Mawson has bothered to think of the cost to the community of a demonstration of this nature (both the costs that can be computed and the costs that cannot be computed). Mr. McKinna said in his evidence that 470 extra police had to be brought into Adelaide on the day of the demonstration and that this seriously denuded the rest of the metropolitan area and near country districts of police protection. I wonder whether members opposite realize that every time they support a demonstration this has to happen. I wonder whether they realize that this means that the metropolitan area is left without its accustomed police cover and without the protection of property against theft and the protection of citizens, and so on. I wonder whether they realize, as Mr. McKinna said in his evidence, that the overtime alone that had to be paid because of the demonstration was nearly \$4,000. This is repeated time and again. There is disruption and much financial loss as a result of all this.

Even more serious, if one reads the evidence and thinks about the attitude and atmosphere here at the time, is the damage that a demonstration of this nature does to our community (the divisiveness and disruption that occur). Let us look in this House and see what happens. Let us remember that on September 18 locks had to be fitted on the back doors of this building in case people tried to get in and those slide bolts are still there. The front doors of this building were all closed during the demonstration, and that is the first time in my experience that the doors of this House have been locked on an ordinary week day. Those things happened in this building, and those slide locks are still there as a testimony to the fact that the staff of this place, afraid that it would be overrun by the demonstrators, took precautions to see that that did not happen. This in itself is a sorry spectacle, and it is something that happened here in this building.

One of the most alarming developments, in my view, that have taken place not only here but throughout the democratic world has been the abandonment by so many people of the conventional ways of making felt their disagreement with the policies of Government (dissent, as we call it). We still live in

a democratic community, and there still is a large degree of individual freedom. However, I remind all honourable members that Parliamentary democracy will function only if the individual freedoms which we enjoy are coupled with a sense of responsibility to keep within the rules; that is, if people obey the law. As our experience has shown, it is very easy in this city to cause disruption in a community such as ours, and the sanctions against disruption are not strong. Certainly they were weakened by the Government on September 18, but in any case they are not strong. If people are bent on disruption of the community, the only way to prevent that disruption is to strengthen the sanctions and make sure that they are imposed. If that has to be done because people will not keep to the rules, we endanger the individual freedoms we presently enjoy because (and I say this deliberately) ultimately ordinary members of the community prefer order in the community to freedom, if they cannot enjoy both. What is happening in South Australia has already happened (perhaps the situation has been worse) in many cities in the United States. I have here the September 1970 issue of the *American Bar News* in which this matter is canvassed and what I have just said is echoed by the President of the American Bar Association as follows:

Conflicts and divisions in American life have led to a national yearning for order alone, even at the expense of sacrificing part of the Bill of Rights. The clash between two social instincts underlying the divisions—one the instinct to preserve things as they are, the other to bring about reform—has posed one of history's major tests of the nation's ability to keep basic individual rights while maintaining the degree of public order essential in a democratic society. Citing a recent public opinion poll that showed a majority of Americans would surrender half of the first ten amendments to the Constitution in return for "shelter from the chaos of the times," he declared: "Thus, it is not law in tandem with order that the majority seeks. The signs and portents indicate that order alone is the national heart's desire—even if it has to be purchased at the price of sundering the heart of the law—our Bill of Rights.

If we are not careful the same sort of thing will happen here. A July issue of the *Central Times* (I think it is a Methodist publication in this State) contains an article written by a Congregational minister in which, under the heading "Why Get Involved in a Protest March?", he sets out three reasons why people do get involved.

Mr. Slater: Did you read the article by the member for Mawson?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have not had that pleasure. This article states:

The first, is that people feel alienated from the decision-making processes in this country. People wishing to dissociate themselves from public policy have found that the traditional means (petitions and letters to members of Parliament and newspapers) are less and less effective as government becomes more and more bureaucratic. Furthermore, it is apparent that, in terms of influencing Government decisions, numbers are more important than argument. Dissenters therefore wish to be counted, and at the same time to call the attention of their fellow citizens to the cause and its strength.

That pretty well sums up how a number of people feel about this. If that is the case, we Parliamentarians have a pretty heavy responsibility to try to do something about it, for we are amongst the people with whom people in the general community, or those who want to express their dissent, are disillusioned. Let me say, as I said (or implied, anyway) at the beginning of my speech, that the standing of Parliament in our community now is not high and, if anything, is declining. I consider that this is due to several causes. First (and I do not excuse any member of this House or any other Parliament), I consider that the standard of our conduct is not as high as people outside expect that it should be. I do not except myself, or anyone else. Whether that expectation by people outside is reasonable or unreasonable is another matter, but people expect the standard in the Commonwealth Parliament and in the several State Parliaments to be higher than it is.

Secondly, our procedures are so based on tradition as to be utterly unintelligible to most people. I, by nature, am one who likes tradition and the traditional ways, and I do not really like to see them changed, but I consider that our procedures in this House, as set out in Standing Orders, are so antique as to mean that the institution of Parliament is losing its significance for most people. If I may be pardoned for using this comparison, it is like trying to make everyone read the authorized version of the Bible rather than a modern translation. It is the same sort of thing.

Whilst we may like those traditions and the ways we do business and whilst some may understand them (although I do not think most of us understand them very well), I think we are now doing Parliament a disservice by not standing off, looking at our procedures and trying to bring them up to

date systematically. I think that matter is extremely important. The second heading under which I think we should and can do something is this: I have mentioned the danger to individual freedom because people will prefer order to it if they must make a choice. Unfortunately, individual freedom is not as highly prized in the community now as it was a generation or so ago or even into this generation.

Up to the present time we, in most of the common law countries, the English speaking countries (and I exclude the United States of America from this) have not considered it necessary formally to define our rights and freedoms in the Constitution or in any other way, because broadly the rights of citizens have been accepted by all and the only dispute has been, perhaps, as to their precise boundaries. Now, with more and more government, and not only Government but the power of non-Government bodies (and I think particularly of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, in some of the things that have happened in the last few months, such as taking part in community activities), there is more control and less toleration in the community, and it is no longer true that we prize our liberty as much as we used to do.

I think that the time has come for us formally to set out, in a sort of Bill of Rights, what we regard as our fundamental freedoms. The United States of America did it in 1791 in that country's first amendments to the Constitution, and the French did it at about the same time. The Canadians (and this is where I think we can borrow something) did it in 1960 in their Bill of Rights. The Canadian Federal Parliament passed a Bill of Rights that sets out the fundamental freedom of Canadians, and I desire to quote briefly from that Act entitled an Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, because I consider that the time has come for us seriously to consider doing the same thing in South Australia. I hope that, if we did so, we would give a lead, as we have done previously on other matters, to the other Parliaments of Australia.

Mr. Hopgood: Where were you in 1945 that you never tried to do just this?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should have thought that both the member for Mawson and I could be absolved from any responsibility for what happened in 1945: I was fairly young and he

was a few years younger than I. I suggest the interjection he has made is utterly sterile. Let me now quote:

The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions:

Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;

And being desirous of enshrining these principles and the human rights and fundamental freedoms derived from them, in a Bill of Rights which shall reflect the respect of Parliament for its constitutional authority and which shall ensure the protection of these rights and freedoms in Canada:

That is the preamble. Then the sections are set out. I will quote only the first:

1. It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely,

- (a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;
- (b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law;
- (c) freedom of religion;
- (d) freedom of speech;
- (e) freedom of assembly and association; and
- (f) freedom of the press.

The subsequent sections in the Act deal with construction of the law and emergency provisions, the safeguards written into this Act when a state of emergency has to be proclaimed. I refer honourable members particularly to sections 5 and 6 of the Act for these safeguards. I know that in any federal system there are great problems in the enactment of a Bill of Rights but, despite those difficulties, we in this Parliament have taken the first step towards this in the Prohibition of Discrimination Act, which prohibits discrimination broadly on the same grounds as those I have just read from the Canadian Act. That is one area in which we have already acted. This should be done systematically. I believe (and I am sorry that it is now) that the time has come when it is necessary to set out these things and be guided by them.

In Canada there have been decisions of the courts. I will refer to one in particular in which the fundamental freedoms set out in the

Bill of Rights have been preserved. The case to which I refer is the Queen v. Joseph Drybones, a case heard in the Supreme Court of Canada last year. Joseph Drybones was an Indian in the North-West Territories, and he did not speak any English. He was prosecuted under an ordinance for being drunk (I think it was) in a public place, one of the offences that could be committed only by American Indians and not by ordinary members of the community. The Supreme Court of Canada said, "No; that offence is out because it is in conflict with the Bill of Rights, which ensures equality to all citizens."

I hope that by mentioning that I have done two things: first, to show that the courts are prepared to back up with their authority such a declaration of fundamental freedoms; and, secondly, to show that such a declaration does, in effect, what we have tried to do in one sector under the Prohibition of Discrimination Act. I regret that it is necessary for us to do this. Until recently we prided ourselves that these things in our community were taken for granted, but they are no longer taken for granted, and the time has come for us to do something about it. This is only one of the matters that I think are of crucial importance in our community today.

I have not had the chance to develop any of the others to which I referred, but I hope that, as the debate continues, other members will develop them. If Parliament is to mean anything in this community we have to discuss these matters, otherwise it will become completely irrelevant to South Australia. People will no longer want a Parliament, and the things that Parliament protects and preserves, that is, the freedom of the individual, the right to thrash out matters of controversy, and the right to change laws that govern us, will all be lost. It is our responsibility to do something about these things in the way that I have mentioned or in other ways so long as we think about them and do something about them as the result of our thought. It is our responsibility here, and it is a very heavy one. I support the motion.

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I congratulate the individual who usually occupies your Chair, and I refer to the Speaker. I congratulate him on the manner in which he handled the conduct of the business in the first session of this Parliament. He adopted a policy of fair play and tolerance to all members but, unfortunately, some members (and I add that they were not on this side)

took advantage of his tolerance. Also, I congratulate our new member, the member for Adelaide, who I believe made an able and efficient maiden speech. As has been referred to by another speaker, in effect he made two maiden speeches. He entered into the debate being conducted at the time and indicated his vast knowledge of the sphere from which he came, namely, the trade union movement.

I have known the member for Adelaide for many years, having been associated with him in the Australian Workers Union, where I was an industrial officer and he was an organizer. I can truthfully say that he is a man of high integrity who will worthily occupy the position formerly held by the late lamented member for Adelaide, my friend Sam Lawn. I listened with much interest to parts of the speech just delivered by the member for Mitcham, in which he referred to the need for a Bill of Rights to protect the fundamental rights, freedoms, and privileges of the individual. I have read enough of American history to realize that the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution has functioned well many times in protecting individuals from injustices before the law. I turn now to a subject that I believe is of major importance in the affairs of man throughout the world, and this is a matter that was dealt with exhaustively by my colleague, the member for Mawson.

Mr. Gunn: An academic!

Mr. CRIMES: Yes, an academic, but one who has done more research than the honourable member will do in a lifetime. I refer to the ecological crisis. The member for Mawson was interested in paragraph 7 of the Governor's Speech, and so was I, because it states:

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

I congratulate the member for Mawson on raising this issue in the extensive and efficient manner that he did. I regret that there was much amusement among Opposition members when he discussed this matter; that amusement probably sprang from ignorance, but we should give our full attention to this subject. All the authorities and all the people in Australia should devote top priority to this matter if any of the things we are striving to do for the benefit of Australia are to come about. If we are to heed the warnings of experts and authorities, we will surely realize that a bleak

and grim future is ahead of us. The member for Mawson warned that the world must look to collective and responsible effort if it is to be saved. I gathered from his remarks that private effort based on priority for profits has been tried by history and found wanting. If I remember correctly, the member for Mawson quoted a wellknown American scientist, Dr. Paul Ehrlich. This scientist and his wife, who is also a scientist, recently wrote a book entitled *Population, Resources and Environment—Issues in Human Ecology*. Incidentally, both these people will be visiting Australia next month for the fourteenth annual international science school at the Sydney University; so, we will hear more from these people soon. In view of Dr. Ehrlich's prestige, we should be willing to listen to what he and his wife have to say when they visit Sydney. He has said the following of the creature known as man:

If he continues to reproduce at the present soaring rate, continues to tamper with the biosphere, to toy around with his apocalyptic weapons, he will probably share the fate of the dinosaur. If he learns to adapt to the finitude of the planet, to the changed character of his existence, he may survive. If not, nothing like him is ever likely to evolve again. The world will be inherited by a creature more adaptable and more tenacious than he—possibly by the cockroach.

Dr. Ehrlich is savagely critical of people whom he labels as environmental villains, ecological Uncle Toms, dum dums, and yo-yos of the establishment. He believes that man's last hope lies in the emergence of a new youth movement based on population and pollution issues, and he foresees tremendous opposition to the movement from the establishment. I am heartened, however, by a recent statement from a member of the commercial side of the establishment, Mr. H. N. Herford, the President of the Associated Chambers of Manufactures in Australia—surely someone to whom Opposition members should give regard. Mr. Herford said:

Industry has a duty to add to the quality of life of society.

He said this at a meeting of the National Industry Council on Environmental Quality which was held in Canberra. He also said:

Members of the council represent industry groupings which, through their individual members, have unwittingly damaged the environment.

Saying that the members representing these giant commercial associations have unwittingly damaged the environment is, of course, being charitable. In fact, these organizations have,

as their prior aim, been seeking profits to such an extent that they have not had regard to the needs of the environment and the future of man. Mr. Herford went on to say:

Society has been playing Russian roulette with the pistol of pollution for too long. We must do our part in turning that pistol away from the heads of society but also in removing the bullets which represent attacks on what we eat, breathe, hear, smell and feel.

Relative to these timely remarks by Mr. Herford, I refer to Dr. Ehrlich's call for youth to play its part in the struggle to maintain our environment and our security in the future. I have found it pleasing to see anti-pollution committees being set up by some schoolchildren in South Australia, and I hope that what has happened here and what, I hope, will be extended here is also occurring in all of the other States of the Commonwealth, because here we see the beginnings of a movement that I hope will guarantee the future of the young people of our country.

In my district, youngsters at the Ferryden Park Primary School have formed an anti-pollution committee, and they have been enterprising: they have obtained publicity in the local press and have made local government and political representations regarding the use of the old sewage farm area at Islington. I hope there will be a great expansion of the interest of young people on a world-wide scale regarding the ecological crisis that threatens their future far more than ours. Perhaps we can afford to take this issue a little lightly but, when we dwell on what will probably confront the younger people of the community and generations to come, perhaps we will not be prone to smile when people talk about the environment and the need to deal with pollution.

I refer now to the Government's ban on Springboks' use of State instrumentalities. I completely favour this move, for it has indicated the Government's compassionate concern about the treatment of the majority people (the coloured people) in South Africa. It has been repeated *ad nauseam* that politics must not be introduced into sport, but I always thought that sport was based on the principles of fair play. Where is the fair play in a situation that ignores the sporting talents of the majority of the people in a country when teams are being selected to represent that country? Those who support the Springbok tour either deliberately or ignorantly support

the undoubted Nazi-like tactics and policy of the South African Government. Today, because of bans on political Parties and on some trade unions in South Africa, and because of a continuing state of emergency in that country, we find that most of the opposition to apartheid comes from the clergy, apart (I hasten to add) from the clergy attached to the Dutch Reformed Church. In 1968, issuing a warning to some people, Prime Minister Vorster said:

I am aware that there are some of these clerics who among themselves are bandying about the idea that they should do the sort of thing here in South Africa that Martin Luther King did in America. I want to say to them: cut it out; cut it out immediately, because the cloth you are wearing will not protect you if you try to do this in South Africa.

Mr. Hopgood: The big stick.

Mr. CRIMES: Yes, with the state of emergency and penal powers all belonging to the same vile programme. On March 6 this year Prime Minister Vorster, uttering Nazi-like doctrine, said:

The State has the right and duty to take action against aliens who enter the country and, under the cloak of religion, make themselves guilty of behaviour which, in the opinion of the State, is dangerous to or subversive of the State.

Mr. Vorster did not attempt to elucidate on what it was that Martin Luther King had done in America that was considered subversive in South Africa. Indeed, there were people who believed wholeheartedly in peaceful protest and who had great regard for the late Martin Luther King because of the fact that, on all occasions, he tried to encourage those who wished to demonstrate on behalf of coloured people in the United States to demonstrate on a lawful and peaceful basis. I have said that in South Africa the main opposition to the vile policy of apartheid comes from the ranks of the clergy. No doubt some members will wonder what are the denominations of those clerics; principally they are Methodist, Anglican, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Presbyterian and Congregational clergymen. I suggest it would be floating into cloud cuckoo land to say that these denominational bodies were all infiltrated and dominated by Communists. I should like to refer to the plight of the Anglican Dean of Johannesburg who at present faces charges that involve the death penalty. The very fact that the Springbok team does not include coloured people is a practical demonstration on Australian soil of the racial policy of the

South African Government and is a standing offence against that basis of sport: the principle of fair play.

I now turn to the question of unionism. I leave out the word "compulsory" because it never did truthfully apply to the situation in South Australia. During the recent debate on unionism, reference was made to the fact that a certain portion of union dues paid by an individual union member went to the Labor Party, for which members on this side are most grateful. This was resented by Opposition members, who want an even greater financial advantage over the Labor Party than they presently have at election campaigns. When speaking on this subject, the Premier rightly pointed out that shareholders of companies that donate to the Liberal and Country League funds have no say regarding that political payment. I go further than the Premier and say that the general consuming public largely finances the L.C.L. That is because the donations come from the profits made by the donating companies, which in turn come from the prices paid by the general public for the goods and services provided by those companies, and members opposite cannot deny that. The L.C.L. is financed by the general public. The member for Glenelg wants union members to be able to opt in for the political levies of unions instead of being able to opt out, but what does he say about the fact that the general public, which in the last resort finances the L.C.L., has no opportunity to opt out of the political charges that are included in the prices charged by those companies which undoubtedly donate to the L.C.L.? The people pay for the donations to the Liberal Party.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Tell us about the ones who make donations to the Labor Party.

Mr. CRIMES: I ask the honourable member to tell me. I am waiting to hear his list of them and I shall be extremely interested to hear him. I now turn to the Royal Commission into the September moratorium, and I indicate my pleasure that the Government intends to implement recommendations made by that Commission. I say briefly, in respect of one important recommendation, that I agree entirely with the Secretary of the South Australian Police Association (Mr. Ralph Tremethick), who, I remind the House, represents the majority of members of the force. He said that the report did not suggest that the powers of the Commissioner of Police be taken away but rather that the Government must

accept final responsibility. What is wrong with that, in a democratic community?

Mr. Clark: That's what the Government is here for.

Mr. CRIMES: The member for Elizabeth took the words out of my mouth. The Government is in office to govern in all situations and more particularly when crisis situations of any kind arise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections from the back bench.

Mr. CRIMES: I am speaking of the Secretary of the South Australian Police Association (Mr. Tremethick), and I suggest that Opposition members note his remarks. He said:

Quite frankly, I feel it is proper that the Government should accept final responsibility.

Here is the voice of the majority of the members of the Police Force in South Australia, and I have not heard that at any of the meetings of the association held subsequent to Mr. Tremethick's making that statement there have been any indications of lack of confidence in him or of rebuke for what he said regarding this recommendation by the Royal Commission. In fact, South Australia is the only State, apart from Western Australia, in which the Government does not have this responsibility and, of course, it may be that there could be a change in Western Australia before long, because that State is now fortunate enough to have a Labor Government. I am delighted to see the smiles on the faces of some members of the Opposition when I refer to that very salient fact.

Mr. Venning: Western Australia is going down.

Mr. CRIMES: It is going that way only to build up its great mineral resources. Regarding the leaders of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, I want to make perfectly plain that we on this side have no agreement with some of them so far as tactics are concerned. I shall be proud to march on July 31. I say that these people, and particularly the people to whom I am referring in the V.M.C., either deserve the title of lunatic Leftists or mindless militants or (and I say this advisedly) may be under the influence of *agents provocateurs* provided by the Australian Security and Intelligence Organization. Truth is stranger than fiction. I do not know how much of that goes on. It may be that members of that organization are in this Chamber tonight.

I remember when we were told there were more members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Communist Party of the United States than there were card-carrying members of the Party. I have no doubt that that was the position. We understand what goes on in the world today. We know there are spies everywhere; we get them in every sphere, including the political sphere. I repeat that those people who have supported the policies that have dragged down Australia's name into the blood, dust and filth of Vietnam are those who should really be condemned for what has happened in the streets of Adelaide and the other capital cities of Australia.

Deep down in their hearts they have gloried in what has gone on in the streets of Adelaide and other cities. It gives them more than anybody else pleasure when they see activities that give the arch-reactionaries in their ranks an excuse for raving hysterically about law and order with one aim, and one aim only, in their minds—the destruction of the ordinary civil rights of the citizens of this country. Shortly after the moratorium march last September, I made a speech in which I said that there was an affinity between the mindless militants of the demonstration and members on the other side of this House. They may be strange bedfellows, but nevertheless bedfellows they are because, through the unwise and wrong tactics being used in the street, they are enabling those people in opposition to rise in complaint about what is going on and to call for more rigorous measures against civil liberties.

On this matter of law and order, it would be relevant to quote the President of the Sydney University Liberal Club. He is Mr. Paul McClintock, and his words were agreed to by the club's Vice-President, a Mr. Browne.

Mr. Clark: Were they the only two members of the club?

Mr. CRIMES: It is a possibility, but I hope they represent a large section of opinion in the ranks of the younger Liberals. Mr. McClintock said:

If there is any phase in American politics today which sums up illegal or unjust use of Government power, of Agnew politics or of Deep South sheriff power, it is law and order.

We can see how younger members of the Liberal Party, speaking in Sydney, equate this emphasis on law and order, which is receiving such use today from the Liberal (Tory) side. I consider that we have to realize once and for all that civil liberties must be protected in the

Australian community, no matter what crisis may threaten or may occur on the streets. These demonstrations are a passing phase, and it would be entirely wrong for any of us to take them so seriously that we would remove the rights and privileges of future citizens.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the rights of people who need to use the streets?

Mr. CRIMES: I had no trouble in walking down the street. There will be another demonstration on July 31.

Mr. Gunn: What are the details?

Mr. CRIMES: We assemble at Elder Park at 9.30 a.m. and hope to move off at 10 a.m. We will welcome the honourable member with open arms if he will join with us. It will be a serious demonstration, genuinely standing not for any impossible revolutionary doctrine but for the aims that will then be stated, and these aims are for all foreign forces in Vietnam to leave, and for the Commonwealth Parliament to repeal the National Service Act.

I now refer to one of the more cultured and constructive public utterances of the Leader of the Opposition. It was reported in the press when he said:

The mob in office today could not run a shoe-shine stall, let alone a State.

I could be charitable and say that the Opposition could run a shoe-shine stall. I congratulate the Government on the programme it has prepared for this second session, and I support the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, formally support the motion and I express my condolences to the relatives of those who served this House for many years and passed away after the opening of the previous session. I congratulate the member for Adelaide on his election. At the time of the opening of the first session of this Parliament the Governor was ill, and I am pleased that he has since returned to active duty.

The member for Florey said earlier that he did not think certain sections of the community were getting their fair share of the national cake. The point of his remarks was that the workers of the country were not getting a fair slice, and he referred in passing to the problems of the man on the land. Since the Kavel District is a rural district and probably has within it the whole range of primary production, I was particularly interested in the honourable member's remarks. He believes that the workers (I presume he means the trade unionists) are not getting their fair share.

Mr. Harrison: And teachers, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government wants it both ways. The Premier has complained about the great imposts on the State Budget resulting from wage increases that were considerably greater than those for which he had budgeted, yet the member for Florey considers that those wage increases were insufficient. Let us remember that primary producers contribute significantly to the baking of the national cake. I should like to quote some pertinent remarks of the President of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia (Mr. Roocke). Regarding the effects of cost increases and wage increases on primary producers, he said:

The national wage increase of 6 per cent as granted during the year has resulted in a higher unit cost of manufactured goods and the irony of it all is that, by the time we rural producers buy the article, the initial increase of 6 per cent has doubled and trebled itself through the cost-plus factor of each person handling the said article. Further, the increased spending power of the recipient of the wage increase has the effect of lessening the purchasing power of the dollar by at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum.

Circumstances have forced the grower to increase his production, or to attempt to diversify his enterprise to try and keep up with the ever-rising cost factor, thus making available an ever-increasing supply of produce to be sold on the export market.

We see the increased cost of goods, rises in costs of essential services, and labour costs rising at a rate, which is seriously affecting our cost of production—so much so, that it is having a very serious impact on our ability to successfully compete with relatively lower cost industries of other exporting countries.

I am putting this point of view because it is an opposing point of view to that advanced by the member for Florey. A table appearing in the publication of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics relates to the average value of Australian production and to the cost of producing the primary products in question over a certain period. From 1965 to 1969, the average value of rural production was \$3,560,000,000; in 1969 it had risen to \$3,707,000,000.

The total cost involved over the period 1965-1969 was \$2,490,000,000, the cost of production in 1969-70 being \$2,738,000,000. Therefore, the average farm income above costs for the four years was \$1,070,000,000, whereas the farm income above costs in 1969-70 was only \$969,000,000—a significant decrease. In other words, more has been produced but, because of rising costs (mainly because of wage determinations, etc.), \$101,000,000 less is

available for the producer, even though the value of production rose by \$147,000,000 last year. I think that this is one side of the story that the honourable member should bear in mind. Also, although the rural producers of this country are in a minority (I think they represent only about 8 per cent of the work force), they, in fact, contribute to the extent of about 50 per cent of our export income. These are the people whom the A.L.P. wishes to disfranchise further by means of its electoral proposals.

The A.L.P., with 51 per cent of the vote, has in this House at present 57 per cent of the seats, but it advocates a policy of one vote one value; in other words, it intends to disfranchise rural producers even further. Labor has even told us that it will tamper with the Legislative Council franchise on this basis of one vote one value.

Mr. Langley: Don't you believe in that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I most assuredly do not. I make no bones about that, for the benefit of the member for Unley, who, if he studied the mathematics of the situation, would realize that this catch-cry of one vote one value cannot be sustained. In the Commonwealth sphere, where the districts are more or less equally divided, the A.L.P., with 51 per cent of the vote, enjoys 67 per cent of the seats. This is democracy according to the A.L.P.! To illustrate the point, I point out that the District of Kavel—

Mr. Curren: What point?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am making the point, for the rather dense member from somewhere up the river, that a policy of one vote one value is nonsense. The catch-cry in the past from members opposite has been this: "We have a greater percentage of the vote but we can't govern." I have pointed out how Labor, with 51 per cent of the vote, holds 57 per cent of the seats in this place. Members can sort this out for themselves later.

Other industries in my district are not at present in the dire position of the wool industry; perhaps they are not experiencing the difficulties of wheat producers, either. Nevertheless, to talk to fruitgrowers, dairy farmers or any other primary producers about a 40-hour week, four weeks' annual holidays, double-time payments and so on is absolute nonsense, although that is the sort of thing that members opposite are keen to provide in other spheres.

Many things happening in my district are a source of pleasure to me. It has been decided recently in the Barossa Valley to

support the Meals on Wheels scheme, and there will be a District and Bush Nursing Society of South Australia Incorporated sister in the district. In Angaston, a committee has been formed to support the establishment of homes for the aged. Much of this type of community work is taking place. As recently as last Sunday, at Mount Pleasant an ambulance was donated to the St. Johns Ambulance Brigade by the Lions Club of Torrens Valley. There is a great sense of self-help in this district, and this a source of great pleasure and satisfaction.

Last session, the township of Chain of Ponds was referred to in the House. The Minister of Works publicly stated that the Government intended to negotiate a resettlement value on behalf of people who would be affected by the proposal for that township. One of the difficulties was that properties in the district were not of great market value. The Government made a statement about providing for resettlement for people affected by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan (although at other times we have heard that the plan has been abandoned), and on the end of that statement it was said that it would also help the people of Chain of Ponds. From inquiries I have made, on behalf of my constituents in this area, of departmental sources and others, I was told that this sort of negotiation is illegal. The Minister told a deputation of which I was a member that he was having difficulty with this proposal. The fact is that the Government made this statement without giving real thought to whether or not the scheme could be implemented, and many people in the area have been left high and dry. About a week ago, I believe that one of the regional news services announced that 75 per cent of these people had been fixed up.

Having been in close contact with the people of Chain of Ponds whose properties are to be acquired (those in the area marked in red on the map made available by the Minister), I can say that about 25 per cent of those people have been settled up. The department seems reluctant to serve a notice of intent on people and, in several cases, valuations that have come to my notice, far from representing the value of a resettlement in another area, have been below those made by independent valuers. So much for that announcement by the Government in this regard. I shall now deal with some of the recent efforts by the Minister of Education. Many members of this House went to see his performance in the

Norwood Town Hall, and it was an extremely good performance.

Mr. Mathwin: He was the principal actor there, wasn't he?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. Probably, from his point of view and that of his Party, this was considered to be a highly successful performance. One must agree that it was successful in that the Minister said everything his audience liked him to say.

Mr. Gunn: Some of them did.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, some of his audience did. The Minister said all the right things, but let us consider some of them and carry them through to their logical conclusions. I thought there were a few untidy ends in this effort but, fortunately for him, these were not probed too deeply at the meeting. The Minister made some points regarding Commonwealth finance. Amongst other things, he said:

I am one of those who would not like to see a return of income tax powers to the States, because there are very great difficulties in a system of uniform taxes to the States.

He does not want the taxing power back, and one of the reasons for that would be that South Australia, one of the smaller States, would be worse off. Next, he said:

We do not need more Government control in education. We need greater decentralization in decision-making.

That means that he wants the education system to remain firmly under the control of the States but that the States do not want the major taxing powers. Then the Minister said:

We do have the basic problem in the education system in that education is the responsibility of the States and that most financial power rests with the Commonwealth.

That is just what he said he wanted and the way he wanted it. This was all very fine. The Minister pursued this line and advanced the argument about what priority education should have. He agreed that it should have a priority somewhere near the top: he was not willing to say that it should be the top priority, but it should share equal top place at least. We cannot quibble at this. Then we come to the crunch—the matter of finance. Of course, we have heard this recitation so often that it hardly bears repetition, but we got it at Norwood, when the Minister said:

It is the responsibility of the Commonwealth to provide the finance.

That is the way he wants it: the Commonwealth Government is to have the major taxing powers. If one examines this closely—

Mr. Simmons: I wish you would.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member would be patient and listen carefully, he might pick up a point or two. The Minister mentioned the amount that the Commonwealth Government got from income tax and other taxation measures. I thought he said it was about \$6,000,000,000 a year, but in the draft of his speech that I received the figure is \$8,000,000,000. However, we will not quibble at that. The figure does not affect my point and we will say that it is \$7,000,000,000. He said that \$1,443,000,000 would be needed to finance the education requirements in the Commonwealth. He said that this could be seen as a huge amount but, when we work it out, it comes down to only \$280,000,000 a year. What the Minister did not say (and I consider this vital to the whole argument—the crunch of the matter) was whether he would tell the Commonwealth Government that the Government must give this \$280,000,000 a year extra. He is willing to say that education should be on the top priority, but surely his responsibility is to intimate to the Commonwealth Government how it should adjust its priorities or where it can raise more money in income tax. The Government does not come straight out and say where priorities should be adjusted. It will not say straight out, "Let us increase income tax." In fact, two years ago the Commonwealth leader of the A.L.P. said, "Let us cut down on income tax."

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Cut defence expenditure.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the first positive suggestion we have had from the Government. We have the problem of finding \$280,000,000 extra.

The idea that the Labor Party is propagating is that the Commonwealth Government has limitless resources at its disposal—"Let the Commonwealth do it." If the Minister wants extra money, the onus is on him to state where the Commonwealth will get this money. Will it increase taxes? Two years ago the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament said, "The people are paying too much in taxes. It is a disgrace. The middle income earners are paying too much." The only suggestion that has come from the Labor Party is to tax the wealthy. There is nothing from the Minister about readjusting priorities in spending. We have just heard something about defence expenditure from the Minister of Labour and Industry: the only other reference was from

the Premier when he returned from the last meeting of the Premiers in Canberra. He said, "We will tax the wealthy"—real emotional stuff! Then they screamed out for a growth tax, but, when they got it, it was no good! So he says, "Very well; we will tax the wealthy". He made several references to this, and he has said it in other places. I have here a letter sent out from the Premier: it begins "Dear Friend", but perhaps it should have been addressed "Dear Comrade". It is as follows:

We have had to turn to the only areas of additional taxation now left after having taxed the tall poppies already this year.

The statement about already having taxed the wealthy is an obscure reference. A measure dealing with succession duties was brought in, running to \$2,000,000. His advice to the Commonwealth Treasurer was to tax the wealthy. This is good stuff; this will have appeal.

We have to raise \$280,000,000 a year by taxing the wealthy. Let us look at the publication put out by the Commonwealth on taxation. This is an interesting publication called *Commonwealth Finance Bulletin*, 1969-70, No. 8, issued by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. It gives a rundown of the income of people in Australia, the number of people who receive that income and the amount of tax gleaned from each of the various groups. If members examine this publication, they will find that most taxpayers in this country fall into the \$3,000-\$6,000 range. It is the average John Citizen who falls into this category, and I suggest that Government members should listen to these figures. In the income group from \$3,000 to \$4,000 are more than 1,000,000 taxpayers, contributing \$383,872,000 in taxation. In the group \$4,000 to \$6,000 are about 684,000 taxpayers, and this group contributes about \$452,000,000 in taxation. The number of taxpayers diminishes in the \$6,000 to \$8,000 group, in which there are only 160,057 taxpayers, who contribute \$199,938,000. In the \$8,000 to \$10,000 group the 56,320 taxpayers contribute \$113,046,000.

No doubt members of Parliament fall into the next group, but the number of taxpayers diminishes quickly. In the \$10,000 to \$20,000 group there are 60,388 taxpayers contributing \$239,877,000 in taxation. The \$20,000 to \$30,000 group (including Ministers and Judges) contributes \$70,193,000 in taxation. At what stage do we get into the wealthy class as defined by the Premier? He is to tax the wealthy, but I do not know whether we have

reached that group yet. He may class himself as one of the wealthy, and now we are reaching his range. Only 1,700 residents in the whole of Australia are in the salary range \$30,000 to \$40,000 and they contribute \$27,494,000 in taxation.

It is not difficult to calculate, if you examine the rate in the dollar at which these people are taxed, when one reaches the second highest group with an income from \$60,000 that if one took all their income over \$30,000 one would be lucky to scrape up \$3,000,000. I am showing how completely hypocritical is the bunkum the Premier talks about when he refers to taxing the wealthy. That is the only suggestion he has brought back from Canberra about how he would raise finance. An examination of these statistics shows that it is an irrefutable fact that most taxation is raised in this country from the average John Citizen, the person whom the Labor Party is hitting to leg. A very significant sentence at the end of the Governor's Speech sums up the whole matter, as follows:

In the light of the very heavy increases in costs which the Government will have to meet during the forthcoming year as a consequence of—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When you touch Government members on the raw they get vocal.

Mr. Clark: Are you still in favour of letting education starve?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Do not talk bunkum. If the Minister is not completely irresponsible he should realize that it is for him to say how the \$280,000,000 will be raised. He is not willing to say how priorities will be altered, nor is he willing to say whether there should be a general increase in taxes.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Cut the defence vote.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: All the Minister of Labour and Industry can say is, "Let us cut the defence vote," and the Premier says, "Let us tax the wealthy."

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If I can pursue my point further, the member for Elizabeth may appreciate it.

Mr. Clark: You said you didn't want Commonwealth aid.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not say that.

Mr. Clark: The public wants it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The onus is on the State Government to convince the public that it should pay a higher rate of taxation. Two years ago it was said that the people of Australia were taxed too heavily, but now we are told that we must raise another \$280,000,000. I am exploring the avenues where that sum can be found.

Mr. Clark: Stop this silly war and you will get it straight away. You ignored that suggestion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not: I said that at least it was one suggestion. Paragraph 34 of His Excellency's Speech states:

In the light of the very heavy increases in costs which the Government will have to meet during the forthcoming year as a consequence of recent increases in wages and salaries, and because of the necessity to expand and improve essential social services beyond what can be accomplished out of revenues presently in sight, the Government will feel bound to submit to Parliament some further measures for the securing of additional revenues.

I think that those taxation measures will be aimed where they must be aimed if they are to raise a substantial amount of taxation revenue—at the average John Citizen. We are getting thoroughly sick of the Minister's statements that the Commonwealth Government should be blamed: not one constructive suggestion comes from him as to how the money should be raised. Government members should read the memoirs of Mr. George Brown. Foreign Secretary in the former Labor Government in Great Britain. I gained the impression that Mr. Brown was fundamentally honest; in his book he says:

A Labour Government wants to do a lot of things. It wants to rebuild the country, it wants improved facilities for education, health, housing, roads and so on—all the things that people themselves want. But to do these things you have to raise very large sums of money. That means that a Labour Government is bound to be a Government of high taxation.

Why have Government members not got the guts to say that? I wish to refer now to another recent performance of the Minister of Education—a half-baked scheme announced about a week ago for providing books for Matriculation and Leaving students. The Minister said today that there was some opposition from headmasters to the proposals but he believed it would all be ironed out.

He said that he had received a deputation today, but I do not know how it turned out. However, these meetings with headmasters are not secret. In fact, from what I can gather, only one headmaster was in favour of this scheme, namely, the headmaster at the school where it was initiated. I gather that the headmasters generally were hostile, but the Minister saw fit to announce last Monday week that this scheme would be implemented. I think the only negotiations he undertook in this regard were with a senior master of the Norwood High School, and the scheme was his brainchild.

It seems to me that the meeting of headmasters held last Tuesday was useless and that they were presented with a *fait accompli*. They were apparently told that this was the scheme and that they must have it. It seems to me that some duress was placed on them and that, if they did not like this scheme, the only alternative was to have a free book scheme similar to that operating in the primary schools. Although the Minister has made several statements to try to justify his point of view, this is a most ill-considered and rash scheme on which he has embarked. The Minister will no doubt have an opportunity to enlighten us with further details, but it is a scheme that he conceived with a senior master of the Norwood High School. The scheme there has not been working for a full year and, although it is designed ostensibly to save parents money, to my mind serious faults are inherent in it.

Opinions are divided about whether the scheme operating in the primary schools has been the unqualified success that the Labor Party would have us believe it is. I think the former Labor Minister of Education (Mr. Loveday) said that paperback books would be changed frequently, but the overall effect of this sort of scheme, where people have to keep collecting secondhand books and re-using them, is that it stultifies the sort of things we are trying to do today in education. This is particularly true in relation to secondary schools, where many curriculum changes are being undertaken and where much good work is being done in this regard by teachers and administrators. The success of this new sort of scheme depends on the use and re-use of books.

From what I can gather, under the scheme parents will pay a deposit of \$10 at the beginning of the year. The allowance for stationery is worked out at about \$1.77 a student, but from my knowledge of the Matriculation course I know that this might buy one spring-back

folder, if the student concerned is lucky. There will be continuing expense during the year for stationery. The average cost of new textbooks is worked out at about \$1.20. Knowing the number of books required for Matriculation study, I do not think that at that price one could obtain too many textbooks of the kind with which I am familiar. In fact, at present the average paid—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Your facts are wrong.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister can check them with the people who know the answers. The average sum paid by parents in regard to Matriculation, over and above the progress allowance, is about \$16. We suggested, and the Labor Party promised, that the book allowance should be raised by \$6, but it will be done in stages. I do not know what will happen to that allowance if this scheme is introduced. From my own personal experience I know that, if students like to scout around and buy secondhand books (an opportunity for this is given in the schools), they can often get away with paying much less than this. The \$16 applies to a student who buys all new books. The effect of all this will be disastrous as regards this curriculum development and these new moves in education that have been fostered for some years, as I believe has proved to be the case regarding primary education.

We hear talk about a profitability of 20 per cent over a two-year period. The success of the scheme, if it can be successful (and there is no proof that it will be), will depend on the purchase of secondhand books. Many students, especially those who go on to university, retain their books. Therefore, these textbooks will not necessarily be available. At Norwood High School good discounts were given, but there is no guarantee that this will continue if all high schools are involved. Another aspect that the Minister does not seem to have considered fully is the situation that will develop in the schools at the end of the year when these books have to be collected. He intends to allow 35c a student out of which to hire extra ancillary staff to collect these books, check them and get them ready for distribution the following year. In a typical large secondary school, there are about 400 Leaving and Matriculation students, so that the sum of 35c a student will work out to a magnificent total of \$140 out of which to hire, at that time of the year, additional clerical staff to do the work.

I have seen something of what is involved in a school in handling books, and I know it is no easy job. I defy anyone to luke someone off the street (and these people will have to be engaged in all high schools) who can handle this efficiently. The only reason the system at Norwood works efficiently is that that school has a couple of senior masters who have been in the school for years and are prepared to put many hours into running the scheme. At a time when teachers are complaining bitterly that they are overburdened, the Minister intends to provide from the princely sum of \$140 temporary ancillary staff in large high schools. It is not an over-statement to say that all the people I have spoken to (and there have been headmasters among them) believe that this is a most ill-conceived scheme.

I believe the Minister even indulged in a little political blackmail by telling schools that they must take this plan or that they would get the other plan. He should know that such an approach is educationally unsound and obnoxious. Earlier I referred to the comments at the Norwood Town Hall. Over the past few months I believe the Minister has displayed complete irresponsibility in the discharge of his responsibilities.

It struck me as rather ironical, as the Leader said, that the crisis in education is supposed to have passed at the date of the Government's election to office. From my knowledge of the sorry state of conditions in schools at present and from the monologue we heard at Norwood, I would say that the crisis is well and truly with us. Whatever the conditions were before the Labor Government came to office, I know (and so does the Minister) that they have not been ameliorated to any great extent. When I asked the Premier earlier how he justified his statement, he got abusive. All he said was that there was some crisis of morale in the last term. We know who contributed to that crisis: it was members of the Labor Party and their fellow travellers. We remember the disgraceful campaign against the former Minister of Education, Mrs. Steele, when she held office. We heard about there being no confidence in Joyce. The Labor Party must have lapped this up. This is the sort of propaganda to which we are being subjected day in and day out, week in and week out. In the Minister's announcement about the Commonwealth Government, there was no suggestion about where the \$280,000,000 would come from. We agree that the Karmel report is an excellent

report, an educational blueprint, but before the Minister starts slamming the Commonwealth Government let him say more about readjusting priorities and let him say that we must have increased taxation. If he did, we might think he had some stomach.

I return to the subject of the moratorium, which was mentioned earlier. I consider that the Deputy Leader dealt with this subject very adequately. The Labor Party has once again had a change of heart. I do not know how they describe it now; the Vietnam Moratorium Committee is now a sort of out group. The Labor Party sees that it is politically expedient to attack this branch of the anti-war movement. We, of course, have adopted the attitude from the start that these people were of dubious intent. In fact, many people have considerable doubts about the V.M.C. and its Chairman. The Premier has described the courses that Professor B. H. Medlin teaches at Flinders University as quite inappropriate. When Professor Medlin was charged as a result of the September moratorium, the magistrate who heard the case considered that he was a most unreliable witness. In fact, the magistrate went further and stated:

Despite his reputation for probity and integrity, as to which the Chief Justice testified—and I have no doubt, therefore, that he has this general reputation—I am quite sure that a lot of his evidence before me in these cases was a pack of lies.

In the Premier's view, he is teaching at Flinders University courses that are quite unsuitable to the department that he heads, and the magistrate who heard his case last year considered that, to put it bluntly, he was a liar. That is what it amounts to: his evidence was a pack of lies. He stated publicly that he would prefer to go to gaol and would be annoyed if anyone paid his fine. The only logical conclusion to be drawn from this is that he prefers to go to gaol rather than discharge his responsibility to his students.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Were you the one who paid his fine?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not pay his fine. The professor, moreover, states publicly that he is a revolutionary Socialist. From my contact with members of the Labor Party, the Socialist Party that now believes in free enterprise, I am not too sure what a Socialist is. However, I know what a revolutionary is. It is no wonder that many people in this community question Professor Medlin's fitness to hold the position that he holds and to be

sustained at the taxpayers' expense. Anyway, the Labor Party has seen fit to throw him off. That Party has now joined the respectable anti-war movement. It has realigned itself with the Campaign for Peace in Vietnam and the member for Mawson eulogized the Chairman of this group as an upright citizen. He is a university lecturer in charge of a politics department, a senior member of the Labor Party, well to the fore in its councils, a frequent commentator in the press and in the anonymous column at the weekend and also a participant in television debates—a fine chap, we are told. We will not argue about that. I have not had the benefit of a close association with that gentleman through a political Party as members opposite have, so I am not in a position to assess his qualities.

Nevertheless, the Premier has more or less lined himself up with this way of thinking. We remember the Premier's stand during the election campaign—"Every citizen must live subject to the law"—good stuff! Then came the moratorium, and what the Premier said made the headlines: "My advice to a young man would be to break the law." Anyway, now we are invited by the member for Mawson to fall in line and walk down the streets. There is a contrary opinion that should at least be aired. An article appeared in the *Advertiser* a week or two ago headed "Reason for the Moratoriums". Members can get up and denigrate the man who wrote that article, Denis Warner, who from 1949 to 1955 was a roving correspondent in the area for the London *Daily Telegraph*. He was Nieman Fellow at Harvard in 1956-67, and he has written several books on this part of Asia. I do not set myself up as a student of Asian affairs, as perhaps some university lecturers and others do, but I think we must concede that this man at least has some knowledge of the conditions in Indo-China. What is the reason for the moratoriums? He says in this article:

Another Australian moratorium has come and gone. For a few hours the flags of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front waved in the city streets and demonstrators paraded their slogans.

He goes on to analyse (I will not read the whole article) why the Americans have not had unqualified success in Vietnam, because of the nature of the war. There is an overall assessment of the position there, the thinking of one of the Communist generals, now deceased, and the reason for the thinking and tactics of the North Vietnamese. He continues:

The Americans are going, it is true, but they are planning to leave behind a support

force and to continue to provide the South Vietnamese with hardware and air power. To be sure that Hanoi's coming offensive meets with more than the qualified success of the 1968 Tet offensive, international pressure against the war must be maintained at a high level.

This is the reason for the moratoriums. He continues:

Public opinion must be built up to the point where the next offensive will produce an overwhelming demand for total withdrawal. Given American fire support and continuing logistical and economic assistance, South Vietnam is in better shape to meet the next North Vietnamese offensive—

the article does not say who the aggressors are there—

—than the Americans and South Vietnamese were at the beginning of 1968. Pacification has made serious inroads into the Viet Cong cadres. It will not be easy, and it may be impossible, to lay down adequate supply dumps in advance of the general offensive. The final phase is just beginning, and in this, moratoriums, and other active protests against the war, will have an important part.

In other words, the war is coming to an end and the Americans and the Australians will withdraw. What is the reason for moratoriums? The reason, he states is to make the victory of the Communists complete. Mr. Warner also states:

The final phase is just beginning, and in this moratoriums, and other active protests against the war, will have an important part. The moment that Washington, under domestic and international pressure, washes its hands of the war will also be the moment of Hanoi's victory.

I do not deny that many of the public of Australia are sick of the war, as is the public of America. When the decision was made to enter this conflict there was an overwhelming mandate given at one election in which this was a central issue in 1966 for the Government's policy. Here we have the wise-after-the-event mob who have the answers now, but for reasons given in this statement the war has been very difficult. Any limited war of this nature where the Americans cannot invade the north is difficult to win, for the reasons stated by Mr. Warner. The value of these demonstrations, according to Mr. Warner, is to make the victory of the Communists complete. I put this point of view to be considered by the Government.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 21, at 2 p.m.