

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

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

QUESTIONS**TRANSPORT BAN**

Mr. HALL: I address my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, and in the absence of the Minister of Labour and Industry I take it that that would be the Acting Premier, who is Deputy Premier in the absence of the Premier. Will the Deputy Premier examine the situation surrounding the Transport Workers Union black ban on the supply of fuel to private bus companies, which are suffering under that ban at present, with the object of having it lifted? The seriousness of the strike is evident not only in the ramifications close to the city but also in those in far-flung areas of South Australia. I understand that urgently needed supplies, including medical requirements, are normally carried by private bus services to areas of Eyre Peninsula. An instance was given to me today of lifesaving drugs or equipment delivered last week, and I was told that if the delivery had been delayed until this week a person's life would have been prejudiced. On the local scene, the bus companies and their ownership are quite innocent of the dispute that has arisen: the Transport Workers Union has insisted that the bus operators require union membership as part of the necessary requirement of employment by those firms. The firms have stated that they will not inhibit the work of union organizers on their premises and, indeed, have facilitated the approach to employees by union representatives. They are innocent of any ramifications concerning the approach by union organizers to the men concerned. The situation has resulted in these firms obtaining an injunction from the Supreme Court that requires the union not to proceed with the black ban. However, as I understand it, the union is proceeding with the ban. In addition, yesterday the union staged a mass meeting at which I believe the Secretary (Mr. Nyland) grossly misrepresented the case before the assembled unionists to such a degree that the vote for the continuation of the strike was in no way related to the relevant issues that exist between the unions, the employers, and the employees. In fact, I am told that the vote was taken on a matter concerning the personal property of Mr. Nyland and the safety of property of the union; that was the misrepresentation

made to those people. In these circumstances and in the light of a possible extension of this strike, I ask the Minister whether he will examine the matter with a view to having the court injunction obeyed and the black ban lifted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Labour and Industry yesterday arranged a meeting between the two parties, and this meeting was held, ending, I believe, at about 5.30 p.m. The parties arranged to meet again this morning and, in fact, met in the office of the Minister of Labour and Industry, but I think this meeting lasted only about five minutes. The Minister of Labour and Industry, as the Leader has said, left this morning for a conference in Tasmania. I had asked the Minister for Conservation (the former Minister of Labour and Industry) to keep in touch with the situation, and he has been doing so this morning, although at this stage nothing definite has been decided on. I point out to the Leader that I understand that the Transport Workers Union will, in fact, meet essential services, although I am not quite sure what the term "essential services" covers.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Hospitals and the like.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes; these are being serviced. The Leader will appreciate that this is a difficult situation, and the Government is anxious to do whatever it can to solve the problem. To this end, the Acting Minister of Labour and Industry is keeping constantly in touch with the situation and I hope that, as a result of this and other things, something may be resolved shortly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General give an assurance that every remedy available to the parties in the present dispute will be enforced on the appropriate application being made? As honourable members will know, the legal proceedings which have been taken in this matter are civil proceedings in the Supreme Court of South Australia, not proceedings before any industrial court or tribunal. As I read the reports in the newspaper, the injunction has been granted by His Honour Mr. Justice Hogarth and, as the Attorney-General will know only too well, any disobedience of such an order is punishable in the appropriate case by imprisonment, and that, of course, in this instance is a civil remedy that can be exercised on the application of the plaintiff. Of course, it could not be carried out without the co-operation of the Sheriff and his officers, who are members of

the Public Service. I therefore ask the Attorney-General for an assurance that if such an application is made and granted everything possible will be done to enforce the appropriate remedy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question directed to the Attorney-General is a hypothetical question—

Mr. Millhouse: Oh!

The SPEAKER: —and subject to certain things happening.

Mr. Millhouse: What absolute nonsense!

The SPEAKER: If the Attorney-General desires to reply, he may do so.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Mr. Speaker, as you have remarked, the question asked by the honourable member is a hypothetical question: any decision of that kind could be made only if and when the situation arose. I and all my colleagues will do everything possible in a spirit of conciliation to restore industrial peace in this State. How this can be achieved or even contributed to by the asking of an inflammatory question, I do not know.

GLENELG TRAM

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport give information about the future of the Glenelg tram service? Since the article appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* about the suggestion of the member for Hanson that the Glenelg trams should receive a facelift, many of my constituents have spoken to me, criticizing the honourable member for making a statement that my constituents believe to be completely unjustified.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment. He may only explain his question.

Mr. LANGLEY: My constituents had previously been informed that the tram service was to be retained and updated. As many of my constituents and their families (and I take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Mawson, whose wife yesterday presented him with a baby boy) use this service, will the Minister tell honourable members, especially the member for Hanson, what steps are being taken to ensure that this service continues to operate at a high level?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Mr. Speaker, I can give the honourable member some information about this matter. I can give the facts, and I regret the member for Hanson did not attempt to get information yesterday before he made criticisms in the Address in Reply debate. In fact, many of the statements he made yesterday were completely off the track;

none was more off the track than his vilification of the Shop Assistants' Union and the completely untrue statement he made about canvassing for Labor Party support.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Standing Orders provide that the Minister shall reply to a question; they do not provide that he shall make a second reading explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has been asked a question by the member for Unley. I ask him to reply to that question and to disregard that part of the explanation of the member for Unley in which he congratulated another member.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was attempting to do exactly what you suggested I should do, but unfortunately the truth has obviously hurt members opposite.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Rubbish! It obviously hurt you.

Mr. McAnaney: Behave like a Minister.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He wouldn't know how.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I apologize again to you, Sir, for saying again that the truth hurts members opposite; they are not used to it. The decision to upgrade the Glenelg tram service was made at the beginning of this year. At 11 a.m. yesterday one of the refurbished trams was on the tracks in King William Street, yet later yesterday the member for Hanson said that the trams should be repainted. That shows how far the honourable member is off the track. Let me emphasize that that is what has been done so that the honourable member may be a little more intelligent in his further remarks.

Mr. CUMBE: I rise on a point of order. The Minister is addressing his remarks to the member for Hanson. I understood that the question was directed by the member for Unley, so the Minister should reply to that honourable member.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister and any other honourable member must address the Chair and not other honourable members in the Chamber. I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to address the Chair and to reply to the question asked by the member for Unley.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: With respect, I was addressing the Chair. I had addressed you as Mr. Speaker, Sir, and I was replying to the member for Unley, who had asked a question about a misstatement by the member for Hanson in this House last evening. The position is as I shall state it. The interior

saloon lighting has been increased by 50 per cent to provide better illumination for passengers. Black-ribbed rubber has been installed in the aisles and entrances to the tramcar. New smooth rubber has been installed under the seats. All seats have been reupholstered and the mechanisms that allow the seats to be reversed have been reconditioned.

Mr. Becker: I am delighted at that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am delighted that the member for Hanson is delighted. I thought, from the way he was speaking last evening, that he wanted the tram thrown out. Metal fittings have been rechrome-plated or replaced with stainless steel units. The member for Glenelg, as a former painter and an ex-unionist, would be interested in this. Window sashes have been repaired or replaced and the leather straps replaced with new ones. The window blinds have also been renewed. The saloon interior has been repainted to a colour scheme recommended by a colour consultant. The new colours make the saloon lighter and brighter for passengers. The exterior of the tramcar has been completely repainted, so last evening the member for Hanson was asking for something that had already been done. However, the honourable member may be interested in these other points. A programme to improve the appearance of the Glenelg track itself has also been in progress for some time, although the honourable member has criticized the condition of the track. Filling to enable the land adjacent to the tram tracks to be levelled has been secured from other authorities and is to be spread by the trust to provide areas that will allow the natural grasses to be kept mown. A special heavy-duty mowing machine, which is towed behind a tractor, has been purchased for this purpose. I hope that I can continue with this reply, despite the mumblings of the member for Hanson. The signs on the Glenelg tram route are also being replaced or repainted to

put them in "as new" condition. The passenger shelters along the route have also been repainted.

Mr. Mathwin: They've had a ball with the painters, haven't they?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections and the Minister is entitled to reply to the question. I ask honourable members to cease interjecting. The honourable Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I want to make only one other point. That is to tell all members, particularly the member for Hanson, who last evening sought to criticize this service, that retired members of the trust's staff have been invited to make a return trip from Victoria Square to Glenelg on the refurbished tramcar tomorrow, July 22. The Mayor of Glenelg, together with members and staff of the council, have been invited to inspect the tramcar while it is at Glenelg and, after making representations this morning to the General Manager of the trust, I can tell the House that, if the member for Hanson cares to travel on the tram tomorrow, not only will he be more than welcome, but he will not be charged a fare.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister for Conservation, in the absence of the Minister of Labour and Industry, give me the information that his colleague was unable to supply yesterday regarding employment in South Australia and a comparison of vacancies listed in this and the other States with the Australian position generally?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have received further details, and I ask leave to have this statistical table incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

UNEMPLOYMENT—JUNE, 1971

State	Registered for Employment		Unemployment	
	No.	Per cent of work force	Benefit Recipients	Registered Vacancies
New South Wales.....	21,609	1.05	5,460	13,623
Victoria.....	17,878	1.19	5,499	9,228
Queensland.....	9,412	1.29	3,368	3,305
South Australia.....	7,975	1.52	2,541	2,596
Western Australia.....	6,683	1.63	1,443	2,340
Tasmania.....	2,682	1.71	873	679
Australia.....	66,239	1.23	19,184	31,771

ROSEWATER CROSSING

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Railways Commissioner whether he intends to install a better type of automatic warning at the Newcastle Street (Rosewater) rail crossing where what is known as the Dry Creek line crosses Newcastle Street? Recently, a fatality occurred at this crossing, and many others have occurred in recent years. In most cases, one reason given for the fatal accident has been the nature of the warning device, which has been there for many years. Representations have been made by many authoritative bodies in the district, as well as by many residents living nearby, for a better and more modern type of warning to be installed with the aim of preventing accidents.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The programme for the current financial year for upgrading of crossings has been determined, but I regret that I do not have details with me. I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Later:

Mr. RYAN: The Minister of Roads and Transport has now told me that he has a reply to my question. I congratulate him on obtaining such a speedy reply, and I would appreciate his giving me this information now.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In our normal efficient manner, when we are asked for information we obtain it as rapidly as possible. I regret that it has taken about 20 minutes to get this reply. Newcastle Street will have the existing wig-wags removed and standard flashing lights with bells installed during this financial year.

FLATS FOR PARAPLEGICS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to my question of July 15 regarding Housing Trust flats for paraplegics?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In 1967, the trust erected accommodation at Mitchell Park which was especially designed and fitted to enable handicapped persons, in particular paraplegics confined to wheelchairs, to live an independent life. The units were built in two adjoining groups comprising 16 three-bedroom family units and 10 one-bedroom units. This type of accommodation has proved satisfactory. Some tenants have moved out, either to their own house or to standard trust rental accommodation. This turnover of tenants has enabled the trust to house a number of subsequent applicants, but at present there is still a small number awaiting assistance. In the light of

the trust's experience with these units and on the recommendations from the medical and nursing professions, it would seem preferable that when any of these special units are built in the future, rather than be built in groups they should be scattered in suitable areas. The trust at present is considering the possibility of providing a small number of special handicapped units in at least some of its housing projects now being planned.

HOLDEN HILL SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether his department intends to provide a cement or similar type of sealed path for the benefit of children who at present have to walk in muddy conditions from the Bentley Drive entrance to the Holden Hill Primary School building?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to attend to the problem raised by the honourable member and obtain a report as soon as possible.

HILLS MOTEL

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the pollution problem that may be created by the building of a motel in the Hills area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Engineering and Water Supply Department was unaware of the current proposal which had been approved by the Mount Barker council subject to a report by the building inspector. Inquiries have since revealed that the present proposal includes a nine-bedroom hotel with lounge, bar and beer garden and application has been made for a full publican's licence. It is understood the hearing will be held by the Licensing Court on Tuesday, August 3, 1971.

No request for approval of sewerage disposal facilities has been received by the Public Health Department. Although the proposed owner has proceeded without consultation with the department, the present proposal is not in conflict with the current water pollution policy, provided that adequate facilities are included for proper treatment and disposal of effluent within the 21-acre site. This will be ensured by the Public Health Department and close surveillance will be maintained on the operation of the facilities.

DUST POLLUTION

Mr. BURDON: Can the Minister for Conservation say what action the Government plans to minimize the emission of dust and particles from industrial plants, including boiler plants?

For several years I have had complaints from people in my district who suffer considerably because of factory dust. These complaints are genuine and justified, and each complaint has been personally investigated. I have made numerous representations to have legislative action taken that would afford relief for these people who suffer from these disabilities.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member may have noticed some of my recent statements about this matter. Regulations controlling the emission of smoke from factories will, I hope, be introduced in the latter half of this year. However, if the honourable member has in his district a specific problem that requires urgent and close attention, I shall be pleased if he will tell me and I will act to ensure that something will be done to solve the problem.

CALF FOOD

Mr. RODDA: Will the Deputy Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture what is the reason for the current shortage of calf food being experienced by graziers in this State, particularly Denkavit, which seems to be the most popular and effective food? Arising from problems facing rural producers, there has occurred an upsurge of calf rearing by means of artificial food and Denkavit is virtually taking the place of feeding the calf from the cow. It has been suggested that one reason for the shortage is that this food is being exported to South Africa. The shortage is embarrassing calf breeders in my district and in other districts. I believe that valuable animals are being slaughtered for fish paste and similar foods, whereas they could be bred with advantage to the industry.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to inquire.

WOMBATS

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister for Conservation say how many wombats are involved in the destruction permit issued by his department to a landowner on the West Coast? Is other action contemplated?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Following a recent press report that a landowner on the West Coast had applied for a pest permit to destroy wombats, the honourable member asked me a question. This application has been considered. I remind the honourable member that local inspectors of the department do not issue these permits: they investigate the claim made by the landowner and report

to the department, and the head office of the department decides whether to issue a permit. In this case the landowner considered that a permit to destroy at least 300 wombats was warranted. However, after an investigation a permit to destroy 50 has been issued. If it is found on re-examination that the destruction of this number would not be sufficient to relieve the problem of the landholders in that area a further application will be considered.

Mr. Gunn: Let him lose his crop first!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member seems to think that we have not been generous enough, but I point out that this is not an area in which we could act hastily. The wombat is not, as the honourable member seems to want us to believe, in such large numbers—

Mr. Gunn: By your interpretation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: —as he suggests. In reply to the honourable member who asked the question, at this stage we have issued a permit for the landholder to destroy 50 wombats, and I hope that this will be sufficient to solve the problem on this property. One of the local residents, who has been associated with the fauna park in the area, has told the department that he would be willing to take and look after some of the wombats until individuals who can obtain a permit to take a pair of wombats could be found. If this action is taken but we still find that more wombats should be removed, further consideration will have to be given this matter, but I hope that this action will result in the problem being solved.

Mr. GUNN: How has the Minister's department arrived at the figure of 50 wombats for destruction? In explanation of my question, since the member for Mitchell has seen fit to poke his nose into the affairs of my district—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member sought leave to explain his question, not to comment. I call on the Minister to reply.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This question about natural fauna does not concern merely the district of the member who has asked it: all members have an interest in conservation. The local inspector for the district is familiar with the area and with the damage that wombats can cause. He has been over the area and has seen the problems that the wombats have caused.

Mr. Gunn: Have you seen what they can do?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes. The inspector, who based his observations on the number of wombats in the area and on the damage done, concluded that 50 wombats could be removed from the area.

TORRENS RIVER EFFLUENT

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Works report on the source of the sewage that has been reported to be flowing intermittently into the Torrens River from a pipe near the Hackney Bridge? Can he say whether similar pipes are discharging into the Torrens River, and whether regular action is taken to check the possible pollution level of the Torrens Lake?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Pipes other than the one to which the honourable member has referred discharge a weak effluent into the Torrens River at certain times of the year, but I am not certain of their location. However, there is a method of warning the department when this occurs, and workmen are immediately sent to the area to ensure that no sewage, etc., is left lying around. I am not certain about checks made regarding pollution levels in the Torrens River, but—

Dr. Tonkin: Where does it come from?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It comes from an inadequate sewer main in certain suburbs in that area. This main will eventually be replaced, but I think the honourable member will appreciate that these mains were laid many years ago and are not completely adequate to serve the area at certain periods of the year, mainly because of heavy rain. When it rains heavily, the drainage causes the pipes to be overloaded and, in fact, if this facility were not available it would mean that manholes, for instance, would be popping open, which would be undesirable. The facility is a most desirable one. Although I made a press statement on the matter recently, following a complaint that had been received, I will obtain a full report for the honourable member, and he will see that in due course the whole matter will be rectified, but it will take time. In the meantime, there is no other means of alleviating the situation.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to instruct officers of his department to undertake microbiological investigations into the level of contamination of the water in the Torrens Lake? I am most disturbed by the reply I received to an earlier question on a slightly different topic relating to discharge of sewage into the Torrens River.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That is incorrect. There is no discharge of sewage into the Torrens River, and you know it.

Dr. TONKIN: Reports have specifically stated that at times human excreta is being discharged into the Torrens River from a pipe near the Hackney Bridge, and this constitutes a decided public health risk. Water from the Torrens River, as well as filling the lake and providing a tourist attraction, is used in the paddling pool in the park lands (children swim in that pool), and it is also used to water the park lands. I am appalled at the attitude of the Minister of Works, and I can only appeal to the Minister of Health to take appropriate and urgent action. The present situation is just not good enough.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. CLARK: Can the Minister of Education give the House further suggestions in regard to writing to Commonwealth members, in the interests of education, along the lines of his letter that was amazingly and mistakenly described by the member for Hanson last evening as being arrogant? I do not wish to explain my question; I think I can safely leave it to the Minister to explain the situation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In the arrangements made by the Institute of Teachers and the Parent-Teacher Council for the recent meeting at the Norwood Town Hall, invitations were extended to all State and Commonwealth members concerned, and it was made clear to school committees that one of the purposes in arranging for school committees to meet with their respective members after the meeting was so that the people concerned, as individuals, would be aware of the general and specific problems of the schools. However, concerning general problems, school committees wanted members to assist in the campaign that is being conducted for increased Commonwealth aid for education. As a consequence of various communications between school committees and members (most of which the members have simply passed on to me as Minister of Education), we had great piles of correspondence in the office. Many of the problems raised by the school committees are general problems; they are not peculiar to the school in question, and in these circumstances it would obviously be inappropriate for the Education Department to require its officers to spend long hours preparing replies in detail on those general points.

Certain matters affecting a school which are not concerned with general policy will be investigated, but the general problems that have been raised with members will finally result in a general policy statement being made by the department. In the course of my reply both to the member for Hanson and to the member for Mitcham, who I think suggested to the member for Hanson that my reply to them was arrogant, I suggested that they were misunderstanding part of the purpose of the meeting held at Norwood and that the Parent-Teacher Council considered that it was essential that Commonwealth members especially should become vitally aware of the general problems of education in this State; and that, as a consequence of the letters they had received, they would be acting in the interests of the Parent-Teacher Council and education generally if they approached any of their Commonwealth colleagues who they thought might be able to exert influence in this matter.

I suggest to members, especially the member for Hanson, that this is just a matter of common sense. I had hoped that members opposite would fully support the case for Commonwealth aid for education and would fully support the stand taken by the member for Torrens when he was Minister of Education, but apparently some of them do not. Apparently, because they have a Liberal Government in Canberra, some of them prefer to abuse the State Government and not take up the cudgels on behalf of the State with Commonwealth members. The sooner members opposite support the conclusions of the national survey, which were reached as a consequence of the action of seven Liberal Governments throughout Australia, the better off we will be.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Education explain why the sum spent on education last financial year increased by only 20 per cent, whereas the sum received by South Australia from the Commonwealth Government by way of taxation reimbursement and other grants increased by 24 per cent? Also, can he say why he criticized the previous Government for not spending on school buildings money that it had in the Loan Fund, whereas now there is \$13,000,000 in the Loan Fund? Why does he not now criticize his own Government for not spending some of this money on school buildings, instead of criticizing the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, any idiot would know that tax reimbursement grants cannot be spent on school buildings.

Secondly, the sum spent on school buildings last financial year was \$17,900,000 which is an all-time record in this State; that came about after the expenditure by the previous Government in its last year of office of only \$13,800,000. Only as a result of protests made was the sum spent by that Government increased during the year. Therefore, the effective policy of this Government has been to provide for an all-time record expenditure on school buildings that far exceeds anything spent previously.

Mr. McAnaney: Through the largesse of the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, because, as the honourable member should be aware, school buildings are financed not out of the tax reimbursement grant but out of Loan moneys. The Loan moneys available to the State last financial year increased by 7 per cent or 8 per cent, whereas for the coming financial year they have increased by only 4 per cent.

Mr. McAnaney: Answer the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am answering it, but the honourable member is incapable of understanding logical connections. The figure I wanted to quote for the honourable member is at page 93 of *Hansard*. The passage states:

In 1969-70 the taxation reimbursement grant was \$125,706,000. For 1970-71 the comparable figure was \$146,932,000, an increase of \$21,226,000, or about 17 per cent.

Therefore, the figure did increase.

Mr. McAnaney: I said it went up 24 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has asked the Minister of Education a question and—

Mr. McAnaney: I haven't got a reply.

The SPEAKER: The Minister of Education is replying to the question. If the honourable member is not satisfied, he can ask another question in his turn but he must not take the opportunity to make a speech by interjecting in this Chamber. I ask the honourable Minister to give his reply, and the honourable member, if he is not satisfied, can raise the matter at some other time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was pointing out that the tax reimbursement grants to this State increased by 17 per cent and that the Education Department's current expenditure increased by about 20 per cent, an all-time record for this State.

Mr. McAnaney: But you—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member does not want to hear the reply, I will ask the Minister to refrain from replying. Other honourable members want to ask questions and Question Time shall not be turned into a debating period.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do intend to reply to the question. Mr. Speaker, because the honourable member's statements create a misleading impression that must be corrected. The second point I wish to emphasize again is that the Loan money available to the State, from which school buildings are financed, increased by only about 6 per cent to 8 per cent, yet the increase in expenditure on school buildings was \$2,500,000 on \$15,500,000, a percentage increase significantly greater than the increase in the amount of Loan money available. Thirdly, the specific grants for education from the Commonwealth Government for science laboratories, libraries, teachers colleges, etc., decreased by 25 per cent. The effective reduction in those grants was from an actual amount available in 1969-70 of a little over \$4,000,000 to a little over \$3,000,000 in 1970-71. I suggest that the honourable member check the amount actually paid by the Commonwealth Government under the various headings for education specifically by way of grants and, if he does that, he will find that the amount in 1970-71 for Government schools and teachers colleges was less than the amount made available in 1969-70. However, last year there was a disproportionate reduction in Commonwealth funds for teachers colleges. On both current and Loan expenditure, this Government has increased expenditure by a record amount, and the increase is more than the increase in respect of any funds made available by the Commonwealth Government.

PORT LINCOLN HARBOUR

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Marine say what stage has been reached regarding planning of the new deep sea port at Port Lincoln and when construction of the main project will commence? Recently in Port Lincoln a person (an ex-secretary of the Australian Labor Party sub-branch, and an active Party member in Port Lincoln) has been trying to drum up support to have this project delayed, and even stopped, by claiming that the plans submitted to the Public Works Committee and approved by Cabinet were wrong; in other words, he has set himself up as an expert apparently to advise the Marine and Harbors Department on this

matter. This person was given an opportunity to give evidence before the Public Works Committee and, in fact, did so. His evidence was specifically answered by the Director of Marine and Harbors (Mr. Sainsbury), who is quoted in the Public Works Committee report on this project as follows:

(This gentleman) is no doubt imbued with the best intentions in putting forward his alternative scheme but it suffers from the fact that he is a layman attempting specialized work without the detailed knowledge and information available to the officers of the Marine and Harbors Department.

I must say that I cannot follow the reasoning of this person, because this project would provide a vital stimulus to the economy and to employment in Port Lincoln generally. However, as some doubt has been raised in people's minds whether the project will proceed, I ask this question of the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether the honourable member is seriously suggesting that the whole scheme may be abandoned.

Mr. Carnie: This man is doing his best to have that done.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know of his efforts at all. As far as I am aware, the planning of this project at Port Lincoln has not changed, nor will it change. The Public Works Committee has reported on the project, and the department has confirmed the decision taken. In fact, Mr. Sainsbury is in Port Lincoln, I think today (he may have been there last evening), addressing the Chamber of Commerce on my behalf and, I think, making it perfectly clear to local residents that there will be no delay on the project and stating, in fact, that it will proceed.

Mr. Carnie: When?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not have that information, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

DARLEY ROAD

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the widening and reconstruction of Darley Road, Campbelltown, will be considered by the Highways Department soon? In addition, will he say what developments, if any, have taken place recently on the proposed construction of a bridge over the Torrens River at the Darley Road ford?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain this information for the honourable member and bring it down as soon as possible.

SCHOOL CHEQUES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education arrange to have details of payments by the Education Department accompany cheques that are forwarded to independent schools? An independent school in my district received from the department a cheque representing payment based on an assessment under the needs scheme, but no detail was supplied as to the category in which the school had been placed or the period the payment covered. For the purposes of accountancy and planning, these details are necessary. Although this is not a difficult problem, it would help if the Minister could arrange for these details to accompany cheques.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will see what can be done.

SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. KENEALLY: As suggestions have been made that the new book scheme, which was recently announced by the Minister of Education and which will apply to secondary schools, could be difficult to implement, will the Minister clearly say how the scheme is intended to work?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am grateful to the honourable member for asking this question, for there has been a tendency by some people to misrepresent the nature of the scheme, the basic purpose of which is to achieve a reduction in costs to parents by means of greater economy in the use of books. I believe members appreciate that, if a book list costs \$40 for new books and if the books on average last for two years, the cost of a loan scheme for those books can be reduced to a cost of \$20 a year. If the book allowance next year for fourth year is \$30 a year and for fifth year is \$40 a year, a further \$8 or \$10 will be available to reduce other fees charged by the school. That is the basic purpose of the scheme. For those who have previously purchased new books, the actual saving is not only a saving in relation to the cost of textbooks but also a saving in respect of other fees that the school previously charged. It has been suggested to schools not that they should eliminate all fees previously charged but simply that they should use the scheme to bring about a reduction in the fees charged to parents. We would hope that ultimately this kind of scheme would enable the Government to be able to eliminate fees entirely.

Towards the end of October or November this year, the schools that are administering the scheme need to be able to buy back from students in fourth year and fifth year this year any textbooks no longer required by those students, because that means that part of the initial stock of books for the scheme next year can be obtained from the secondhand sources at the end of this year. In order to put schools in a financial position in which this can be done, up to 40 per cent of the secondary school book allowance due to be paid to the schools or parents in March or April next year will be made available to the schools in late October this year. This does not cost the Government any additional sum whatever: it is merely a change in the timing of the payment during one financial year. In addition, it is intended that a payment should be made to each school so that additional casual clerical help can be obtained for the administration of the scheme at the end of this year and at the beginning of next year. The sum suggested initially (and it is not the absolutely final sum) was about 35c a student. I point out that that would permit the employment of clerical time of almost 20 minutes a student and that that rate of payment should certainly be adequate to provide for the clerical tasks associated with issuing books to students at the beginning of the year and receiving books back from those students at the end of the year. However, we are open to experience on this aspect of the scheme.

On this aspect it is not possible to make an absolutely clear decision about how much is necessary. The work of the schools in issuing books to students at the beginning of the year is undertaken within the schools; to the extent that assistance is now given for that purpose, teachers in the schools will be in a slightly better position. We do not believe that the scheme will be expensive: we believe that in the long run an effective introduction of a scheme such as this that achieves greater economy in the use of books will ultimately help avoid some of the increases in secondary school book allowances that would otherwise have taken place. The overall economy of the scheme will be of great assistance in this regard.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'll get a cheap education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is not so. The member for Kavel is apparently opposed to reducing costs to parents in this way.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's ridiculous.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He has said previously that, if we use second-hand textbooks—

Mr. Goldsworthy: I said that last evening.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member does not want to listen.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is permitted to reply to a question, but, in replying, he is not permitted to reply to matters raised in a debate that took place, possibly last evening. I ask the honourable Minister to confine his remarks to replying to the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The scheme is, first of all, a scheme that does not compel parents to join in it; parents are given the choice of opting in or out of the scheme.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What choice—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, if I am not allowed to reply to interjections, I would appreciate their not being made.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are the schools compelled?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has been asked a question and I have asked him to confine his remarks to replying to that question. I ask other honourable members to maintain order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At Norwood High School this year the scheme has applied to fifth-year students and, excluding repeat students, only three parents out of about 200 opted out of the scheme. However, that option will always be open to the parents in this scheme. If a certain school feels so badly about the scheme that it does not want to go on with it and if it will face up to parents and devise other ways of lowering costs to parents, that certainly will not be frowned on. However, it is up to the school and the teachers to pay some attention to the position of parents and the need to minimize costs that parents currently have to meet. One other matter I want to refer to—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You're supposed to reply to the question only.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have been asked to explain the scheme and I am explaining it. One other matter is that specific assurances have been given (and they have been put on paper) that the scheme will not be allowed to affect the profit that now goes into school funds from the sale of books and that that return to the school will be continued. Also, the scheme will not be allowed

to impinge on the right of teachers to change the titles of new books as a consequence of desirable curriculum developments or because of other changes that they desire to introduce. These assurances have been given to the headmasters and to the South Australian Institute of Teachers. My Government and I feel strongly that a scheme like this, the object of which is to achieve a reasonable economy in the use of books, should not detract from the desirability of ensuring that teachers responsible for a course can acquire the textbooks necessary to teach that course at the highest possible standard.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say whether secondary schools will be compelled to take part in the book scheme recently announced by him? I believe that, at the meeting of headmasters held last Tuesday week, there was total opposition to this scheme.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to comment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was endeavouring to explain, Mr. Speaker. Be that as it may, the Minister has stated this afternoon, in reply to a question, that the schools will not be compelled to adopt the scheme if they are willing to reduce charges to parents (or words to that effect). As, in view of the Minister's statements regarding the achievement of educational aims and the turnover of books, headmasters are convinced that this scheme cannot be economically and efficiently run, I ask the Minister whether secondary schools will be compelled to adopt this scheme.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have already made a statement on that this afternoon, and I made an identical statement at the meeting of headmasters last Tuesday week.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Would you repeat it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I repeated it again this afternoon.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do it now!

The SPEAKER: Order! Once a question has been asked, it is not permissible to ask questions again and again.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's a different question.

The SPEAKER: I call on the Minister of Education. Members are not allowed to ask the same question twice.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have already made a statement on this matter this afternoon, covering the point now raised by the member for Kavel. Apparently, he was not listening at the time.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Yes, I was.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Then the honourable member had better check *Hansard* to find out—

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's a different question. I asked a question and I want a reply.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is replying. This is not a debate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am afraid the member for Kavel is an ignoramus, because in the course of the previous statement I replied to the question he has now asked. I also answered it in identical terms when I was talking to headmasters at Norwood last Tuesday. To make sure, I repeat that I said that compulsion did not apply but that I expected that, in view of the economies that could be achieved for parents, parents would want to join the scheme and would no doubt be disturbed if a certain school would not participate in it. I made that position clear. I should also make clear that the additional clerical assistance being provided and the other matters associated with this scheme apply in relation to this scheme. The member for Kavel has had very inaccurate reports of the meeting at Norwood. It is simply not the case that there was total opposition: he has either been misinformed or is exaggerating the position for his own political purpose. Moreover, the scheme is capable of running efficiently and economically. If the honourable member can get through his thick skull the simple fact that—

Mr. Goldsworthy: It is not as thick as yours.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —if, on average, textbooks last for two years, a textbook list that costs, for example, \$40 can be provided effectively under this kind of scheme for \$20 a year, which is below the current book allowance currently provided for fourth-year and fifth-year students. Some textbook lists for fourth-year and fifth-year students would not cost as much as \$40 while others would cost a little more than \$40. The suggestion that on average these textbooks might last for as long as two years is certainly conservative. If they are properly cared for many of them will last for longer, but the conservatively estimated life of a book is two years, and this clearly means that a book list costing new, say, \$40 can be provided by the school for \$20 a year. That is the basic economic fact which underlies the scheme and which means that it is workable and is capable of being effective and of achieving not just the elimination of textbook costs to parents but

also some reduction in the fees charged to parents.

In the case of Norwood High School, I point out that textbooks have been provided free of charge, an \$8 composite fee has been eliminated, and an issue of stationery has been made free of charge to fifth-year students. That has been achieved in relation to this scheme and that was on a book allowance of \$28 for fifth-year students this year. The member for Kavel should not examine the scheme in the light of previously held prejudices: he should be willing to allow the scheme to have a fair trial because its stated object of achieving a reduction in the price to parents of education without impairing the efficiency of the education system, curricula development, and the right of teachers to change titles when necessary is worth while and should have the support of headmasters, the honourable member and all other members of this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It has the support, but there are other economic matters to which you haven't referred.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Kavel has asked his question and had a reply. I expect members who have asked their question to show courtesy to their colleagues who have not asked a question and to allow them to ask questions in silence. I ask that the honourable member for Glenelg be permitted to ask his question without interruption.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Works say when Drain No. 18, which is part of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, will be commenced? Earlier this winter considerable flooding occurred in this area, causing great hardship and financial and general worry to many people there, and the commencement of the drain would prevent a repetition of this trouble.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the Minister of Local Government would be the Minister to give that information to the honourable member. However, I will take the matter up with my colleague, if necessary, and obtain the information for the honourable member.

SCHOOL WATER COOLERS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Education consider installing refrigerated water coolers at infants and primary schools? I

understand that the Education Department has replaced the type of drinking tap used at schools so as to prevent a health hazard, and I ask the Minister whether it would not be better for our schoolchildren to drink refrigerated filtered water, instead of unfiltered water from taps in school yards, the latter water being muddy at times and warm to hot in summer.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine this matter for the honourable member. My impression is that water coolers are available on a subsidized basis and that many school committees do install them on this basis, many having been installed already. However, I will check the details so that the precise information is available for the honourable member.

HIGH SCHOOL COUNCILS

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Education be more explicit regarding the details he gave yesterday in reply to a question regarding the formation of high school councils? I hope the Minister will be as grateful to me as he was to the member for Stuart earlier this afternoon. However, the Minister has not asked me to ask this question. I understood the Minister to say that high school councils would be given an opportunity to express an opinion. However, I am not sure whether he meant that it was now open to these councils to express an opinion, or that he would communicate with the councils and seek an opinion before the end of the year, expecting that the new constitution would come into operation in about the middle of January, 1972.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am grateful to the honourable member for asking the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Another Dorothy Dixer?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, but if I had thought of it I would have asked the honourable member to ask his question anyway. I have already written to the High School and Technical High School Councils Association asking for submissions on this matter, and I would imagine that the association would communicate with individual high schools. It seemed to me more appropriate that the association should collate the various opinions expressed by the individual councils, summarize them, and express the association's own general view on the matter, rather than that the Government should ignore the existence of the association and approach individual high

schools and technical high schools directly for an individual opinion. What I considered should be done has been done in this matter. I should think it completely appropriate for any high school council to make representations on this matter to the association or, indeed, direct to me if it wished to do so. One other matter I should like to mention in this regard is that radio news reports this morning that detailed the recommendation of the Karmel committee on this matter might have been taken to imply that the Government had accepted that recommendation, whereas this is not the case. The whole purpose of asking for submissions is to have, before making a decision, not only the Karmel committee's opinion but also the opinion of those directly associated with schools.

NORTHERN RAILWAY LINES

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what is the Government's policy on the future of the narrow gauge railway lines in the north of the State, namely, from Gladstone to Wilmington and from Peterborough to Quorn? We understood that the Commonwealth Government had decided not to recommend that these narrow gauge lines be standardized in the Commonwealth's present programme.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The former Government agreed to employ Maunsell and Partners, a firm of consultants, to carry out a feasibility study on terms mutually agreed to by the Commonwealth Government and the State Government. This feasibility study did not recommend the conversion of these narrow gauge lines in the standardization project. Of course, on that basis the decision about the future of these lines, whether to try to continue the operation of two narrow gauge lines in complete isolation or whether to do away with these lines altogether, would remain in the hands of the State Government. It appeared obvious from the committee's recommendation that to continue these two narrow gauge lines in isolation, without any connection, would be impossible. When we became the Government we came to grips with this aspect and with other aspects of the Maunsell report, even though the former Government had virtually agreed to the recommendations of the Maunsell study, with the one proviso about a hope that the proposal could perhaps be varied to give a connection with Elizabeth.

Mr. Venning: I asked the Minister about—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought that the question was about the future of the lines, and this is tied up completely with the Maunsell report. I am sorry if I cannot give the honourable member the reply he would like, but I am trying to give him the facts. Over a period since we came into office we have had virtually non-stop negotiations with the Commonwealth Government on a Premier-Prime Minister level and on a State-Commonwealth Minister level in an endeavour to resolve the whole position of the northern lines to which the honourable member has referred. It appears that we have met with much success, as we have arranged for connections to Elizabeth, Woodville, and the industrial complex at Mile End. Nothing had previously been achieved, and it appears to be impossible for us to achieve anything further. The position regarding the northern lines is the same now as it was when the Government of which the honourable member was a member was in office.

HAWKER SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Education take steps to have three important matters at the Hawker Area School attended to: first, asphalt paving of the schoolyard; secondly, provision of a new classroom and library; and thirdly, painting of the school buildings? Application for this work to be done was made to the Public Buildings Department on May 14, 1969. The asphalt paving, which is the most important matter, was referred to that department on August 20, 1969. The main problem is that the additional classrooms, which were built some time ago, were built away from the paved area. In wet weather, there might be a pool of water up to 20ft. wide between the classrooms. The classroom and library block is badly needed, because the present library is very small and because the science room is being used as a science room and as a secondary classroom. Funds for painting were approved on October 17, 1969; the work was referred to the Public Buildings Department on August 18, 1970; and tenders closed on January 14, 1971. On April 21, the school was told that paving was still dependent on survey, that consideration was still being given to the site for classrooms, and that painting had been deferred because of lack of funds.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think, without knowing in detail what the position is,

that painting will proceed shortly. I think the area to be paved is the area between the old pavement and the new craft blocks that have been added. I think the honourable member should have said craft blocks instead of classrooms. I shall be pleased to obtain a reply.

LOTTERIES

Mr. HALL: Will the Deputy Premier have the Lottery and Gaming Act regulations framed so that organizations within the State that have many constituent branches may obtain licences for minor raffles and competitions up to \$100 or \$200 in prize money with only one enabling licence, instead of having to obtain a licence for each individual branch of operation? I have received, as no doubt many other members have received, representations from organizations so affected. I refer, in particular, to the Country Women's Association, which has 306 branches. If each branch is required to have a \$5 licence to conduct raffles or games of chance for a prize of up to \$200, the licence fee would represent over \$1,500, which would be collected from moneys provided by the charitable work of individuals in the community who are trying to help other people. People who studied the legislation when it was introduced believed that its objective in regard to smaller lotteries was to regularize and control them to bring some order into gambling in the community. It was never considered by the general public that the Government would try to earn revenue from small lotteries run by charities.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader is correct in saying that members other than himself have been approached about this matter, and I am one of them. I have taken up this matter with the Chief Secretary, to whom I shall refer the Leader's comments. Although there are difficulties in this matter, I will obtain a report as soon as possible.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government intends to introduce amendments to the Local Government Act this session? A Bill was rejected in its entirety by another place last session, notwithstanding that it included matters that were desired by local government, including a provision that particularly interested my constituents and me. That is the clause that gave power to councils to request the disposal of unwanted reserves or parts of reserves of more than half an acre. This power was

required by councils seeking to assist in establishing kindergartens but, because of the action of another place, many kindergarten committees, particularly one in my district, were affected by the rejection of this legislation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government has considered this matter and is concerned that many of the desirable features sought by councils were denied them by the actions of the Legislative Council. Accordingly, we will be re-introducing the Bill, and we hope that a more tolerant attitude will be adopted by the Legislative Council to the needs and desires of the people.

NORTH ADELAIDE SCHOOL

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister of Works will recall that last session I asked several questions about the North Adelaide Primary School in which I requested that the old buildings, which as the Minister would appreciate are part of one of the oldest schools in this State, be repainted and renovated. The Minister may also recall that when I asked this question the second time he told me that he had agreed that funds would be made available for this work to proceed; I think the sum was about \$50,000. Can the Minister say when it is intended that this work will be done?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot reply offhand, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Works urgently investigate the continued breakdown of the air-heating system at the Mount Gambier High School? This system, which was installed about two years ago, has been in use only about one-third of the time because of continued breakdowns. It is claimed that bad initial planning, which made no allowance for expansion and contraction, has caused numerous pipes to burst, and this, combined with electrical faults and pump failures, has resulted in only one-third efficiency of the unit. It is claimed that the lack of suitable maintenance makes the position intolerable. This is a serious situation, particularly with the weather experienced in the South-East at this time of the year, and I hope the Minister will be able to take action to rectify this situation, particularly in relation to maintenance and the correction of the fault, in order to ensure that the unit operates efficiently.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall have the matter investigated and obtain a report for the honourable member.

TOURIST BUREAU BUILDING

Mr. EVANS: Can the Leader of the Opposition say on what date the previous Liberal and Country League Government announced the proposal to build a new building for the Tourist Bureau in Adelaide? It was recently announced by the present Labor Government that it was intended that a new building for the Tourist Bureau would be built in South Australia, but no credit was given to the former L.C.L. Government for its activities concerning this project and the fact that it had announced that it intended to construct this building. Has the Leader further details of this matter?

Mr. HALL: I saw a reference on television to the announcement that a new building for the Tourist Bureau was to be built in South Australia, and I was rather surprised, because the L.C.L. Government announced on July 2, 1969, that a new building for the Tourist Bureau would be built and, I think, predicted that it would be finished in October, 1971. The decision was made by the previous L.C.L. Government and not by the present Labor Government. Why the present Labor Government has repeated the announcement but failed to give credit to the previous L.C.L. Government is not within my knowledge.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Take out your handkerchief and stop crying!

Mr. HALL: I know that the Minister, who is particular about facts and figures, would like me to put things right and give credit where it is due. To place the matter in its proper perspective, let me say that it is true that the decision to construct this building and to set aside the necessary funds for it was made by the previous L.C.L. Government, not by the present Labor Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You never set aside a cent.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is untrue and you know it.

The SPEAKER: I point out to honourable members that questions to ex-Ministers concerning transactions during their term of office are not in accordance with Standing Orders.

Mr. Hall: I wasn't the Minister.

Mr. CURREN: Having noticed the press announcement about the construction of a new building for the Tourist Bureau in South Australia, I ask the Minister of Works whether he has any comment to make on what this Government intends to do.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I welcome the opportunity to say a few words following the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the Minister of Works replying to a question?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am replying to a question asked by the member for Chaffey, who invited me to comment on the announcement made in the newspaper. The announcement involved the calling of tenders for the new building for the Tourist Bureau in King William Street.

Mr. Hall: Not the one I saw.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The announcement was that tenders had been called: there was no other reason to make the announcement. Tenders had been called some time before for the demolition of the old building, and tenders were called recently for the construction of a new six-storey tourist office in King William Street, with provision to add a further two storeys later. The present Government did not claim that it initiated moves for this new office, but I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that his Government referred the project to the Public Works Committee, which recommended against the construction of this building.

Mr. Hall: A Labor-dominated committee.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should like the Leader to check that statement too, because I think he will find that he is a little off the track again. The Public Works Committee recommended against the construction of this building. I remind the Leader that the Government has no authority to spend money on any project unless it has been recommended on by the Public Works Committee one way or the other. How on earth, in these circumstances, could the previous Government have allocated funds for this purpose? True, this Government (and not the previous Government, as stated by the Leader of the Opposition) has allocated funds for the construction of the new Tourist Bureau building, and I am pleased to note that work on the building is going ahead. Indeed, the previous Government must be given some credit for initiating the project, but members opposite would be the last people in the world to give this Government any credit for bringing the project to fruition, as we are in fact doing. I do not see that there should be any area of disagreement, except that the Leader of the Opposition is a little hurt that we are able to announce purely and simply that tenders have been called for this project.

Mr. COUMBE: I recall the Minister putting this proposal before Cabinet and, at the same time, outlining how the financial aspect would be achieved on the usual five-year programme he works on, so financial arrangements were made to have the building constructed. This was accepted by Cabinet, and the matter was referred to the Public Works Committee. The committee heard legal argument, of which I am aware, and in its recommendations it rejected the proposal because of the legal arguments. However, the Government has now decided to proceed with this building. As it cannot proceed without the committee's approval, I ask the Minister whether this matter was referred back to the committee or whether the committee was advised by correspondence that the legal objections had been resolved?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although it is true that the Government plans five years ahead, it is also true that money is not made available until a decision has been taken to call tenders. This Government made that decision and allocated the money. It could have said, "We do not have the finance." It was the Government's decision to decide whether or not the money was available. When the committee reports to the Minister, whether it recommends for or against, the authority is there for the Minister to spend money.

Mr. Coumbe: A project only has to be referred.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. There was no requirement to refer the matter back to the committee in order to get the recommendation for the proposal to proceed before spending money on it. The honourable member said that the proposal was rejected for legal reasons. I took the decision, as Minister, to proceed with the project because my advice was that, if we did not proceed, the legal matters would never be resolved and that, if we did proceed, the legal matters would be resolved. In fact, they have been resolved, and there is no problem. I am not certain whether the committee was informed by letter. The Chairman of the committee was informed verbally that I had taken this decision, and I also informed him later that the legal aspects had been cleared up. So far as I am aware, there is no requirement to refer the matter back to the committee. Having received the recommendation, the Government could spend money on the project.

DIAL-A-BUS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport elaborate to the House on the recent references made regarding a fairly early

introduction of a dial-a-bus system in this city through using taxis? There is no doubt that members of the public are looking to obtain an early solution of the city's transport problem, and I think it is fair comment that a bus operating under the Minister's control may pick up only perhaps \$5 worth of passengers after the peak period. I think the use of taxi fleets in connection with this system may well contribute to the State's finances, about which the Government is so worried. Can the Minister elaborate on any plans he may have to use the city's 1,200 taxis in connection with the dial-a-bus system?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Representatives of taxi owners called to see me one day last week and submitted an interesting proposal wherein taxis might be used as one way of operating the dial-a-bus concept. This proposal is currently being examined in depth, although the whole concept of dial-a-bus operation will shortly be subject to a more definite study with a view to determining the desirable features necessary for its successful operation. I do not think that at this stage it would be proper to go into great detail about the whole concept other than to make the general observation that it is not just a matter of deciding willy-nilly that something will be done here or that something will be done there: the Government will take action only after the proper studies have been undertaken and, as soon as this has been done, the honourable member, together with the public at large, will be notified of the Government's intentions.

GLANDORE HOME TRANSPORT

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Attorney-General investigate the present transport facilities of the Glandore Boys Home with a view to providing a new bus or a reliable reconditioned unit? I have been informed by one of my constituents, who in an honorary capacity assists in the transport of these boys on excursions to the country, that the present bus provided has been broken down for some weeks. This bus previously afforded an opportunity for the boys in question to travel about as a necessary part of their rehabilitation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the matter raised by the honourable member and let him have a reply.

SMALL BOATS

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Marine say whether it is expected that legislation regarding small power craft will be introduced before the next summer boating season? This

matter is referred to in the Governor's Speech, but it is not precisely indicated whether legislation will be introduced this year or early in 1972: the Speech merely says "this session". Can the Minister clarify the situation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I intend to introduce the relevant Bill into the House early this session in an effort to have it enacted before the next season.

EGGS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Agriculture an authoritative statement on the present state of egg production in South Australia? Will the Minister give his assessment and the department's assessment of the situation that could eventuate if no uniform marketing scheme can be achieved at the Agricultural Council? The Minister will be aware of the difficulty being experienced this year by those in the egg industry, as it has been estimated that the return to producers will be about 7c a dozen less than the price of 12 months ago. Western Australia has undertaken a marketing scheme, and it has been suggested that South Australia and New South Wales are willing to enter into a marketing scheme but have not yet been able to get the other States to agree. Therefore, because of the inability to set up a uniform marketing scheme, producers in this State are in a difficult position.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to get an authoritative statement as quickly as possible.

SHOW ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, say what the Government intends regarding sittings of the House during the Royal Show period? I realize that today is only July 21 and that the show does not commence until early in September, about six weeks hence, but many members want to make plans to accept engagements during the time when the House normally is not sitting, and it would be of great convenience to know whether the normal show procedure will be followed this year. As I remember that procedure, the Budget is introduced on the Wednesday evening and the House does not sit on the Thursday. Then, in the next week of the show the House does not sit and we come back on the following Tuesday. Can the Minister confirm that this will happen again this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, it is intended that the normal procedure be followed. The House may adjourn for a little longer at that time.

Mr. Millhouse: Why?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is not for the honourable member's ears at present. I said it may be that that will be done, and I think it is fair enough for me to give the honourable member an indication that the adjournment may be for a little longer than usual. However, I will confirm that later. I think the show opens on a Thursday, and we will adjourn on that day and will certainly not be sitting during the following week.

Mr. Millhouse: And we may not sit after that?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will confirm that as soon as possible, because I do not want to inconvenience members by holding them in suspense for any longer than is necessary.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government intends to alter the functions of the Wheat Quotas Advisory Committee and replace that committee with a Government-appointed committee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire of my colleague and let the honourable member know.

HOUSE PROCEDURES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask you a question, Mr. Speaker. The question is whether you intend to call together the Standing Orders Committee to review the working procedures of the House. Yesterday, during my speech in the Address in Reply debate, I touched on the subject. Of course, I will not trespass by going into that again, but I am sure you think that the Standing Orders Committee or even you yourself should consider the matter. Then, in due course, if the committee makes a report the House may consider it.

The SPEAKER: I intend to try to get the Standing Orders Committee together as soon as possible to arrange with members of that committee about the date and time of meeting. The honourable member appreciates, as do other members, that members from each side of the Chamber are on the Standing Orders Committee and that it is not always possible to get a time that is suitable for all members

of the committee to meet. I am just as anxious as is the member for Mitcham to try to have these matters discussed, but the honourable member knows well that there are problems in arranging a meeting.

Mr. Millhouse: You're going to try, though?

Mr. Jennings: You've been told that.

The SPEAKER: I intend to try to complete the work that the committee has been doing during the last session, and I am anxious to do this as soon as possible.

HOUSE TELEPHONES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, some members are ignoring your request that, as the new telephone boxes have been fitted out, those boxes rather than the telephones in the interviewing rooms should be used. I have been prevented twice this afternoon from using an interviewing room by another person using the telephone therein. Unless you, Mr. Speaker, remind members of your request, this undesirable practice will continue. The new telephone boxes are adequate.

The SPEAKER: I circularized all members regarding the new telephone boxes. Erskine May states that questions on matters within the Speaker's jurisdiction shall be addressed to the Speaker by private notice. I should appreciate it if questions on private matters were addressed to me so that I would not get into difficulties with other honourable members by not giving them the call.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from July 20. Page .)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): It gives me pleasure to support the motion. I pay my respects to the memory of those members who are no longer with us, in particular those who have passed away. I express my condolences to the families of the late Hon. C. D. Rowe and Mr. Lawn. As every member knows, Mr. Lawn was a character in his own right. He was also a well respected and honoured member of the Labor Party, and we were all saddened by his passing.

There are 34 paragraphs in the Governor's Opening Speech, every one of which is of importance to the State's future. Paragraph

5, dealing with industrial development, interests me as a country member. The Speech deals with the many problems associated with the pollution and conservation of our environment. These problems can be solved by sound town and regional planning, and the State Planning Authority will continue with the preparation of development plans for towns and regions throughout the State. As we all know, this matter is being discussed at length throughout the community. My point on environment, conservation and town planning relates to the development of regional centres. As the cities of Australia contain the great bulk of its population, the development of regions outside the capital cities is of great importance.

The announced policy of the South Australian Labor Party and of the Commonwealth Leader of the Party is for the development of regional areas and centres, and I give that policy my whole-hearted support. With the development of these regions I believe that there is hope for the future and for the containment of our capital cities. When a city reaches a certain size it becomes self-generating and continues to grow.

Mr. Millhouse: That is about a population of 20,000.

Mr. BURDON: We say that it is self-generating at 20,000; some say 25,000 and others say 50,000. I look forward to the day when this will happen in my district. I am aware of an announcement that is to be made about Mount Gambier that could set this self-generating movement in motion. We would have an area of about 60,000 people that would be the operating centre for a region. I am sure that my colleagues also hope that similar regions will be developed in their districts, but I believe that Mount Gambier is reaching a stage where, with the addition of another industry and the development of present industries, it will become self-generating. This is my Party's policy, and we look forward to the day when Australia will enjoy the benefits of a Commonwealth Labor Government. I believe that the events of the last few weeks have set this possibility in motion. Whilst we have people like the member for Rocky River and the member for Eyre, who have complained bitterly about wheat quotas, restrictions on wheatgrowers, and the lack of markets for wool, we also have a statesman-like move by the Leader of the Commonwealth Labor Party and his colleagues in making a journey—

Mr. Gunn: We will never be able to send wheat to China after their efforts, and you know it.

Mr. BURDON: —that will completely change the face of history.

Mr. Gunn: And Whitlam and Patterson making fools of themselves, and intimidating the Wheat Board.

Mr. BURDON: That is the opinion of the honourable member, but I do not think it is shared by his colleagues in the wheat and wool industries.

Mr. Gunn: What did the President of the Wheat Federation have to say about it?

Mr. Wright: You can't sell it, but you still have your head in the sand.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

Mr. BURDON: I am sorry that these gentlemen from the wool and wheatgrowing areas are so concerned about what I am saying, but they are ignoring the truth of the situation. I hope they do not complain about restrictions and quotas and, at the same time, deny an outlet for their products. For about 20 years we have tagged along with the United States of America as our guiding light, but now we find the Australian Government left in the backwoods in relation to China with the announced visit to China of the President of the United States. I believe that this is a visit that many American people have been waiting to see eventuate, because the peace of the world may be brought about by the intervention of the U.S.A. in China.

Mr. Jennings: Canada has done all right.

Mr. BURDON: Of course, but Australia has missed out because of its non-recognition of China.

Mr. Gunn: Why not do your homework: you don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. Jennings: You wish he hadn't.

Mr. BURDON: When people have such allegiance to the League of Rights, the mention of "China" upset them.

Mr. Clark: They think the Liberal Party is a left-wing organization.

Mr. BURDON: China has been recognized by the United Kingdom Government for 21 years, but it has not been recognized by the Australian Government for the last 20 years. It will be interesting to see the reactions of the Liberal Party, and particularly of the Democratic Labor Party, concerning the projected recognition of China by the incoming Commonwealth Labor Government. On the subject of the development of regional areas through the policies of the State and Commonwealth Labor Parties and the decentralization that will follow, I refer to the legislation

introduced by this Government last session to establish an Industries Assistance Corporation. This legislation was passed as part of this Government's programme for further industrial development in South Australia. The corporation has power to assist smaller industries at an early and often critical stage of their development, when they may find it difficult to obtain bank or institutional finance on acceptable terms. I am sure that this situation has occurred in most districts: I have found it, and it is an extremely difficult one. Perhaps because of the lack of finance a small industry has failed.

With the assistance of this corporation small industries could draw on finance, and this could be the answer to the problems of these industries in their early developmental stages. In approved cases the corporation may make non-repayable grants to country industries for development and research, and to lend money to industries anywhere in the State with interest payments deferred. In some cases, where industries are likely to be profitable but are under-capitalized, the corporation is empowered to take up share capital, subject to a recommendation from the Industries Development Committee, and is authorized to borrow from the State Treasury and from other sources. Although for the time being this sum will be limited to \$3,000,000, the new corporation represents an important advance in the development of secondary industry and will be responsible for further decentralizing industry in this State. That is one of the significant features of the legislation passed last session.

During the last 12 months, significantly more houses were built in South Australia by the Housing Trust than were built in the previous year, representing an increase of 28.5 per cent. Last week, I asked a question in this House about housing in my district (a matter that has been causing me concern for a considerable time), namely, an extension of the project involving the building of rental houses in Mount Gambier. Although the Housing Trust has built many houses in this area, there is at present a waiting list amounting to 15 or 16 months, and this is causing considerable concern and unrest among young people who come to Mount Gambier to earn a livelihood. Although they may live in caravans or available flats for a while, the situation becomes unbearable for these young people when they start raising families. Last year, 49 houses were completed in Mount Gambier, and the Minister, in a reply I received from him yesterday, stated that 11

houses were being constructed, and that contracts for another 25 houses had been let, although work on those houses had not yet commenced.

In addition, 20 double units will be built in the area. Although this will take up some of the backlog, it will in no way overcome the present situation, bearing in mind the projected development that I am confident will take place in the area soon. I hope that the Housing Trust will continually keep this matter under review. An industry that may need some assistance from the Industries Assistance Corporation, to which I have referred, is the meatworks to be established in the District of Victoria. This project, which will considerably help the South-East, has received the approval of all sections of the meat industry in the area. Knowing some time ago that the Minister was favourably disposed towards establishing this industry, I was pleased when he announced that it would be located in the South-East, namely, at Naracoorte. The existing works at Mount Gambier of Thomas Borthwick, which has been operating for some years, has an outlet for its products over the border. I hope that the new meatworks to be established in Naracoorte will become an accomplished fact soon.

A significant feature of the legislation considered last session was the new Workmen's Compensation Act, which in many respects leads the field in Australia. Although some features of this legislation are not equal to certain parts of the New South Wales Act, I believe it has other features that surpass those enjoyed in New South Wales. In regard to workmen's compensation, one cannot be niggardly in any way because, after all, one is dealing with human beings. It is extremely difficult for a workman, including his wife and family, to have his source of income cut off through injury and only to receive a minimal sum while he is on compensation. The raising of the weekly sum paid as compensation nearer to an average weekly income is a step in the right direction and a move that I believe every worker in South Australia will welcome. The impending legislation concerning the Police Pensions Fund will be made retrospective to a certain date and will include certain officers who have retired, having reached the age limit in the last few months. This measure is due to the Police Force; indeed, I look forward to the day when Australia has a genuine national superannuation fund, as well as a national health fund.

As most people in the State know, the two largest sawmills in Australia are situated at Mount Gambier, namely, the State sawmill and that of Softwood Holdings Limited. Both these organizations are expanding their activities, including their plantings of softwood timber and radiata pine. Anyone who has not visited Mount Gambier should do so in order to see the manufacturing of radiata pine in the chipped or board form or into paper. It is interesting to see today virtually the whole of a radiata pine tree being used to some purpose. In the old days, only about 28 per cent of the pine log was used. Through the establishment of pulp mills, the conversion of logs to chip form and their reconstitution into board, and saw milling the position is that about 90 per cent of logs is now used. The total available supply of timber is not being used, but in the next few years, with the exception of the bark, virtually all of it will be used in various industries in the South-East. Some chips produced today are taken as far as Melbourne to be used in the manufacture of paper and board. This shows that the industry is becoming more efficient and is on a better economic basis. Everyone is concerned about rising costs, and in this respect the greater the use of raw material the greater the return.

What is happening in the South-East is providing prosperity for the region. In view of the present situation in the rural industry, without the mineral discoveries (South Australia turned over \$100,000,000-worth of minerals last year) and the development of secondary industry, including the forestry industry in the South-East, the State would be in a situation similar to that in which it was placed in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and this applies to the whole of Australia. Mineral production and secondary industry has helped Australia at this time when rural industry is suffering from a lack of markets and falling prices. Despite what Opposition members have said, I believe that all South Australians should be thankful that the Premier is seeking markets in Asian countries for South Australia's manufactured goods. This could provide for the future progress of South Australia. All members know that over 80 per cent of the goods produced in South Australia must be sold in the markets of the Eastern States. Although the markets will increase as those States develop, the time will come when the growth of our industries may be inhibited by lack of markets. We hope the Premier is successful in inducing people in overseas countries to invest in the

State, and in finding markets for our goods in those countries. The member for Chaffey would be greatly interested in the Premier's finding markets for citrus products, especially in view of Britain's pending entry into the Common Market.

I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Education and the department to the need for further education facilities in country areas. Although some criticism has been made of the new schools in Mount Gambier, by and large we are extremely fortunate in having such fine schools, whose equal can be found perhaps only in Whyalla. However, the college of advanced college at Warrnambool is tending to draw students away from the South-East; I hope our education authorities will take note of this. I have been told that the facilities at the college at Warrnambool do not measure up to the facilities at the high and technical schools in Mount Gambier or in other places. However, the Warrnambool college has a diploma, something that country schools in South Australia do not have. This makes a difference in that most, if not all, employers today require people to have a degree, diploma or some other qualification. Our schools should therefore have some educational qualification for students. If such a qualification is provided, our schools will be the equal of those of Victoria.

I had the pleasure of attending the meeting held in the Norwood Town Hall and listening to the addresses of the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science (Mr. Fairbairn) and the State Minister of Education. All I have to say about the meeting is that I thought the Commonwealth Minister had been badly briefed, as he gave no indication that the Commonwealth Government would change its attitude towards the continual plea of the Australian States for more money for education. I believe he caused considerable embarrassment to the Commonwealth and State Liberal Parties. However, I find it curious that since that meeting Opposition members have complained bitterly when we have asked the Commonwealth Government to provide more finance. This is extremely difficult to understand, because, only two years ago, the members of the then South Australian Liberal Government complained bitterly about the lack of finance provided by their Liberal colleagues in Canberra; nowadays they are going out of their way to defend the Commonwealth Government. They say it is terrible for the South Australian Government to have the temerity to suggest that the Commonwealth

Government should increase the assistance it provides to the States. The position has been explained and it is not necessary for me to repeat it, except to say that we all know that the Commonwealth Government holds the taxing powers and distributes to the Australian State Government the taxation collected and, if the Commonwealth Government does not face its responsibilities on taxation and the provision of finance for such development projects as the replacement of school buildings and teachers colleges, I and, I consider, most other people in Australia will condemn that Government for its lack of initiative.

The member for Kavel made an interesting point last evening when he was complaining about the electoral system in this State. He stated that at the last Commonwealth election the Labor Party obtained 51 per cent of the vote and 67 per cent of the districts. I will remember that for about 30 years in this State the Liberal Party foisted upon the people a system whereby that Party retained Government with only 38 per cent of the vote.

Mr. Wright: That was Liberal democracy.

Mr. BURDON: That is the kind of democracy under which the Liberal Party considers that South Australia should operate. That Party believes in minority Government, the same as the South African and Rhodesian Governments do. Rhodesia considers that about 250,000 whites should control about 15,000,000 black Africans, and the same position applies in South Africa. Despite all that has been said about electoral systems and rule by minorities, I consider that we have broken the system in South Australia. Not only have we achieved that for the House of Assembly, but I look forward to the time when the gerrymander and electoral system for the Legislative Council is changed and that House becomes a democratic House similar to the House of Assembly. I do not think that we have yet reached the ultimate desirable electoral system for the House of Assembly.

The only other matter that I wish to raise relates to the train services to the South-East, and I have mentioned this matter several times in this House over the years. We enjoy an overnight and day-time service between Adelaide and Mount Gambier, and we have at long last been promised that, on the day service at least, a mini-buffet will be provided. If I understand correctly, the Railways Commissioner has said that a commencement will be

made about now in providing these mini-buffets on the Bluebird and that ultimately the service will extend to all trains to the South-East.

However, I draw the attention of the Minister of Roads and Transport to one matter that has concerned me. Although the Railways Commissioner has told me that the department has on the drawing board plans for modern air-conditioned carriages for the South-East service, finance must be available before these can be provided. I hope that the Minister can find a hidden pot of finance or gold to construct these carriages. The other problem about the train service at present relates to the mechanical signalling system between Tailem Bend and Wolsley. The last Labor Government moved to electrify this system, and I understand that the electrical system is expected to go into operation about next November and that much of the present lost time will then be avoided. I hope that this is correct and that trains running between Adelaide and Mount Gambier will run nearer to time table. At present, the trains are far from doing that, as the Minister would agree. If the system is not as we expect, we will be approaching the Minister again. I could elaborate on many other matters in the Governor's Speech, but I do not intend to do so, as I have covered the points that I wanted to make. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I agree with the comments that other members have made about the late Mr. Sam Lawn, who was a member of this House for a long time and a personal friend of members. I also join other members in expressing sympathy to the relatives of those other former members who have been mentioned. I wish to mention the serious illness of Sir Thomas Playford during the last few weeks. Sir Thomas is a personal friend of almost all members, certainly of everyone who knows him. For many years he dominated this House by the force of his own genial personality and I know that all members want him to get well again as soon as possible.

The society in which we live is not a very happy one. There is a rift in the society. On one hand, we have a noisy, intolerant and not very numerous group of people, who are making all sorts of demonstrations. Frankly, many of them have Marxist tendencies and I think these people are leading many others who have some good motives but also some who have immature ones. Some of the persons being led have bad motives and the result is that

on one side of our community we have a group of people who are behaving intolerantly and noisily with a blatant display of ill manners. I think that the inability to see the other side must worry those who stand for law and order. Harold Nicolson, who was in and out of politics over a long period, said:

The worst of being old is that one is apt to see the other person's point of view.

By that he meant that immature people often do not consider other people's viewpoints. The forces of law and order, particularly the Police Force, have been provoked. Many of the provocations involved deeds that were not in themselves very serious and, consequently, they received light penalties. When we have arrests on the wholesale scale that has been seen recently, one wonders whether the penalties for misconduct have been heavy enough.

Some aspects of the recent civil disturbances have not been in any way palatable. Whilst some relatively innocent people have been led along, other people have been involved in those disturbances with the worst of motives; they have shown their worst side with weapons that will do serious damage. Police officers have had to run risks in carrying out their duties and attempts have been made to nobble police horses. Some of those involved in the demonstrations are most intolerant; they brand everyone who objects to their way of thinking as either a warmonger (if he will not noisily protest against the Vietnam war) or a racist (if he will not stay up for half the night to keep a team of young footballers awake).

At present a struggle is going on within these groups of people to maintain a democratic viewpoint. The leaders of such groups vary in their viewpoints, but many of them have Marxist tendencies. They do not value the democratic system that has been built up in this country over about 200 years of evolving government, which we have fought to maintain in several wars. Now, our system is being despised and held in contempt by the remarks and attitudes of the leaders of these civil disturbances.

Viet Cong flags are being carried in marches, and some of the banners are so appallingly unAustralian that one wonders who on earth managed to think of them. Yet we find quite moderate people joining in these demonstrations—probably with some embarrassment, but they go to swell the ranks. Some Government members will do that shortly; we have been told about it. During recent demonstrations

the South Australian Police Force, which I regard as the best in Australia, has been under tremendous strain. It has shown itself to be firm, tolerant and courageous. It has been tried over and over again, during these disturbances: the leaders of the disturbances have set out to do that. In many cases the leaders have refused to give any prior information to the Police Force in order to cause the maximum amount of embarrassment.

Young policemen have had to behave with dignity and poise in maintaining order in the face of older people who ought to know better. I would like to see more praise of our Police Force issuing from the Government ranks. Members know very well that last year I criticized the Government because of the way it intervened on the eve of the September moratorium. I said then that I thought that the Government had made the job of the Police Force infinitely harder than it otherwise might have been. By publicly disputing a decision of the Commissioner of Police, the Government made his task extremely difficult.

At present we have a rift in our society between the group of people sympathetic to demonstrations on the one hand and the vast majority of Australians on the other hand. The vast majority are heartily sick of these sorts of disturbance, and anyone who moves among the community will find that, irrespective of the part of South Australia that he visits. In this rift between the two groups I have described stands the Government. The leaders of the Labor Party are swaying uncertainly, not knowing how far to support the demonstrations and how far to disavow them. Some Labor Party leaders join in the marches; I do not know whether any Ministers have joined in them. Another march will be held soon, in which some Government members will certainly take part. Because the Premier is not in the State at present, we do not know what his attitude is.

Mr. Crimes: He supports it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not know whether he intended to march. I shall be interested to see which Ministers, if any, join in the march. Demonstrations give rise to hysterical behaviour, but the behaviour of the Minister of Roads and Transport is the most hysterical of all. The Minister issued an instruction to the Railways Commissioner that he should not handle any rail bookings that the South African rugby union team might try to make while it was in South Australia. That was a most improper instruction. Only

a few nights after it was issued, I was at a meeting of the Australian National Tourist Association which was chaired by the Railways Commissioner. That meeting discussed how we could attract more tourists to South Australia. The Commissioner, who is a very competent and sincere man, did his very best to see that the meeting was a success, and I am glad that he is interested in the tourist industry. However, I wish the Minister would back him up. Giving instructions of that nature is an appalling bigoted action.

The Minister had no moral right to instruct the Railways Commissioner to discriminate in connection with railway bookings, and I detest his action in doing so. However, shortly afterwards the Deputy Premier tried to get the Minister out of it a little by explaining, "Oh well, the instruction was given in case it caused industrial trouble on the railways." That is what I call backing away from an issue and why I call this Government a squid, because it backs out of everything. It has done so time and time again: not only this Minister, but also the Minister of Education who, as often as we ask a question, says, "Oh well, I cannot do anything about it unless the Commonwealth Government gives me some money." That is the action of a squid.

Another aspect of the hysteria we have seen lately is that of oversea visitors telling us how we should conduct ourselves—such people at Peter Hain, Dr. Benjamin Spock, Bishop Crowther and others, who came to Australia to meddle in our affairs. Does anyone think they came in our interests? Of course they did not! They have not the slightest interest in Australia or in what happens to it: they simply wanted to push a point of view wherever they could. That is meddlesome, and there is no other word for it. They were free to do that, but it was still meddlesome. We should deplore this activity. I do not say that we should stand chanting outside their rooms trying to keep them awake or that we should treat them with discourtesy, but we should disapprove of their motives.

People who come here not to help us but to instruct us are an insult to our intelligence as Australians. We should not behave badly to any visitors, whether South African rugby players or Russians. Every country has faults. The Russians who come here are treated kindly, as they should be, but at the same time we should not overlook the things the Russian Government has done. Hundreds of thousands of German prisoners of war who disappeared

into the eastern parts of the Russian territory have never been heard of again; only a handful of them returned to their homes. The neighbouring countries of Russia have had a very rough time, as every honourable member knows. Yet when the Russian dancers or the Russian circus visits us there is no thought in the community of giving them a rough time. We should treat them with courtesy, and we do.

We should have treated the South African rugby players with courtesy, instead of treating them as we did recently. I deplore interfering in other countries' affairs. Domestic quarrels should be settled at home by constitutional means. No statesman is entitled to go to another country to make a platform for argument against factions within his own country. I do not know of statesmen who normally do that. Certainly, Churchill did not do it, nor did Roosevelt. When Wendell Willkie was defeated as a Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, he travelled around the world speaking as an American and trying to do good for the whole world and not simply saying things about his opponent at home.

When Churchill visited the great old French statesman Georges Clemenceau in his retirement (and he was the most famous man in France, although a man of tremendously controversial character), he happened to mention the name of a French politician. "No," said Clemenceau, "I cannot discuss French politics with a foreigner." That was his argument, and I think he spoke rightly at that time, and so did Churchill. Our Premier would not agree with that. He uses arguments in other countries in order to carry on the quarrels that he has in his own. Recently, he was reported as making a speech in Singapore on Australian immigration policy. He spoke of "ponderous troglodytes shuffling through our nation's corridors of power."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who was he speaking to?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: He was speaking to an Australian alumni group in Singapore, but I do not know the name of it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They would be interested in Australia's migration policy.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No doubt the Minister is trying to infer that the Premier was not making a casual statement in a foreign country for everyone, but was making it to this association in the form of a domestic conversation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you were asked to accept an invitation—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister will not interrupt any more or he will be called to order.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you threatening me?

The SPEAKER: Order! That applies to both sides of the Chamber.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier spoke with the press of the world listening to him in a foreign country about a matter for which he has no governmental responsibility.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He was Minister of Immigration.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is a misnomer, and everyone knows it. I should know because I was Minister of Immigration, but that portfolio is used in South Australia in relation only to United Kingdom migration and has nothing to do with a national policy of immigration. Yet the Premier chose to use those words when he was in another country. In case anyone thinks that perhaps the Premier was trying to say something in private or was caught off-guard, perhaps another and even worse example was his statement on the eve of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference in January this year. He had sent a telegram to Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, and the newspaper report on the topic stated:

He said South Australia had already stolen a march on other States by setting up trade agencies in Tokyo, Hong Kong and Singapore. Because it was expected that during the 32-nation Singapore conference Australia would try to defend a White Australia, he had wanted to show that neither he nor his Government would support such a discriminatory policy.

That is a disgraceful interference in someone else's business. We in South Australia are not responsible for foreign policy, and this Government should be here governing for the good of South Australians, not trying to take over Commonwealth responsibilities. There was a trenchant rebuke from the then Prime Minister, who said that it was a strange thing, verging on the unbalanced, for a State Premier to send cables to a foreign Head of State when that Premier could not speak either for the Government or for the Opposition. That is a perfectly correct statement. However, our Premier believes in taking his fights into other countries. He is not the only one.

Mr. Whitlam has been electioneering in China, and has made statements there of domestic political interest only. These statements

should not have been made. This is no way for a Government to behave, and this Government should learn its place, which is at the head of South Australia and not at the head of a nation. The Governor's Speech is a document that is dull in some places, a bit sad in others, uninspiring, and probably of less interest than almost any other Governor's Speech I have known. We had heard about the promotion of industry. The Government is grappling with environment problems, and it is converting to the metric system (all States are doing that, by the way). It puts in a little brag about the Workmen's Compensation Act. Then the Speech tells us what the Government is going to do.

I shall not read all of it, but I see that we are going to do something about door-to-door salesmen. That is almost an annual exercise for Parliament, and I wonder how many more Bills we will get on the subject. There will probably be an annual tampering with that Act, and each year there will be found one little thing after another to be altered. However, door-to-door salesmen will still exist. I see that we are to have another go at the Citrus Organization Committee: that is another matter that is becoming an annual exercise. The Companies Act is due for renewal; I do not think it has been amended for two years, and that must be quite unusual.

The Land Tax Act is to be amended, and we will have a new valuation. That is an interesting point, because about a year ago the Government was told that it should deal with that problem immediately. It knew very well that values had slipped alarmingly in a short time. Now, it will do something about it, and I hope that what is done is done properly, because the primary-producing industries are in no condition to pay heavy taxation. Many brutal examples of that are known. I noticed that when the Premier replied to a question last session about land tax he dealt with random figures of 48,000 assessments of rural land. However, there are only about 18,000 farms of 100 acres or more in South Australia and some of these so-called assessments must have been minute in many respects.

I hope that the land tax situation will be corrected. However, I wonder how on earth the Government can expect a Speech to be treated seriously when it fails to deal with finance, as in this case. What sort of taxes are going to be levied? How is this extra revenue to be raised? These problems have been referred to by the Government, and

naturally members of Parliament and the public are interested to know just what the Government is going to do. In paragraph 34 of his Speech, His Excellency said:

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—

And members should listen to this—
will feel bound to submit to Parliament some further measures for the securing of additional revenues.

Members will not get much out of that. We have not the faintest idea what the Government is talking about. It may as well have said, "We will probably raise some taxes." From whom are these taxes to be raised? I have said previously that the primary producers cannot pay heavier taxation. Indeed, they are already in a bad way and must be relieved of taxation. Is the general public to be taxed? We have already seen one attempt to tax the public recently, and in this respect I refer to the entertainment tax, which lasted for a good deal less than a year. That was one of the most pathetic examples of Government mismanagement that one could ever imagine: the imposition of a tax that did not even run a full year before it had to be lifted.

Is the Government going to tax secondary industry? How often do members in this House warn that we cannot afford to raise the costs for secondary industry? The member for Mount Gambier, who just resumed his seat, said that 80 per cent of our production is consumed in the Eastern States' markets. Living 500 miles or more to the west of them how can we compete with those markets if we insist on setting trends in our State for high-cost production, by putting up such things as workmen's compensation and all the other little matters that affect the cost of production?

Mr. Langley: What do you mean by "little matters"?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Had the honourable member allowed me to finish, he might not have interjected so quickly. Because I referred to "little matters" affecting the cost of production, he no doubt thought I was saying that they were unimportant matters, which, of course, is incorrect. I have been very much a supporter of workmen's compensation legisla-

tion. The cumulative effect of the Government's measures will be to raise the costs to industry, added costs that cannot be borne if we cannot sell our products. I have asked from where this extra money is to be obtained. Is it to be obtained from the primary producers, the secondary producers or the general public? I do not know the answer to these questions, nor do any members sitting opposite, except possibly the members of Cabinet, who have merely told us that further measures for securing additional revenue will be submitted to Parliament. We must be told more than this. Indeed, we must be told of the Government's intentions.

I noticed a few other matters in the Governor's Speech, one of which is that the Government is to take over the operation of the Weights and Measures Act. When that Bill comes before Parliament, that matter will be discussed. In the past a Government department has happily accepted the responsibility for that legislation when requested to do so by district councils and corporations. Where it has not been requested to do so, the Government has, correctly, stayed out of the matter. However, now it is going to take this away from local government bodies, whether or not they like it. I will have more to say on that matter when the legislation is introduced.

I noticed also that the Packages Act is to be tightened up. Although I have not referred to what I have said about this legislation recently, I have forecast that it will be difficult legislation to maintain. Indeed, this forecast has proved correct in the past. This is one of those pieces of legislation that will come before Parliament each year for amendment, just as some other Acts do.

I should like also to refer to one or two matters that would interest the Minister of Roads and Transport, the first of which is the Kangaroo Island transport system, the Government's and the Minister's silence on which has been remarkable. No-one would say that I have harassed the Minister unreasonably, that I have asked him unnecessary questions about this, or that I have pressed him on it in any way. I was indeed pleased when the Minister made his announcement regarding the Kangaroo Island road link ferry.

A committee that inquired into this matter was set up by the previous Government in November, 1969, and it reported to the then State Government in 1970, only one or two days before the election. Therefore by the

time the first formal Cabinet meeting was held after the election there had been a change of Government. I saw the Minister about this matter on the day he was sworn in, and he studied the report and discussed its implications with the departmental officers. His announcement that there would be a road link ferry was made only a few weeks after the new Government assumed office, and it was made not with haste but with admirable celerity; after examining the matter properly, a decision was made. Considerable time then elapsed during which no information was given about the matter. The committee's report has never been released, and its details are still unknown to the people of Kangaroo Island, although they have extracted some information about it. They know that a road link ferry service is to be implemented and that it will ply between Penneshaw and Cape Jervis.

On October 15 last year I asked the Minister whether he had in mind the problem of time for having the ferry established before the expiry of the subsidy to the Adelaide Steamship Company, which runs the *Troubridge*. That is to expire on June 30, 1972. The Minister said "Yes"; he had it in mind. He went on to say:

The Minister of Marine and I have over the past few weeks been actively engaged in discussions on this matter, both within our own departments and with Canberra, and throughout we are stressing that the ferry must be operating by July 1, 1972.

That kept me quiet for a little while.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Nothing works for long.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wonder whether I should not say some more things about this matter. I recently asked the Minister of Roads and Transport about it, and I had a statement from him yesterday dealing with this problem. The District Council of Kingscote and, I think, the District Council of Dudley combined have written to the Minister expressing concern about the apparent lack of activity. Yesterday, the Minister said:

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.

I have now been asked by the councils concerned to arrange a deputation. In support of the Minister and his colleagues, I say that I have not been refused a deputation when I have asked for one. I do not ask for deputations on matters of trivial concern but, when I have asked for them, they have been granted. I hope I shall have the same treatment on this occasion.

The fact is that the people of Kangaroo Island are now very worried because there is less than a year to go before the *Troubridge* subsidy expires. If nothing further is done, there will be no guarantee of any transport to the island other than transport that would be totally inadequate to cope with the full freight of the island. Many thousands of tons are involved. Including the weight of prime movers, probably about 90,000 tons a year goes each way, in the form of exports and imports to and from the island. That is an enormous amount of freight. If the *Troubridge* run ceases and no ferry operates, a serious situation will develop.

At present the farmers on Kangaroo Island are suffering problems common to all farmers who grow wool and various other presently depressed commodities in agriculture, but they are suffering even further because of the cost of freight and because of the difficulty in getting their goods and in getting their stock to market. If anything is done to injure the present system of transport before a substitute is found, the situation will be serious. On that basis there will be bitter recrimination and certainly a serious hunt to pin the responsibility on the people who should have provided transport. I think the Minister is clear on that, but I am worried that there is no definite or clear explanation of what is going on.

The Breuning report is, I think, becoming one of the most puzzling documents I have ever read. It is not difficult to read: one can read it in an hour or so. It is written fairly clearly but it apparently means anything one day, everything another day and nothing the next week. The trouble is that there are different interpretations of it; they are absolutely staggering. As members know, the several matters that interest me include the access from north to south through the metropolitan area. The old M.A.T.S. plan, which one day we are told has been scrapped and another day we are told is still being followed, provides for the Salisbury and Noarlunga Freeways. With those two freeways there would be a ready transit of vehicles through the metropolitan area. At present, an appalling situation

is developing. The local carrier at Noarlunga tells me that he makes 30 trips a day with his vehicles into and out of the metropolitan area. Those vehicles have to thread their way in and out of traffic on the South Road and often to Gepps Cross and along the Main North Road. The situation is serious.

Only two or three years ago the main South Road was widened through Morphett Vale and a fine road was constructed there. I understand now that that road will be widened even further; yet there is a freeway sitting there waiting to be built. If anybody likes to look at the map of the M.A.T.S. plan, he will see that the Noarlunga and Salisbury Freeways travel through completely open country for more than half their length. There is no reason on earth why the Government cannot get on with that straight away. The Breuning report treats it all without the degree of urgency that I should like to stress. Dr. Breuning says:

Adelaide has not committed itself to massive irreversible developments and the expenses attendant upon them. Nor is the situation here so acute as to compel the adoption of whatever measure offers a moment's respite at any price. At present—

and this is what I want to note particularly—the system is coping adequately with the demands placed upon it and it can do so for some time yet.

Further, in his policy recommendations, he says:

Prepare for future high-speed routes by continuing acquisition of land as it is offered. There is no doubt that Adelaide will, at some time in the future, need high-speed north-south transportation corridors ... In view of the questionable need for freeways and of the expectations that new and better travel modes will be available, decisions as to the type of facilities to be built should be delayed as long as feasible. In the meantime, the land needed for these routes should be acquired whenever convenient to do so. Since it will be some 10 years until actual route construction, the property should be otherwise utilized in the interim.

That is a statement that I completely dispute. I know that Dr. Breuning is an expert on a subject on which I am not an expert, but I know also that he is strongly in dispute with many other experts who have spent much longer studying Adelaide and its transport problems. I asked the Minister a question about this matter the other day, quoting the remarks of Mr. Pak Poy, as follows:

Whether there are freeways built or not, there is an overwhelming need for the establishment of transportation corridors in one form or another. The creation of these corridors must proceed.

I take it that by saying "must proceed" he means that they must proceed immediately. Many other things in Mr. Pak Poy's article can be commented on, but I do not intend to comment on them. I am quoting from his remarks, he being an expert who has studied Adelaide's transport problems probably for most, if not all, of his working life. Mr. Pak Poy has determined that it is urgent to get on with the job. I asked the Minister about this, and—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How do you interpret it to mean that it must proceed "immediately"?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The terms "overwhelmingly" and "must proceed" would mean to most people that something must be done immediately. However, to the Minister of Education, who is sitting on a hot seat and who wishes to back out of every problem, like the squid I referred to earlier, it does not mean anything at all; nor does it mean anything to his colleague the Minister of Roads and Transport, who gave a long dissertation in reply to my question. When he finished giving that reply, I was more puzzled than ever before about what he meant. He said:

I am pleased to know that, although the honourable member did not agree then, he now agrees that there should be a north-south corridor, which is a recommendation of the Breuning Report and which is what the State Planning Authority is currently implementing.

I do not know whether the Minister would say that "currently implementing" meant immediately or in the future, but I should have thought it meant immediately. Why does not the Government stop fooling around with vague words? Why does it not get on with this job? As I say, more than half the land in question goes through open country, and there is an overwhelming need, as Mr. Pak Poy says, to provide these corridors. Why does the Government not get on with this work?

Mr. Millhouse: It's evading the issue.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Of course, you would say that—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation. The member for Alexandra is entitled to be heard.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: During this session there will be other aspects of the Government's verbal activities on which I will certainly comment. The Minister for Conservation, in many cases, has some purpose and some policies that I think can be useful to South Australia; he will certainly need to introduce legislation into Parliament, and the relevant

matters will be discussed then. Although I will not go into detail at present, I believe that allocating conservation as a complete portfolio is a good move. To the Ministers generally, I give a mixed blessing. I believe that each of them does his best to perform his duties. I think every Minister works hard and makes himself available to members who wish to discuss problems. In all those respects, I commend the Ministers and give them my good wishes. However, I wish they would stop blaming the Commonwealth Government for everything; I am tired of reading and listening to Ministerial statements wherein, somewhere through the statement, Ministers manage to blame every problem, crisis and difficulty in this State on some aspect of the Commonwealth Government's administration.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And some of its policies stink and are rotten, as you well know.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: People who insist on blaming the Commonwealth Government for everything they do not have and who take no responsibility for things that they themselves are doing are, in the long run, doing themselves a disservice, because one day people will say, "What are you there for? What good are you? You're no value at all." I believe the Commonwealth Government is doing a good job.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Labor Party shamefully ignores many aspects of the Commonwealth Government's activities and does not care one bit whether this country's defences are good or bad; it does not care whether the services get any money at all. The Labor Party is interested only in extracting everything possible from the Commonwealth Government, never saying, "Thank you" for it, never supporting Commonwealth policy, but setting up situations to embarrass, if they can, the Commonwealth Minister in question. I do not see why the Commonwealth Minister in charge of education should be expected to go to organized meetings, such as the meeting to which the Minister of Education in this State went the other evening, and have to sit and listen to the sort of statements made at that meeting. I do not see why a Minister of Education or any other Minister should always insist that he is not responsible for anything bad. These Ministers are always those with good ideas, but they have the bad luck to have an unsympathetic Commonwealth Government!

With that mixture of praise and criticism, I support the motion.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I add my condolences to those already offered to the relatives of past members who are referred to in His Excellency's Speech and who have passed away since the last session. I especially offer my condolences to the relatives of the late member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) who, of course, was better known to me than were the other members referred to. I know that, in other circumstances, Mr. Lawn would wish the present member for Adelaide all the best in his endeavours as a member of this House. As Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I refer to the retirement from the committee of Sir Norman Jude, who was a committee member for some time, during which he rendered valuable service. On behalf of all members of the committee I wish to convey to Sir Norman our best wishes for good health in his retirement. I refer to paragraph 7 of the Governor's Speech, which states:

My Government is aware that many problems associated with pollution, conservation and our environment, can be solved by sound town and regional planning. The State Planning Authority will continue with the preparation of development plans for towns and regions throughout the State and my Government proposes to introduce legislation to amend the Planning and Development Act. The Foreshore and Beaches Committee has made recommendations concerning the establishment of a Beach Protection Authority with adequate staff and finance. A new Department of Environment and Conservation will be created and a Director of Environment will be appointed who will be responsible to the Minister for Conservation.

I am sure all members will agree that in recent years the word "pollution" has become familiar, being frequently referred to in the news media. Last session the Government appointed the first Minister for Conservation that this State has had (that Minister also assists the Premier). In the past, we have mostly thought about pollution when we have been appalled at the sight of broken and unbroken bottles on roadsides and beaches; some of this litter has been casually thrown from motor cars. Sometimes we see rubbish and household refuse left at roadsides within a short distance of council rubbish dumps. I believe that higher penalties are necessary to deter people from pursuing this unwanted practice. If members of another place had not rejected the Local Government Act Amendment Bill introduced last session, heavier penalties would now apply, because that Bill

provided for an increase in the penalty for dumping rubbish from a maximum of \$80 to a new minimum of \$10 and maximum of \$200. That heavier penalty would have assisted councils to discourage this practice.

Technological and scientific discoveries, most of which we are not aware of (for that matter, most of us do not have sufficient interest in them, because they do not directly affect us), have far-reaching effects on our standard of living and on the quality of our future life and the life of all animals and plants. The proper assessment of these discoveries is important, with advantages and disadvantages needing to be weighed carefully. At present, it seems that mainly only advantages are considered. Human nature being what it is, obviously some technological developments are exploited for reasons of profit. An example of this is the manufacturing of larger and more powerful motor vehicles driven by petrol engines. The result of this is an increase in the pollution of the air by exhaust fumes, a high rate of consumption of non-renewable natural resources, such as oil and iron, and an increase in the road toll, which is often the subject of debate in this House. Alternatives should be developed which would produce less, or preferably no, pollution; which would be smaller so that less of our natural resources would be needed and therefore some would be left for future generations; and which would be slower, so that lives could be saved. For the interest of honourable members I intend to quote the following article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of February 13 this year under the heading "Nuclear Engine Invention":

A 20-year-old Adelaide man has developed a nuclear-powered car which will run without additional fuel for 50 years! And he lives in fear of his life because of it. The nuclear power source has now been installed in a 1967 Mini and powers the car motor. When this person spoke to the *Sunday Mail* from Sydney, he said he hoped to have an engine in production this year. The nuclear power supply will come from a 6in. cube weighing 20lb.

He claims it will supply enough electricity to produce 120 b.h.p. or more from an electric motor. "It could fit in the glovebox and easily power the average-sized Australian car," he said. "It could be produced commercially." He is reluctant to reveal the secret of his power source, but says he stumbled on the process while experimenting at home with nuclear physics and electronics.

"I have been to the United States twice with this and have seen top officials at N.A.S.A., General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford. General Motors said they were not interested as they were working on something else. However, N.A.S.A. expressed great interest. They were impressed with its potential as a possible power source for future space flights."

I do not know whether or not that claim is genuine, but it has received publicity in the newspapers, and perhaps it could provide one solution to the problems to which I have referred. Possibly members noticed the following article that appeared on the front page of today's *Advertiser* under the heading "Plan for Air Train":

A French-based company hopes soon to have a pollution-free air-cushion passenger vehicle making trial runs between Adelaide and Marino. The aerotrain, powered by a linear induction motor with no moving parts, ran on a guided track on a cushion of air, similar in principle to the hovercraft. The vehicle was fast, reaching speeds of up to 150 m.p.h., and inexpensive and could be fully computerized. It was noiseless and could carry up to 40 passengers. A large model was capable of speeds up to 300 m.p.h. with 80 passengers.

In relation to pollution, the article states:

We claim that the widespread use of the aerotrain is virtually inevitable as man seeks to improve transportation and minimize pollution. We might see one of these aerotrains in use in South Australia. I now turn to the retailing business, which is an avenue that could be used to pressure and finally force manufacturers to produce articles that would help in preventing pollution. An interesting article on the subject in *Time* of April 5 this year, under the heading "Ecology at the Supermarket", states:

The national furor over the deteriorating environment has persuaded a rising number of grocery chains to join the fight against pollution themselves. Many stores now label the phosphate content of detergents that they sell, thus encouraging housewives to choose a brand less likely, after sewage treatment, to befoul waterways. Denver's King Soopers has even installed special mufflers on its delivery trucks to reduce their exhaust fumes. Still, few supermarkets have carried environmental concern to such lengths as Alexanders, a ten-store chain in Los Angeles with annual sales of \$25,000,000. At the urging of his daughter Chris, owner Veryl Alexander, 44, has made antipollution measures the main theme of his entire operation. Since he began plugging the idea in mid-January with the slogan "We've merged economy with ecology," sales have risen by nearly 5 per cent. Alexander switched from plastic packaging to biodegradable cardboard containers for eggs, meats and produce. To promote the recycling of waste materials, he arranged for a local citizens' group to place bins for old newspapers in his parking lots and to collect the contents for processing into blank paper. In addition to posting the phosphate content of soaps and other cleaners, Alexander tagged those that are low in phosphate with "ecology preferred" stickers.

When you buy the products we've indicated are low in phosphates, reads a point-of-sale sign, you help decrease the amount of phosphates that will wind up in our water. Two, you help bring pressure against the manufacturers of products with high phosphate ratings

—pressure that can force them to change their products' ingredients. Since the signs went up, sales of well-known high-phosphate detergents have dropped 17 per cent in Alexanders stores, while total sales of relatively unknown low-phosphate brands have climbed 446 per cent. At Alexanders, even the familiar brown paper grocery sacks carry a message urging shoppers to make ecology your bag by writing Congressmen about pollution, right on the outside of the sack. Alexander hopes that other store owners will follow his example. What we are doing is a start, he says, but a lot more people have to care before we can overcome the crisis. His success in attracting business with his environmental theme may provide the incentive that other chains need in the highly competitive food field. One of Alexander's stores already draws some shoppers from 20 miles away.

In that report, the word biodegradable is mentioned. This word is appearing more and more on products that are for sale, and the manufacturers' action in putting the word on products is commendable. However, this must be done to a greater extent if it is to be effective. I am sure that more anti-pollution measures could be adopted here by our retail outlets, particularly the larger ones who are in a better position to do so. Perhaps the success of the supermarket mentioned in the report will encourage other retail outlets to adopt the same policy. However, I think we must all agree that pollution is a problem that can never be solved completely. It is not merely a South Australian or Australian problem; it is a world problem.

The Commonwealth Government has appointed a Minister for Environment, but unfortunately he is also responsible for many other matters. They include Aboriginal affairs, arts (comprising the National Gallery, the Literary Fund, the Historical Memorial Committee, the Art Advisory Board, and the Composers Advisory Board), the National Library of Australia, the Australian War Memorial, film production, Commonwealth Archives Office, the War Graves Commission, world expositions, the National Radiation Advisory Committee, grants to national organizations, the Australian Government Publishing Service, the Government Printing Office, the Commonwealth Supply and Tender Board, and the Commonwealth Advertising Division. As this Minister is responsible for these other authorities, obviously, however much he may be interested in pollution and the environment, he cannot devote much time to these latter matters. Last year the Commonwealth Government, when pruning costs, decided against appointing a director of environment and a deputy director,

thus saving \$25,000 in a Budget amounting to millions and millions of dollars. However, public pressure and opinion have changed the Commonwealth Government's attitude and it has now advertised these two positions, but apparently the salary being offered is less than what the South Australian Government offered in its advertisement for a departmental director.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Perhaps the South Australian Government will ask the Commonwealth Government for the money to pay the director's salary.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Tea Tree Gully is speaking.

Mrs. BYRNE: I do not have to explain the matter to the honourable member, because it has been explained many times. In New South Wales there is a Minister for Mines, who is also Minister for Conservation. That State also has a Minister for Environment Control. Queensland has a Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs. Victoria has a Minister who is Minister of Lands, Minister of Soldier Settlement, and Minister for Conservation. In Western Australia the Premier is also Minister for Education, Environmental Protection, and Cultural Activities. I have already mentioned South Australia, and Tasmania seems to be the only State that has not a Minister in this field. We must have co-ordination amongst all departments and Ministers, both Commonwealth and State, if anything of value is to come out of these essential appointments.

Further, the co-operation of vested interests must be obtained, and it is now being sought. Those interests have a valuable part to play in this field. If necessary, monetary encouragement or incentive may have to be resorted to (although I hope not), as technology to counter pollution is not always profitable. Unfortunately, until now steps have been taken to try to rectify the difficulty only when it arises and when public concern is so great that it causes action to be taken.

His Excellency's Speech does not mention the Local Government Act. I, as well as other members, hope that a Bill will soon be drafted and introduced on this matter. However, as the Minister has said this week, this will take 12 months to draft and we realize that such a major piece of legislation will take this time to prepare. Today, when I asked the Minister whether the Government intended to introduce amendments to the Local Government Act during this session, he said that this would be

done, but he did not say what provisions the Bill would contain. I hope that it contains provisions similar to those in the Bill that was defeated in its entirety in another place during last session. That Bill included many matters that were not only desired by local government but also had been supported previously by the Local Government Association of South Australia.

I shall now mention some of the matters provided for in that legislation that interested me. If the measure had been passed, councils now would have had power to employ social workers. This power would be valuable in many areas, such as my district. The Social Welfare Department has established an office in the Modbury area and has a full-time staff there. Nevertheless, we know that there are many social problems in the community, and additional social workers are necessary, one of the reasons for this being that they could work with medical practitioners, who have a good knowledge of who requires such help in a district.

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

Mrs. BYRNE: The Local Government Act Amendment Bill, which was defeated last session, contained 163 clauses.

Mr. Gunn: We have heard this sort of nonsense before.

Mrs. BYRNE: Opposition members are probably sorry that members in another place defeated the Bill. When this legislation again comes before this House, Opposition members will probably support it, because most of its provisions were requested by councils and supported by the Local Government Association of South Australia. We all know why the Bill was defeated: because it contained a clause providing for full adult franchise in council elections. The Bill empowered councils to employ social workers and to spend money in providing homes and services for aged and handicapped people; councils that took advantage of that provision could apply for a Commonwealth subsidy. I wonder whether the member for Eyre would oppose that provision; I do not think he would because, if he did, he would not remain for long as the member for that district. All members know why additional homes and services are needed for the aged and the handicapped.

The Local Government Act Amendment Bill of last session also empowered councils to dispose of reserves exceeding half an acre in area. Such a provision was requested by

councils that wanted to assist in establishing kindergartens. That provision interests Government members, particularly the members for Playford and Salisbury. In his second reading explanation given last session the Minister of Local Government said:

Section 459a of the Act empowers a council, with the Minister's consent, to dispose of reserves not exceeding half an acre in area if the land is not required as a reserve. Clause 97 removes this restriction of half an acre. In disposing of reserves, size should not be a determining factor, but rather the usefulness of the reserve for the purposes of public use or enjoyment. Buildings such as kindergartens have been established on some reserves. The Government does not want to see reserves used in this way. However, councils often have surplus reserves, or portions, that could be made available for such purpose. The amendment will permit the disposal of redundant reserves where it is appropriate.

In reply to a question asked today, the Minister said that the Government intended to reintroduce the Bill this session, but he did not say what clauses of the previous Bill would be included in the new Bill. I trust that the provision relating to disposal of reserves will be included in the new Bill, because the erection of a kindergarten in my district, and possibly kindergartens in other districts, is at present being delayed.

I turn now to the defeat last session of the builders licensing regulations in another place. When I was first elected to this House six years ago I spoke of the need for registering or licensing builders. I mentioned cases that had come to my attention where it was obviously necessary, in the interests of reputable builders and homeowners alike, that builders be licensed. The legislation was passed finally, although its effect was nullified because it was not proclaimed. It was introduced by a former Labor Government, but when the succeeding Liberal and Country League Government was in power it did nothing in this respect, although at one stage an amendment was introduced, but it lapsed on prorogation. When the present Government was elected it introduced regulations under this Act. Although the Subordinate Legislation Committee heard much evidence on this matter and the Government agreed to certain amendments to the regulations, they were defeated in another place.

Today, the Leader of the Opposition has given notice that he will move to disallow the builders licensing regulations, tabled in this House on April 8. He has every right to do this, but it seems to me that some Opposition members do not want builders to be licensed.

There was very little wrong with the previous regulations and certainly there is nothing wrong with the present regulations but, obviously, some Opposition members want builders to be able to continue unchecked.

On Monday of this week a constituent visited me with a problem of this nature. Before these regulations operated people who, unfortunately, had problems with builders had no redress, and if these regulations are defeated the same position will prevail. I do not know whether Opposition members have constituents who visit them about these problems, but if they want proof that this legislation and the regulations are necessary, all they have to do is come to my house and I shall be pleased to take them to people in my district who have problems of this nature. Paragraph 12 of the Governor's Speech states:

It is proposed that the combined Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs will be renamed the Department for Community Welfare.

One section of the community that receives assistance from this department is the single mother and her child. In our community assistance is given to many sections, including war widows, civilian widows, and deserted wives, and I do not suggest that sufficient is done for these people. However, I do suggest that more could be done for the single mother and her child. At present during pregnancy the single mother can apply for certain Commonwealth benefits, and later, if she decides not to have the child adopted but to keep it, she can obtain relief payments from the State Social Welfare Department. I have a scale of payments but do not intend to quote from it, because the payment depends on the age of the woman, whether she lives at home, the number of parents who work, and whether she lives alone. It is suggested that I seek to have these figures incorporated in *Hansard*, but I do not ask for this to be done because they also contain other relief payments made to widows, *de facto* wives, invalid persons, etc., in certain circumstances. However, these payments, like many others, are not sufficient.

In calculating these payments, whether or not the father of the child pays anything towards supporting it and whether or not the mother goes to work are taken into consideration. Because the relief payment is an entitlement and not a pension, the single mother receives no fringe benefits such as concessions on television licences or fare reductions on public transport. Also, there is no retraining programme, which there is for widows. Single

mothers need more than monetary support: they need community acceptance and an understanding of themselves and their children. Some, of course, need emotional help and practical support whether they keep their children or have them adopted.

Helpers from the general public are needed in most suburbs. They could assist by serving in different ways, such as providing neighbourly services, including child-minding, telephone, accommodation, employment, furniture, and clothing and equipment for the baby. What probably is required is a committee of helpers; no doubt, that will eventuate one day. The women concerned do everything to help themselves in the community under the guidance of a Mr. Thomson, who is a clinical psychologist. In the last five months an organization known as the Council for the Single Mother and Her Child, which meets at 137 Melbourne Street, North Adelaide, has been formed. This organization provides help by child-minding in an emergency—for instance, if a mother is ill. Of course, there is no father to look after the child and child-minding is required both during and after school hours and during creche and school holidays. It also helps by providing baby sitters for evening and day-time outings and by trying to obtain clothes and furniture for the mother or child.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you advocate a 35-hour week for these people?

Mrs. BYRNE: These women, being single mothers, because of the poor relief they get are forced to work. They cannot be full-time mothers, in many cases, even if they want to be. These people are only a small section of the community but they should not be overlooked.

Mr. McAnaney: I agree with the honourable member.

Mrs. BYRNE: An organization in Victoria with a similar aim, called Parents without Partners, had its inaugural meeting at the St. Kilda Town Hall on October 21, 1967, and has been firmly established now for two and a half years. The establishment of other branches in Tasmania and Queensland is now being considered. On May 6 last, at the request of this organisation, I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Social Welfare, who, I am pleased to report, was most sympathetic towards the aim of that organization.

The Minister has appointed a senior officer of the department to hear suggestions and complaints about the welfare of the single mother and her child. Also, this organization desires

to obtain its own headquarters, which would serve a multi-purpose: it could be a place where mothers left their babies while they went to work or went shopping or when they were sick; also, it could be used as a place where furniture and clothes for the baby could be stored. A Government guarantee was sought, I believe, to obtain a building (the organization had in mind a building at Unley), but, as I understand that a special Act of Parliament would be necessary to achieve this, that plan did not come to fruition. However, that does not mean that it will not come to fruition eventually, and I hope and trust, as I am sure do other members, that this organization will eventually obtain headquarters that will serve its purpose usefully.

I refer here to a person in the community who has greatly helped single mothers, namely, Pastor Rev. A. M. Zinnbauer of the Lutheran City Mission. It was Pastor Zinnbauer who contacted me and asked me to suggest that certain female applicants for employment in the State Public Service be allowed to use the courtesy title of "Mrs." This was agreed to by the Government in correspondence forwarded to me on January 14 last. Although this may not seem an important matter to some people, it is important to those women concerned who wish to use the courtesy title of "Mrs." It is not necessary to point out that women in this position love their children as much as do other mothers and wish to shoulder their responsibilities and to bring up their children to be useful and happy citizens. These women want to be treated, materially and socially, on an equal footing with other mothers who support their children on their own, so that they can care for their children with less stress and poverty. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): At the outset, I must say how pleased I am. Mr. Speaker, to see you continuing to wear your full wig. I think there are some things that add to the dignity of this House and I think your wig and the way you wear it is in keeping with the best traditions. I congratulate the member for Price on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. Although I was a little surprised that he did not receive another appointment earlier, I am sure he will do justice to the position of Chairman of Committees. We can now look back on just over 12 months of Labor Government, and what a miserable record the Government has!

Mr. Jennings: And the next 19 years to come.

Dr. TONKIN: The honourable member has always been an optimist, but I am afraid his optimism will be sadly out of place if the Government continues in its present vein and adds to the record that it has established in the last 12 months. The Government fervently hopes that South Australians will forget as soon as they can the last 12 months; members opposite are working on this. They are trying to pretend that the past year never existed; shades of 1984! They are saying, "Let us rewrite history; let us forget all the blues." I do not think that we can let them forget these things, not while there is a good Opposition here.

Mr. Clark: The weakest performance ever!

Dr. TONKIN: That statement is all part of a campaign. If the member for Elizabeth thinks that we are misled by this he is mistaken. I am sure the Government hopes the people of South Australia will forget these growing mistakes that have led to mismanagement and confusion, but can they forget that horrible mismanagement that led to the shopping hours referendum, which asked incomplete, inadequate questions and which represented \$70,000-worth of farce!

Mr. Langley: How did your district vote on the matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! Question Time finished at 4 p.m.

Dr. TONKIN: Even when the results of that referendum came out, the Government could not make up its mind. After wondering whether or not to do what the people wanted, the Government thought it over and I suspect it tossed a coin and came down on the side of the "No" vote. That is the only justification or rationalization I can see for the Government's action. I am sure the member for Playford will never forget how the five Labor members representing fringe areas had to vote, according to the instructions of the Party, against the wishes of the people in their district. "Overwhelming" is a much over-used word, especially by Government members on the front bench and in the corner on your right, Mr. Speaker, but the vote in favour of retaining night closing in those fringe areas was certainly overwhelming. The member for Playford may well smile. The member for Unley, who continually interjects, has a penetrating voice; it is a pity, because he makes the most inane remarks. Other members have spoken about the

Moratorium Royal Commission far more ably than I can. At this moratorium groups of irresponsible, alienated radicals, who were shouting "No violence", deliberately set out to involve in violence those people who honestly believed that they would achieve something by marching. The Government totally failed to support the Police Force; it adopted the attitude of Pontius Pilate, washing its hands of the matter. I join the member for Alexandra in paying a tribute to members of the Police Force for their actions at this time. Can the people forget the actions of a Premier who, immediately after the moratorium, announced from another State the appointment of a Royal Commission? He was not even here when he made that statement. Having been conveniently absent for the day, he successfully gagged any debate in this House on the subject, again at a considerable cost to the people of South Australia. Can the people of South Australia forget the Premier's statement that the Dartmouth agreement would be re-negotiated within a few months?

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

Dr. TONKIN: It is now 13 months later and, although we have passed legislation through this House, that has not got us any further towards getting the Dartmouth dam or getting any water for this State. We had the option on an agreement that had already been ratified by the other three of the four parties to the agreement, but we are now right back to square one, where we started, and water is vital to the future of this State, more than anything else, perhaps, except getting rid of a Labor Government. Water is the most vital commodity for this State's future, but we are no further towards getting it. That is a wonderful record, a record of which I am sure the Government is proud!

We had another promise, and let us remember these things. That was a promise to review the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. We were told that that plan would be reviewed as soon as Labor came to office, and it certainly has been. I think the Minister of Roads and Transport sat in his office and reviewed it for a whole two or three days immediately he moved into the office, and then he did not know what to do with the plan! It was a bit of a hot potato and so, to avoid any direct decision making on this major problem, he found another way out: he appointed another expert to report on the report. Dr. Breuning, who

reported on the report, came up with the profound finding that we would be able to see what happened to transport trends if we waited long enough to see what happened! That is about it: that was the strength of it. In the meantime, although the Government denies that it is going on with the M.A.T.S. plan, houses are being bought from people, and we have voted considerable sums of money for the purchase of houses on the old freeway routes. When the Minister is asked what is the difference between a freeway route and a high-speed transport corridor, can he say there is any difference? The term "high-speed transport corridor" runs off the tongue very nicely, but is it any different from a freeway and can the Minister, when asked, say that it is any different? No, he dodges the issue and says that the matter is being presently considered, again by another committee. Where do the people stand?

Mr. Mathwin: What is the difference?

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot see any difference at all, Mr. Speaker.. The terms mean exactly the same thing, and I believe that this Government is trying to hoodwink the people of South Australia over its transport policies. It is interesting to see in the press this morning a report about a high-speed rail transit vehicle but, once again, as I read the report, it seems that it was private enterprise that suggested the system to the Minister, not the other way around. The M.A.T.S. plan, despite the Minister's continual expressions of boredom, is a crucial issue. There is not time to be indecisive about it. We must do something about it soon. The volume of traffic is increasing day by day. The number of registered vehicles and the number of licensed drivers are increasing at an astonishing rate, and I shall deal with this matter later.

It is all very well to consider long-term plans for public transport, and it is right that they should be considered, but what will we do in the immediate short term over the next 10 years? We will have to change the entire thinking of a generation of people. We have young people who, as I have said many times previously in this House, now look upon the gaining of their driving licence as a step on the road to maturity and look forward to owning and driving a car as being their right and privilege. These are the people whom Cabinet, including the Minister of Education, is trying to tell, "No, you are not allowed to drive any more. You must use public transport." We are not going to convince them just by

telling them; anyone who has had anything to do with the age group knows that one does not get anywhere by telling them to do things, anyway; they have to be led, and they have to be told why it is important to do these things. I believe that these people will respond to a request based on the need to avoid pollution, and that they will use public transport for that reason. They have to be told this, and they have to be given the reasons.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What percentage of air pollution is caused by the motor car in Adelaide; would you say it would be 40 per cent?

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister is probably destroying a suggested argument that might just persuade people to use public transport. I think this is something we have to consider right now. Let us look at the long term, but let us look also at the short term.

Mr. Jennings: And the middle, too.

Dr. TONKIN: I propose to look at the short term first. I believe that the public is being deliberately confused on this issue. We are told that we are going to have an underground railway, then we are told that we are not, and then we are told that we might have one. We are told that we are to have a dial-a-bus system, then we are told we are not to have it, and then we are told we are going to try such a system. Then we are told that perhaps we will have a rapid rail system instead. We are told that we are to have freeway routes, and later we are told that they are to be high speed transport corridors. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely wrong that the public should be confused in this way.

Mr. Coumbe: Deliberately.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, I believe they are being confused deliberately. I am still deeply indebted to the Minister of Roads and Transport for his classic statement on compulsory unionism, his directive to departments that employees should be induced to join a union by being given the necessary motivation by way of ultimatum. We are told by his colleague the Minister of Labour and Industry that he will amend the Industrial Code to allow for preference to unionists. It is all very well for the Labor Government to shrug this off as being unimportant. We saw a first-class example of this last week.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: It is all very well to do this, but nevertheless it is still, whatever Government members say, in direct contravention of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to

require anyone to join an association against his will. For a Party which says that it believes in and subscribes to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and then that it supports compulsory unionism, this is hypocrisy of the worst order.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: All the shouting in the world by the member for Adelaide will not help him hide this.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. This makes it practically impossible for Hansard to hear the member who is speaking and compile an accurate report. I ask members to cease interjecting across the Chamber.

Dr. TONKIN: I entirely agree with everything you say, Mr. Speaker. I am very sorry indeed for the Hansard reporters that honourable members opposite should make such a din. I repeat that it suits the A.L.P. to declare its support for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights sometimes and that it does not suit it to do so at other times. What a beautiful basis for a Party that is! I think that the Labor Government opposite, which says that it believes in the individual and in the working man, should perhaps get to work and start talking to some of these individuals who are being threatened with loss of employment. I would even suggest that the journalist who made a few comments in the press last Sunday (I think he must have been a guest columnist) should depend a little less on the circulating members of the Premier's growing empire in the State Administration Centre. He should try to see things from an individual's viewpoint. Perhaps he should talk to some of the people who are being directly threatened.

The Labor Government wants the people to forget all these things—and there are others. The very attitude of Ministers typifies this: they are indecisive. The replies to questions and press statements they have made in the matter of health illustrate my point. For example, appalling conditions exist at the chest clinic, where there has been pigeon excreta to the depth of feet in the ceiling of Ruthven Mansions and dead pigeons all over the floor. And the only reply the Minister of Health can give is that it is all right: there will be a new clinic by 1973!

Dr. Eastick: Did you get an answer from him?

Dr. TONKIN: I hope I will. The Minister does not even consider what should be done about it now; or, if he does consider something should be done about it now, he does not make it very plain. In replying to a question today about the discharge of sewage into the Torrens River, the Minister of Works said that it was a weak effluent. I cannot see much difference between a weak effluent and a strong effluent: either will contaminate the river. The Minister's press statement disclosed that the Government knew about it; the statement said, "We have an electronic gadget that tells us when sewage is spilt into the Torrens River." All is well! That is not good enough. What is the Minister going to do about it—now! It must be remembered that the Torrens River flows past the site of the festival hall. What is the rate of contamination?

Mr. Langley: What did your Government do about it?

Dr. TONKIN: It is about time the Minister did something about it. I agree that there is a little less to criticize about the Government's performance nowadays than there was in months gone by. The policy seems to have changed a little; instead of making decisions and then revoking them, the Government has not really done much at all lately. Of course, I must exempt the entertainment tax: it went on and off so quickly that hardly anyone knew it was really on. The Government has become scared of the consequences of its decisions, because it has made so many booboos. The Government has now reached the stage where it is afraid to do anything. It is dodging decisions as hard as it can. It has been finding excuses and scapegoats by appointing judges and experts before it acts—and then it does not act decisively. I only hope that the Karmel report will be acted on efficiently and properly.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Much of it has been acted on already, but you wouldn't even know.

Dr. TONKIN: Many reports have not been acted on at all. We had the ridiculous situation of a report of the committee that inquired into hospital communications making widespread recommendations that were outside the ambit of its terms of reference. Those recommendations were going to be acted on without any comments being sought on them. The Government is a funny lot: it cannot make up its mind one way or the other. I do not like to build up the Minister of Roads and Transport by continually referring to him.

Mr. Mathwin: He won't want us to ride on his train soon.

Dr. TONKIN: That is exactly the matter I want to talk about. The Minister has put his foot in it again in direct contradiction to the spirit of the anti-discrimination laws. He has virtually banned the South African rugby team from the South Australian Railways on the ground of their country of origin. I have not seen any similar action, as has been pointed out before, on the same ground with relation to any other national group. As someone said, we should all be careful, because he may decide to ban Catholics, or Protestants, or vegetarians, or non-unionists, or calathumpians, if we are not careful. This is a petty and miserable Government. I bring up one other matter, that of the private member's motion that I introduced into this House concerning the licensing of air guns, and the member for Tea Tree Gully should be interested in this matter, because after I had put forward a case for the licensing of air guns, whether rifled or not, the Attorney-General stood in his place and said that although we put up a convincing argument the Government could not accept it. As Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the member for Tea Tree Gully will know that these regulations have been changed, and are lying on the table of this House now, in exactly the same way as was suggested. It has amounted to more than pettiness, because to my certain knowledge two people have lost eyes as a result of air gun accidents in the time between that motion being introduced and now, when these regulations lie on the table of this House.

Mr. Payne: Speaking of pettiness, do you think you are getting a little nasty now?

Dr. TONKIN: I leave that to the member for Tea Tree Gully and other Government members to ponder on. I am sorry that the member for Mawson has departed, because I was going to compliment him, and I will, because he has come to realize the tremendous importance and significance of our population problem. This is spoken of, as he said, by many scientists (and has been for a long time), by others in the community, and by me during previous debates. To save my detailing population figures, I repeat that the rate of increase in the world's population is about 2 per cent compounded at present, and the current doubling time of the world's population is less than 35 years. Thus, the population will double by the turn of this century. The member for Mawson has obviously read widely on this subject and has gone to great lengths into

history and the background of this matter. He has quoted the teachings of Malthus and Hobbes, but everything he said was basically theoretical. It was a theoretical dissertation on population and land use. I suppose it is understandable, because once an academic always an academic.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You tell us about—

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister of Education frequently gets into the academic field.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Tell us about the world's population without being theoretical! Why not give us a practical dissertation on the control of the world's population?

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the Minister raised that subject, because I intend to relate the whole problem as it applies to South Australia and Australia. The Minister may well have read my notes, but I do not think so. Perhaps he would like to read my mind.

Mr. Mathwin: He comes in very well.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Mawson was on more pertinent ground when he dealt with ecology and population as it affected Australia, because he was much nearer home. Some of the ideas he put forward are well worth studying. They have been advocated by many modern scientists in other fields.

I was particularly interested in his comments on migration policies. Certainly, if we are to reach population stability by the turn of the century (and Sir MacFarlane Burnett, Sir Mark Oliphant and others say it is essential if we are to survive) our own population increase will more than cover this. I repeat what I have said for some time, and I agree with the member for Mawson, that we must re-examine and modify our immigration programme. The member for Mawson's performance in this regard is much better than that of his Leader, the Premier, who is so busy promoting his interstate and international image overseas that he has fallen behind modern thinking in this regard. Anyone advocating an intake of about 20,000 people a year from Singapore, Asia, Europe or anywhere else is obviously quite unaware of the true situation. Either he does not appreciate the important implications of such a programme on Australia's future or he is quite irresponsible, and is making these suggestions purely for his own political advantage, knowing full well that there is little chance of their ever being accepted or implemented.

Again, I congratulate the member for Mawson on his far more realistic and up-to-date point of view in his attitude to the problem than the Premier's. Having spoken very sensibly about the population problem (which, I agree with the honourable member, is a most important problem—in fact, one of the most important problems ever to face mankind), the recycling of resources to avoid disturbing the environment, maintaining ecological stability and advocating family planning (which I agree is necessary), he then goes completely off the track because he says that, as family planning and the recycling of resources are necessary, the free enterprise system has had it. As the member for Ross Smith would say in a patronizing way, just when we were beginning to have the highest hopes of the member for Mawson, he completely goes off the rails. It is most disappointing. I thought we were getting a little sense from at least one source opposite.

This is a very sad and illogical statement. Does he imagine they have no problems of population or disturbed ecology in Russia or in other Socialist countries? Does he believe that a Socialist State-owned factory will not produce the same need for pollution control as will a private enterprise factory? I suppose he has been guilty of polluting this Chamber in this regard with a certain amount of hot air. To be practical, let us relate the whole population problem to Australia, and in particular to South Australia. The time for theorizing is past and the need for action is present. The population of South Australia was 1,091,000 in 1966 and it is expected to double before the year 2000. The average age is growing younger, and we are all aware of this. The percentage of the population under the age of 20 increased from 31 per cent in 1947 to almost 40 per cent in 1966, and it is estimated that it is probably 45 per cent now. More than half of the population is now under the age of 30. The effect of the increasing population and the disparity between various age groups is quite marked. The percentage of the population over 65 years of age is remaining relatively constant: it was 8.7 per cent in 1947, and 8.5 per cent in 1966, in spite of the growing proportion of young people.

In 1947 the percentage of the population between 20 years and 65 years (that is, by and large, the income-earning population) was 60 per cent; in 1966 it was 51 per cent; and now it is probably 47 per cent. This proportion of

the people in the community earning income and, therefore, paying taxation is getting smaller and smaller. In other words, the number of taxpayers is falling in proportion to the total population, and the amount of revenue available to the Government tends to be falling in proportion to the total population.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That has been offset somewhat in the last few years by a slight decline in the birth rate.

Dr. TONKIN: I think "slight" is the operative word. The effects of this increasing proportional disparity in financing the various Government services have already become apparent in the many so-called crises that have received so much publicity in recent years. The term "crisis" has been used to describe almost any situation where difficulties have arisen or have been expected. Any problem confronting the community, where a completely successful solution has yet to be found, is now called or regarded as a crisis. If we are to believe all the various naturally concerned and self-interested groups in the community, including the mass media and politicians, we are surrounded by innumerable crises, all of paramount importance and urgency, and all crying out for rapid and, of course, satisfactory resolution.

Life has always involved coping with one crisis after another, using the term in its modern and modified sense, and never before, it seems, has the community been faced with so many crises all at the same time. We are told (and we know) that there are crises in agriculture, industry, education, juvenile behaviour and delinquency, transport, drug abuse, pollution and conservation, morality, nursing, hospital beds, and medical training. It is quite a list.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And in the medical profession, too.

Dr. TONKIN: But at least we are spared the problems of existence in developing countries where the crises are more fundamental and really involve life and death. I agree with the Minister of Education that there is a tremendous problem regarding the shortage of professional people in the community and, once again, this can be traced back to the pressures that are being put on tertiary institutions; in turn, it can be traced back to the effects of the population increase. It is no accident that these so-called crises all seem to have arisen at the same time; in fact, a little careful thought will show that these are simply symptoms of an underlying and a more fundamental prob-

lem, namely, our population crisis, which is rapidly advancing towards a point of decision, where the destiny of man will literally hang in the balance.

As I said before, I believe that this can be regarded as the most important factor facing any Government in the world today, whether in a developing country or a developed country such as our own. With the increased number of young people in the community and increasing standards of education, young people are encouraged to take advantage of and, indeed, should expect education opportunities of the highest possible standard within each individual's ability. I think some parents are guilty of expecting more, and this makes the task of some schoolteachers a little more difficult. It seems that the school leaving age, which was once so important, is not terribly important any more. There is increasing competition for employment and for further academic opportunity in all forms of tertiary education, and this opportunity depends on attaining high academic standards in secondary education. This is one of the factors that has led to a shortage of doctors, for instance, in our community. The growing demand for education is being financed by a reducing portion of the population. If there is a crisis in education (if we agree to call it that), it is due to population increase and is compounded by what is generally called the science explosion. The rate of scientific discovery in the last two or three decades has been amazing, and has increased at a tremendous rate. We all benefit from many of the discoveries made.

Within the field of education, recent developments have shown that some pupils have difficulties that were previously not thought of; they have a high overall potential expressed as an intelligence quotient but they have difficulty in some specific field of learning and understanding. I think all teachers have now become aware of the child with specific learning difficulties who requires special training and teaching by teachers who have been specially trained. New methods have been used. I am grateful indeed to Mr. Graham Forbes for telling me of the work done in special classes; I think this is something of which the Minister of Education can be proud, as this work is of immense value to the community.

The specific requirement in this case is that a teacher must be able to give almost individual attention to these children; no special

class should have more than six pupils. Suitable teachers should be encouraged not only to undertake the course in special teaching but also to stay with special teaching. I am told that there is a tendency for teachers not to stay in this field. I believe they must be given the necessary incentive to stay in the field of special teaching in special classes, as this is an important and demanding field and we need more teachers trained in this way. I believe most members have received a communication from Speld which is an organization of parents and friends of children who have specific learning difficulties and which is working vigorously in the community to promote the need for trained teachers in special classes. This organization is well worthy of Government support. This is just one more example of the need for additional funds, but we have seen that finance comes from a reservoir that is diminishing in relation to growing population.

What steps can we take to make the best use of the funds available so that all areas of need are fulfilled, not necessarily excessively, but adequately? Generally, Commonwealth-State financial relationships must be looked at closely. Education, health, social services and care of the sick aged are major matters which have already felt the stresses of the developing situation and which must be helped by reorganization. Lack of adequate educational facilities and opportunities for higher education have already added to the community's expense account by contributing to the increase in adolescent alienation shown in increased juvenile delinquency, sectional student unrest, and drug abuse. The population crisis in South Australia, as in other parts of the world, is also manifesting itself in increasing pollution and changes in ecology, with threatened crippling effects on agriculture, in problems of housing, transport, and especially water supply.

It has been estimated that the expected world population in the year 2000 can be comfortably fed by utilizing present developments in agricultural science, provided there is enough water. As I said before, this makes water one of the most significant factors in the development and, indeed, the survival of the State. This is not a matter that can be trifled with politically, as we have seen happen. The Government may have to answer to posterity in this regard.

I believe that several proposals should be examined urgently either by the Government or

the expert committees appointed by the Government. One is stabilization of the population. It is generally considered that, for the world civilization to survive, every country should have reduced its birth rate to stabilization level; that is, an average of a little more than two children to a family. The means already exist in this State and in other States by means of family planning clinics. These clinics have already been established and are working, but there are not sufficient of them and they are not receiving the support they should receive. I think we must extend the present facilities and back this up with an extensive programme of education.

We should also see what expert committees have to say about this. Of course, this raises the matter of training of additional doctors. Sir Macfarlane Burnett says that it is essential, for adequate family planning, to train more doctors, but we are expecting our universities, with only moderately expanded facilities, to cope with far greater numbers of students now. Inevitably, selection for all faculties at a university has become more competitive and it is unfortunate that academic performance has been taken as the governing factor in deciding who shall be admitted to a university.

I do not intend to go deeply into the problems with which this policy has confronted the general practice of medicine in the community but the tendency that has arisen for good examinees and academic students to remain within the fields of academic and hospital medicine has been long recognized. It is refreshing to hear of Professor Fraenkel's proposals for training medical students at Flinders University, where it seems that there will be greater emphasis on community medicine. I am pleased to hear that planning for the Flinders University medical centre is now firmly under way, but I shall be very surprised if we have any graduate doctors from that medical centre practising in the community before 1980, and that is nearly 10 years away.

However, not only is there at present a relative shortage of doctors because of these inadequate training facilities that have not kept pace with population growth and because of this academic selection that does not always admit those men who may otherwise practise and work with people in the community; the way of modern life, with its pressure and tensions, adds to the number of people in the community seeking support and advice. The workload on the family doctor has become intolerable in many cases. It is obvious that

we must investigate the use of trained social workers in medical practice in community medicine. Once again, there is a shortage of social workers, and there certainly seems to be a very strong case for providing additional assistance to train more social workers, particularly while there is a shortage of doctors in the community.

I welcome the announcement in His Excellency's Speech that regional centres will be set up by what will become the Department of Community Welfare, but such a scheme will not work unless we can find social workers who are adequately trained to serve these centres, and I consider that the Government will have to provide the incentive by a cadetship or scholarship scheme to induce more people to train.

Speaking of education, there should be assessment of the probable educational requirements of the younger members of the population, both up to the planned stabilization point (and we agree that this should be in about the year 2000) and for some years beyond, as infants grow up. However, in view of the increasing difficulty of financing the provision of these facilities, particularly the capital expense, we must consider ways of utilizing existing facilities to the fullest extent. I have said this previously (I think about 12 months ago), but I see the time coming when schools will work in shifts, as they do in other countries, using the existing capital outlay and facilities but with more teachers and different teachers to take care of each shift. This system works very well in other countries and it may well be that we will have to consider it, because we may find that our money is better spent in training additional teachers and in building perhaps a teachers college if a shift system is not able to be worked there. Staff is more important than buildings in the long run; more buildings are desirable but not essential at present.

As well as provision of new universities, the administration and organization of teaching programmes of all such institutions have to be examined and modified to train greater numbers of students without prejudice to academic standards. The universities of Australia have already investigated a system whereby the academic year is divided into three parts and each year of study can be covered in two contiguous parts, including, for instance, the third part of one year and the first part of the next. This would constitute a year's work. With a corresponding increase in staff,

this scheme would enable half as many students again to utilize our present university facilities. Further consideration of this proposal has in fact been deferred at present, but it appears very likely that it will have to be considered again and implemented soon. The increased use of existing teachers colleges and universities will provide additional staff to allow for these proposals.

Speaking of urban planning and housing, the rapid rate of increase in our population makes it no longer possible to plan leisurely ahead. It is frequently stated that any immediate plan for traffic control by freeway construction will be out of date because of advances and changes in modes of transport in 20 or 30 years. Indeed, this was the text of Dr. Breuning's report. But this does not take into account the staggering traffic problems that will develop very rapidly in the next few years if nothing is done. Freeways may well be out of date by the end of this period but they will have served an essential role in maintaining the viability of the community until new and alternative methods of transport are developed in the meantime and accepted by the public. Our rapidly expanding community cannot afford delay.

Regarding health, we already have seen at least one positive forward planning step with the setting up of the general committee of health inquiry. Advances in research and medical science make available new procedures and treatments that were unthought of a short time ago. People are cured when otherwise they would have died. But these procedures are expensive, both at the time and in relation to the research that is undertaken. Hospitals are becoming more and more the homes of specialized departments, and more and more emphasis must be placed on community medicine, with local clinics and doctors, social workers, community nurses, and home nursing facilities for non-critical illnesses. Further help must be given to the elderly and chronically sick and to rehabilitation services.

When looking at graphs showing the increases in population, the increase in the number of schoolchildren, in hospital and health costs, in the number of registered vehicles and in the number of licensed drivers, one sees a very similar curve in all cases. There is only one exception, and that is the curve showing a consistent decline in the use of public transport. The numbers of public servants and all

other people employed by Government instrumentalities have also risen through the years, and to make the best use of the funds that we have available I believe that we must streamline the Public Service. The popular reputation of the Public Service is that it is tied hand and foot with red tape. Although this is always good for a laugh, that reputation is not really justified. However, I understand that in some departments there have already been moves (I am speaking of both Commonwealth departments and State departments) to cut through unnecessary red tape and to reduce the effect of regulations governing junior members. For example, the transfer of titles in the Lands Department is now much more efficiently performed. The whole operation of the Public Service has been geared to Statutes and regulations and this has not left much room for initiative at lower levels.

Decision making and recommendations are the prerogative and duty of senior public servants—directors and heads of departments. There is no reason why the Public Service (a permanent body) should not run as efficiently as any public company. One wonders how many of the formal and detailed regulations laid down to control the duties and activities of junior staff are really necessary. As I have already said, I believe that some unnecessary red tape is beginning to be cut, but that process must be further encouraged. Perhaps experts from the Public Service and from management could take a new look at the present Statutes and streamline the whole operation. By giving public servants an incentive to act with more initiative and responsibility, we can give them the chance to help solve the growing problems of administration by increasing the efficiency of Government departments. This, in turn, will give us, as a community, more value for money.

Finally, I stress that in the community we get what we pay for. It is all very well for the Minister of Education to get up and blame the Commonwealth Government, but the Commonwealth funds are obtained from the income-earning members of the population, and everyone wants his slice of the pie, including the Minister of Roads and Transport. Even under a Socialist system we must pay for what we get. The method by which we are made to pay may be hidden from us and we may not get as much as we want, but we still have to pay.

The term “free education” sounds good but, really, we have to pay for it! Everyone wants

the best possible health and medical facilities, but we have to pay for them. Everyone wants increased social services, but we have to pay for them. I stress that it is “we” who have to pay—the income-earning members of the population. If we want control of pollution we must pay for it. How many people are there who are loud in their support of anti-pollution measures and who are also willing to pay an additional \$250 for a motor car engine that will reduce pollution? This is called putting one’s money where one’s mouth is, and that is what I believe the people of Australia must learn to do—to accept the responsibility of paying for these things.

It is no good blaming the Commonwealth Government and saying, “It is not giving us enough money.” Actually, it is giving us all the money it can; I think it has been inordinately generous to South Australia. It is the responsibility of the individual to find that money and to be willing to finance the things he wants. If he wants the standard of living that we enjoy in Australia, he must be willing to pay for it. I have a suggestion to make. It would be very interesting if every individual taxpayer could nominate what proportion of the tax he pays should go for each of several purposes—education, health, social services, defence and conservation. It would be interesting to see the responsibility put right back on the taxpayer. Would we not have some lobbying then?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You love to unload responsibility.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister should be the last to talk about unloading responsibility. I am talking about the responsibility of every member of our community. We must expect to pay if we want the services I have referred to. I support the motion.

Mr. BROWN (Whyalla): I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sympathy to the next of kin of the late Mr. Sam Lawn. I did not know Mr. Lawn before I became a member of this House, and I was associated with him for only a short time, but during that time he was of great assistance to me in my duties. I also join with my colleagues in congratulating the new member for Adelaide on being elected to this House. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition said that the new member could expect to be in this House for about 12 years, although this was only a conservative estimate and it could be longer.

Mr. Venning: How long do you think you will be here?

Mr. BROWN: I assure the honourable member that I expect to be here as long as he is, and perhaps longer. I wish to discuss an incident that happened whilst the House was in recess. It has amazed me that Opposition members have not spoken about it: I refer to the trip overseas taken by a very esteemed and learned colleague of mine, the member for Ross Smith. I understand from a reliable authority that when the honourable member was in San Francisco he attended some important conferences, and I understand that one of these conferences was the reason for the President of the United States of America (Mr. Nixon) trying to open negotiations with the present Chinese Government. I understand that when the member for Ross Smith speaks in this debate he will outline some of the matters that were discussed at this conference. I now turn to an important statement made last evening by the member for Kavel. He went to great lengths—

Mr. Venning: He made a good speech.

Mr. BROWN: That is the honourable member's opinion. As this is a free country he is entitled to it, but I thought it was a terrible speech. My colleagues remember (unfortunately we have to remember) that the honourable member went to great lengths to explain what the Labor Party would do about taxing the rich people of this country. He went through the various stages very boringly, and pointed to pensioners, the peasants of the country, and the old workers, and suggested that, in fact, the Labor Party would tax these people. That is the very thing that the Commonwealth Liberal Party does. Unfortunately, the member for Kavel is not present, but I draw his attention to an important document that was published on June 30 this year and I refer to the balance sheet of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited.

Mr. Jennings: Only 4¢ in the dollar!

Mr. BROWN: That company is only allowed to earn 4c in the dollar, but it made a profit of a mere \$69,000,000.

Mr. Gunn: Here he goes again!

Mr. BROWN: I point out to the member for Eyre that not only did the B.H.P. Company make \$69,000,000 last year but there is a sideline also: it announced \$20,000,000-odd a year in depreciation alone. I have that from a reliable authority. I understand from the grapevine (and it originated from the opposite

side of the Chamber) that Willie McMahon is seeking a conference with the directors of the B.H.P. Company to obtain the \$69,000,000 it made to balance his budget! I understand it is the only way he can balance it. This will not be a takeover bid, because the company will survive on the \$20,000,000 depreciation. I want to kill that rumour because it is not true. From my association with the company, I can assure members that it will not give the Commonwealth Government \$69,000,000, and I advise Willie McMahon not to go near the company because it will take something off him.

The second point made by the member for Kavel in that great speech of his was when he drew the attention of the House to what the company had done for the people it employed—about 54,000, if I remember correctly. He said it was an honour and privilege to work for the company.

Mr. Clark: Did you find that?

Mr. BROWN: I found that in no uncertain manner! I now refer to a dispute that once took place in a most insignificant area of the company's operation—at Iron Knob. I understand the mineral wealth of Iron Knob is among the richest in the world. I do not know whether the member for Kavel has ever been to that insignificant place, but I point out that, despite all the mineral wealth that has been taken out of that area, some of the company's employees had a dispute with the company over the food that was supplied to the men employed in the company's quarters. In no circumstances could I describe the quarters but I assure members that, in view of the mineral wealth taken out of that area, the company could easily have afforded to provide its employees with the Taj Mahal and it could have put extensions on it. But we found when we got there that for weeks and months on end the men could not even get an egg for breakfast. After considerable negotiation with that great asset of the working class (the B.H.P. Company) we managed to get an egg for the men in the morning, but then they found they could not eat it because a proper spoon was not available. That is the gospel truth. This is the type of employer that makes \$69,000,000, yet the member for Kavel says we ought to be honoured working for it. He has to be joking.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You have got the wrong speech, brother: the member for Kavel did not even mention the B.H.P. Company.

Mr. BROWN: I have been called "brother" before, but this time it might give rise to an action for libel! I was pleased to note in His Excellency's Speech that the Government had reported a successful completion of an expanded housing programme for the year ended June 30, and that, even though the South Australian Housing Trust erected 2,200 houses and flats during the year (an increase of 500 over the number for the previous year, or a percentage increase in production of 28.5 per cent), housing remains in short supply. I agree that that is the true position. There is hardly a district in which people are not crying out for housing. I believe that we must adopt a more positive approach to this mammoth problem.

Although the housing position in Whyalla is not as acute as it is in other areas (because of the agreement between the Housing Trust and the B.H.P. Company), I instance two problems that are occurring in districts similar to my own. First, where there is an agreement between the Government and an employer which gives the employer a priority in regard to housing and company employees occupy the houses in question, if the sons and daughters of those employees are not employed with the company concerned they cannot obtain a house. I wonder here whether our priorities are strictly correct. The second problem is that, in the case of Whyalla, where a considerable number of migrants have seen fit to settle, a problem is created in that, in addition to the normal number of elderly people in the area, these migrants prevail on their elderly parents to migrate to this country and to settle in the area also. I wonder whether we should not have a serious look at these two matters affecting housing.

Last evening, the member for Hanson, dealing at length with pollution, said that he wondered what the Government was doing about this matter and asked whether our policy was a progressive one. I personally think that our policy on pollution is the correct policy and that, as time goes by, it will be found to be a most progressive policy.

Mr. Rodda: Are you going to grow seaweed in the Whyalla harbour?

Mr. BROWN: I am glad the honourable member referred to that. I want to explore what a previous Liberal Government did in the time of the Sir Thomas Playford, whom Opposition members call the grandfather of South Australian politics. What did he do about pollution? I refer to the Broken Hill

Proprietary Company's Indenture Act introduced in this Parliament by Sir Thomas Playford who was Premier at the time and who said when introducing it:

This is probably one of the most important Bills that has been introduced in this Parliament for many years. Its implications are very far-reaching indeed.

Never a truer word has been spoken in this House. Speaking for the Opposition, Mr. Riches said:

The B.H.P. had the big end of the stick all along in bargaining powers; we had to accept its terms or we would get no steel-works. . . . So we hand over to the company the whole of South Australia's iron-ore resources and give it a complete monopoly for all time.

Actually, we handed over an area, the richest of its type in the world, to this monopoly. Regarding pollution, section 6 of this Act provides:

The parties to the indenture made by agreement in writing vary the terms of the indenture so far as may be necessary for the purpose of more effectively carrying out the intention of this Act and of the indenture but for no other purpose.

That section clearly gives the B.H.P. Company the whip hand over this House, for no other agreement may be made except by agreement with that company. The member for Hanson says that this Government is doing nothing about pollution, but let him listen to this section of this Act:

The company shall not be liable for discharging from its work at or near Whyalla effluent into the sea or smoke, dust or gas into the atmosphere, or for creating noise, smoke, dust or gas at such works, if such discharge or creation is necessary for the efficient operation of the works of the company . . . and is not due to negligence on the part of the company.

Yet the member for Hanson last evening had the gall to say that this Government is not concerned about pollution. He has to be joking!

Mr. Rodda: What are you doing about it?

Mr. BROWN: I will tell the honourable member in a few moments. Section 30 of this Act states:

The State will not at any time by legislation, regulation, order or administrative action under any legislation of the State as to prices, prevent products produced in South Australia by the company . . . from being sold at prices which will allow the company . . . such reasonable depreciation, reserves and return on the capital employed in the production of those products as are determined by such company,

Mr. Rodda: What are you quoting from—the *Sunday Times*?

Mr. BROWN: I am quoting from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Indenture Act. This company has just made a profit of \$69,000,000. I wonder what the word "reasonable" in section 30 of that Act means. The member for Victoria has asked what we are going to do about pollution. Some time ago a journalist who works for a newspaper in the city and who resides at Whyalla telephoned me and said that, when he had gone to his office to start his normal day's work, he had found his desk, the floor and other surroundings absolutely covered with red iron ore dust from the B.H.P. Company's pellet plant, which was just alongside his office. He told me that he wanted to sue the company for damages, but I advised him that, under this Act, not only could he not do that but the company could sue him for damages for telephoning. As members opposite know, a Liberal Government passed that Act.

The member for Victoria has asked what I am doing about the matter. During the last fortnight or three weeks something appalling happened in my district. Some people may say that we are only talking about the gulf, seaweed, or a few fish, but recently thousands of fish were killed in the gulf waters around Whyalla, and I understand on reliable authority that they were poisoned by acid that originated from a B.H.P. acid dump. If this proves to be correct, I will be pressing the Minister of Works for a top level conference with the directors of the company to get some element of common decency regarding the Act, and I will ask that the company agree, morally at least, to some provisions in the Act being changed. Surely common sense tells us that no employer anywhere in the world should be allowed to continue polluting the sea, the air and the water unnecessarily.

I shall now deal with what I consider to be the most important legislation that has come before this House for many years. I refer to the Workmen's Compensation Bill introduced by the present Government last year. That has removed many of the hardships that working-class people have been enduring.

Mr. Mathwin: You got support from this side on that Bill.

Mr. BROWN: I think members opposite got the message. This time I shall refer to the B.H.P. Company in a friendly way. I consider that the position regarding workmen's compensation should not be allowed to remain

as it is at present and that we should further amend the Act to rectify some wrongs. I believe there must be some enticement for employers and insurance companies alike to look more seriously at the question of industrial accidents. For many years the B.H.P. Company has been in the forefront in implementing industrial safety measures, and I agree with its policy. Primarily, it should not be a question of compensation for injuries but rather a question of preventing injuries.

Mr. Jennings: The B.H.P. Company looks at the financial aspect, too.

Mr. BROWN: Yes. I wish to refer to a speech given by Sir William Hudson at a meeting of the Road Safety Council on the benefits of preventing road accidents. Sir William showed that there is a close relationship between road accidents and industrial accidents. He said:

I shall commence my address by contrasting the problems associated with road accidents with those of industrial accidents. The reason for approaching my subject on these lines will become apparent as my talk develops.

Later, Sir William said:

Just as Australia's record of road accidents is one of the worst in the world, so is our record in the field of industrial safety something for which we should feel ashamed. For instance, our accident frequency rate in industry is more than double that of U.S.A. Similarly, the ratio of our accident losses in industry to our gross national product is over 4 per cent compared with about 2 per cent in the U.S.A. Estimates of this country's direct and indirect losses from industrial accidents is estimated to be between \$800,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000 per annum, a staggering amount in any language. Halve this huge annual loss, and large sums—\$400,000,000 to \$500,000,000 per annum—would be available for useful purposes.

I agree with what Sir William said. The member for Victoria can laugh, but this matter is important for industrial workers with families. Sir William continued:

Take the case of B.H.P., one of Australia's greatest industrial organisations and a pioneer of industrial safety in this country. During the 18-year period, 1950-1967, B.H.P.'s accident frequency rate (viz. the number of lost-time accidents per 1,000,000 man-hours worked) was reduced progressively from 50.2 to 3.4, a total of 93 per cent. At the company's Port Kembla works, the accident frequency rate fell from 37 in 1945 to 10 per cent of that figure in 1961. This phenomenal improvement continued, and by 1969 a frequency rate of 1.8 had been achieved.

What would the B.H.P. Company save, first, on the amount that would be saved in lost time and, secondly, how would the ordinary

worker benefit because he was at work and not absent from work because he was maimed? This is important. The question of workmen's compensation has not been finished with in this House. I believe there has to be real consideration of this question with insurance companies in this State and throughout Australia. There has to be a much more realistic outlook by these companies, and what will bring it about is the question of average weekly earnings. This will make the insurance companies realize that it is important from their point of view to ensure that people work in safety. The member for Playford dealt with the Arbitration Act and I shall not go to any great lengths speaking about it, but I have been associated with it for some time. I say in all sincerity that in this country there are too many awards and definitely too many unions; this is the crux of the problem of industrial unrest, and not compulsory unionism.

Mr. Mathwin: You have your head in a sack now.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Listen mug, and you may learn something.

Mr. Mathwin: You are the expert!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BROWN: I believe that the member for Glenelg knows nothing about awards or industrial unrest.

Mr. Mathwin: You are being too kind.

Mr. BROWN: Serious consideration of the makeup of our industrial system would make one realize (which I do, and I am not a lawyer) that there are too many awards and too many unions.

Mr. Rodda: You are getting mostly unionists in Parliament now.

Mr. BROWN: This may be so, but the important step forward for the unions in the past 12 months is the amalgamation of some unions, such as the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the Boilermakers Union, and the Sheet-metal Workers Union. In some cases negotiations are continuing, and I think this is an important step for the future. To quote an example of this lopsided system, I refer to a dispute of painters and dockers in the shipyard at Whyalla during the last 12 months. It was an important dispute, and I do not think that Opposition members realize what went on.

For many years the painters and dockers who were employed in the Whyalla shipyard were covered by a shipyard award, not the Commonwealth award. This was satisfactory until

the Commonwealth award became a better proposition for them than was the award that covered them. So obviously it has created ill-feeling. What happened was that the union members at the shipyard said, "We are not going to cop this; we want the same as our federal members get." So a dispute resulted.

The dispute ultimately reached the arbitration court and was heard by Commissioner Horan, the Commissioner for that industry. He gave a decision in favour of the painters and dockers, but he went further than the terms of reference and gave the painters and dockers what he called "full justice". The B.H.P. legally appealed against this decision and was successful, because the Commissioner had gone outside his terms of reference. But, once the men got this decision in their favour, a major dispute occurred. When the appeal went before the Full Bench, a fellow by the name of Mr. Commissioner Taylor was a member of the Full Bench that upheld the B.H.P. appeal, and after the painters and dockers had decided to submit another case the very person who came back to decide the pros and cons and merits of the second dispute was Commissioner Taylor!

In all sincerity (and even the member for Glenelg may be able to understand this) how could Commissioner Taylor be able to listen to a second case when he had already given a decision in the first case? The ironical part of it is that he did grant a certain portion of the argument to the painters and dockers even after he had upheld the appeal on the first matter, and on one point alone he agreed that he would adjudicate in a period of five months and he hinted that he would give that union a fair and just hearing on the subject of a shift work allowance. That part of the claim of the painters and dockers was in fact going from 25 per cent to time-and-a-half for the first two hours and double time thereafter. If that is granted, as it will be, 80 per cent of the work force in the shipyard in Whyalla will still be getting 25 per cent. So the system has failed again only because there are too many unions and too many awards. There must be a real look at the need of these men to have industrial agreements covering all workers in particular industries. That is the only step forward we can take. Then we would have a common basis on which to operate in our relationship between employer and employee. Another important matter is the position in Queensland at present. I never believed I would live to see such a situation developing in this country.

Mr. Rodda: Neither did we.

Mr. BROWN: I am pleased the honourable member has said that, because I honestly suggest that the decision made by the Queensland State Government in the matter of the visit there of the Springboks will be regretted for many years to come. The statement made by people that politics should not deal with apartheid or racial discrimination is so much bunkum that it is not even funny. The Deputy Leader said that we must have law and order and that that was the prime object in a democracy.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't agree with that?

Mr. BROWN: All I know is that Hitler came into power in Germany on the basis that there must be law and order; the military junta rules in Greece because it says that there must be law and order; and Ian Smith says, "We must have law and order."

Mr. Hopgood: And Franco!

Mr. BROWN: Yes, it also applies to Spain's General Franco. All these people came into power on the basis of demanding law and order.

Mr. Gunn: Do you advocate breaking the law? We know what you stand for.

Mr. BROWN: The member for Eyre, who is an authority on wombats, should never get off that subject. What do we mean when we refer to law and order?

Mr. McAnaney: The Queensland Government is a democratic Government.

Mr. BROWN: Is the member for Heysen trying to tell me that the present political set-up within the Queensland Parliament is democratic?

Mr. McAnaney: It's no less democratic than your set-up.

Mr. BROWN: Is the honourable member suggesting that Sir Thomas Playford did not have a political set-up? It is a sorry state of affairs that has developed in Queensland, and the position should be condemned. We have the situation that in a State in this country a man, his wife and children, in trying to attend a sporting event, must open up any bags they are carrying and have them searched.

Mr. Gunn: Rubbish!

Mr. Rodda: Who started it?

Mr. BROWN: We know who started it—the South African Government!

Dr. Eastick: The South African Government isn't here.

Mr. BROWN: Dealing with apartheid and the Springbok tour, I refer to an article that appeared in a church magazine called *The Advocate* which is circulated in my district. This was written by a gentleman whom I know.

Mr. Venning: Tell us who wrote it.

Mr. BROWN: Very well; it was Donald Sarre. I believe that this subject is much more important than members opposite seem to think. I draw attention to this article because I believe that what it contains is true. This gentleman claims it spells out the policy of his church on this question. I do not suggest that I go to this church; I am looking at this in an unbiased way. This gentleman states:

This Assembly of the Congregational Union of Australia (1) declares its belief in the brotherhood of all men, irrespective of race, colour or creed and is therefore opposed to the policy of apartheid practised in Africa.

And so am I, and honourable members can call that playing politics if they wish to. The article continues:

(2) believes that while South African sporting teams are selected on a racial basis no Australian sporting body should issue or accept invitations for tours to play with such teams; (3) believes that in the interests of its relations with Asian and African nations Australia should in no way appear to support or condone a policy of apartheid. The whole political, social and economic structure of South Africa is designed to prevent non-whites enjoying human rights and personal dignity. They are told and made to feel that they are second rate. They have no voting rights, isolated slum living camps, separate transportation and no unions, no rights to strike and no workers compensation.

Yet members opposite have the gall to say that politics should not enter into this matter of South Africa's policy of apartheid. Members opposite may also be interested to know that six Australian rugby union players who toured South Africa have refused to play against South Africa again, and that some South African cricketers recently walked off the ground in protest against apartheid in cricket. I understand that the Indian golfer Sewtalum stood in the rain outside the clubhouse and had the trophy handed to him through a window when he won the National Open in 1963, while the runner-up, Gary Player, was inside the club, drinking champagne.

Mr. Clark: And they never let Sewtalum play in the event again.

Mr. BROWN: No, yet members opposite have the effrontery to say that we should not oppose the Springbok tour of Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: You are being very nasty.

Mr. Langley: Even your country has barred them.

Mr. BROWN: I do not know about being nasty. I think a report in this evening's *News* is important to us here, because we hear statements by members opposite and those who support them that we cannot afford 6 per cent increases in wages, that we cannot give the worker a decent Workmen's Compensation Act, and that the worker must submit a case for increased wages to arbitration and conciliation. Despite that, in the stop press of this evening's *News* there is a statement that General Motors-Holden has decided to increase the price of its cars. How does the company do this? Does it go to arbitration? Does it put a case to the court to justify this increase? No. The company calls a special meeting of the board of directors, who are told that as the company made only about \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 this year the price of the car must be increased.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): Last week I listened with much interest to the Governor's Speech when opening this session, because I thought that this Government, after having had a session in which to settle down into its new administrative responsibility, might give some concrete indication of where it intended to lead this State. The new member for Adelaide, when speaking in the debate, stated that he understood that the Address in Reply was an account of the Government's performance and an indication of its legislative intentions. That is what His Excellency's Speech should be, but, once again, as we had last year, we have had a document that is both indeterminate and indecisive, a document of inaction at a time when some firm positive action is essential. This country is facing a severe inflationary crisis, and we are experiencing a degree of inflation that could have serious results. This inflation has been spearheaded—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I wish that honourable members would conduct themselves in a proper manner. Anyone would think they were at a pit meeting at a mine rather than sitting in a legislative assembly. I take a dim view of the smirk on members' faces when I am appealing to them to conduct themselves in a suitable manner and to give their colleagues the courtesy and respect that they deserve. The member for Flinders.

Mr. CARNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The inflation from which this country is suffering is being spearheaded by this State. In the

press a few days ago a headline on the front page said that South Australia headed a big jump in the cost of living. However, South Australia is spearheading inflation in another way. When talking of inflation it is impossible to point to any one cause: inflation is almost invariably caused by many things, many of which are outside the power of State Governments to control. However, there is one major cause of inflation that is within the power of the State Government to control, and that is Government expenditure. The editorial in the January-March bulletin of the Institute of Public Affairs says:

The capital expenditures of governments, at all levels, are by far the most inflationary, not only because the benefits are usually long delayed, but because they are of a kind which the people do not associate with an improvement in their personal living standards.

Practically all increases in Government expenditure are financed by heavier taxes and increases in the prices charged by Government instrumentalities. Of course, such increases merely serve to inflame the ever-present demand for higher wages all round. Last January, when the Commonwealth Government announced reductions in capital expenditure, the then Prime Minister appealed to State Governments to do likewise. Our Premier, who is absent from South Australia at present (as the member for Mitcham said, we are becoming used to that), has shown a consistent lack of understanding of financial management. He paid no attention to the Commonwealth Government's appeal; instead he announced his intention to increase taxes and charges in the fields of gas, transport, electricity and water. The editorial that I have referred to specifically mentions our Premier's announcement that he intended to raise taxes. The editorial says:

If this course is persisted in, the central pillar of the Commonwealth's counter-inflationary policy—the reduction in government expenditure—will be undermined. The cost of living will be further raised, inciting another burst of claims for higher incomes all round.

The Government has shown its contempt for any attempt to control inflation by persisting with a level of expenditure 15 per cent greater than the general increase in the community, which is certainly high enough. The only way whereby Governments can contribute realistically to containing inflation is by sharply cutting back their own expenditure, and we have certainly not seen that from this Government. The Government is not helping

to curb inflation; rather, I contend that it is actively promoting inflation. In this connection, trade unions are also far from guiltless. Through extravagant wage demands, through instigating work stoppages and through go-slow measures, trade unions are adding their quota of fuel to the inflationary fire.

Mr. Wright: What about over-award payments and such things?

Mr. CARNIE: Over-award payments come into it, too. I said that unions are far from guiltless. I stress that rank-and-file unionists represent all sections of the community.

Mr. Wright: What about over-charging and excess profits?

Mr. CARNIE: These are ordinary people: there are good people, bad people, intelligent people, and idiots, but these are ordinary people the same as any of us.

Mr. Wright: And they are human, too.

Mr. CARNIE: Exactly, but these are not the people who are making excessive demands. The idiots who are making the demands are the heads of the unions. In a debate last week the Leader of the Opposition referred to stand-over tactics by unions, but what he did not refer to were the stand-over tactics that exist within unions. Many union leaders are not elected by fair and democratic means.

Mr. Wright: Prove that!

Mr. CARNIE: This situation does not apply to all unions, but I believe it applies to all militant unions. There will never be a fair vote when a man can have a brick thrown through his window or be ostracized. I challenge the honourable member to say that this does not happen. There will never be a fair vote—

Mr. Wright: That is a deliberate lie.

Mr. CARNIE: The new member for Adelaide knows that it is true.

Mr. Wright: That is a deliberate lie, and this House won't stand for lies.

Mr. CARNIE: We hear much about democracy from Government members. If they are so keen on democracy, why are they so keen on a compulsory vote? I have said before that in the minds of Government members democracy and compulsion seem to be synonymous. I disagree with that attitude. How can they believe in a compulsory vote when they do not have a compulsory vote or a secret ballot in their union elections? Until such time as they do, we will not get fair representation from union officials. If the unions had those

things, I would have no argument against unionism. I am sorry that the Minister of Roads and Transport is not here, because I know that he would have said that I hate unionists, but that is completely untrue.

Mr. Wright: You hate what they represent.

Mr. CARNIE: I would like to see secret ballots in a union. Despite their protests, trade union officials must know that wage increases of about 10 per cent a year must inevitably lead to increased prices. I do not blame unions in this particular context, but the Government sets the pace by raising taxes and charges, which add to the cost of living. These also add to manufacturing costs, so that there is a constant spiral, one chasing the other. While Sir Thomas Playford was in power South Australia became an important industrial State, because the Government of the day offered incentives to industry to come here. It offered such things as lower charges and, in particular, a stable industrial climate.

Mr. Wright: And a low-wage State.

Mr. CARNIE: These incentives have been gradually eroded, with the result that it is no longer any advantage to an industry to come here. Industries with most of their markets in the Eastern States and other industries that are here will have to consider seriously the question of whether there is any advantage in remaining in this State. I should like to refer now to an article in the *Advertiser* of last Saturday, which states:

Uniroyal General Products said yesterday that it was transferring part of its Edwards town plant operations to its factory at Dandenong, Victoria. The company's managing director (Mr. R. A. Footner) said the shift involved rubber and plastic parts made for the automotive and electrical appliance industries, valued at about \$1,500,000 in annual sales. Some retrenchments at Edwardstown were imminent. Mr. Footner said the move was being made because of lower production costs in Victoria. "Wage, freight and manufacturing costs in South Australia are rising continually, and it is time someone drew attention to it," he said. "I don't think we are the only company in this position. Excessive wage demands by the Miscellaneous Workers Union, added to the factors I have mentioned, also played a part in the decision to move. The M.W.U. executive and the shop committee at the Edwardstown plant are using guerilla tactics to force wage increases."

So, as a result of this, we are losing a company that has sales valued at \$1,500,000 a year and, as its Managing Director says, it will not be the only one: others will follow. Today's press contains the following report:

The general manager of the Chamber of Manufactures (Mr. C. W. Branson) blamed higher Government charges and fees for much of South Australia's 2.2 per cent cost of living rise in the June quarter. South Australia has lost its cost advantage because of this continuing trend, he said. He said some firms were considering moves similar to that of Uniroyal General Products.

He is perfectly correct: other companies will go. South Australia cannot afford to lose them. The union's attitude clearly derives from the notion that profits are there to be squeezed to get more for the wage and salary earner. It is possible, however, to squeeze too hard. Uniroyal's action shows that a manufacturer will stand just so much of being pushed around. Are the workers who demanded \$6 and went on strike any better off? Now they have no job.

Mr. Wright: How would you like to live on \$51? It wouldn't pay your tram fare.

Mr. CARNIE: This view, however, is based on the unrealistic and outmoded assumption that wages and profits are directly in conflict. A little reflection will show this to be false. It overlooks the fact that the prime function of profits in the economic process is to promote progress. Profits are not there only for monetary gain of the shareholders. The money that companies earn goes largely to development and progress. Great mining developments of recent years have contributed much to Australia's rapid economic growth. The provision of increased employment opportunities throughout the entire economy and improved living standards would not have been undertaken by the companies had they not been able to foresee substantial profits to compensate the enormous risks involved. The B.H.P. Company is always a target for the unions. It has been mentioned several times—first by the member for Florey who, in his speech, referred to it as "the greatest alligator in Australia commercially". He went on to say of the company:

It blows up hills and mines the country, we are told, but it really rapes the country.

Does the member for Florey suggest that this great company, which has done so much for the development of Australia and for employment, should never have started? The honourable member also mentioned the recent television advertisements that showed the company getting 4c in every dollar of sales. He complained, I might add, that this was not converted to a percentage. I am sorry that the member for Florey is not here, but perhaps his colleagues can tell him that it is not

difficult to work out that 4c in the dollar is 4 per cent; and 4 per cent profit on sales is not a large profit. Certainly, the B.H.P. Company has recently announced \$69,000,000 profit, which is a large sum, but expressed as a percentage of capital invested it is not large and the average business could not operate on such a low percentage.

In fact, it has been frequently shown in the past that company profits as a percentage of shareholders' funds are lower in Australia than in practically any other Western economy. Also, it is not a large profit for people wanting to invest in the B.H.P. Company. Anyone looking for a dividend return would not buy B.H.P. shares, because on current prices he would get a dividend yield of only 1.9 per cent. If people were looking for dividend income from share investment, they certainly would not buy B.H.P. shares; they would get double the sum if they left their money in a savings bank account. People who invest in the B.H.P. Company and similar companies have every right to expect capital gain.

Mr. Crimes: In perpetuity?

Mr. CARNIE: When people put up their money in this way, there is an element of risk and therefore the prospective reward must be greater than if they were to invest their savings in directions where there is little or no possibility of loss, or even a reduction of capital. But now this has happened, the unions want a share of the profit (not a share of the risk involved); they already have a large share in the form of wages. In fact, the biggest individual expense in operating these companies is their wages bill. But still the unions want a share of this profit. They were not around when the companies were formed. They did not say, "A risk could be involved, but we would like a share. We would like to take some of this risk." However, once a company starts to show a substantial profit, the unions come along and say, "We want some of this."

The unions could have a share in the profits of the B.H.P. Company: they could invest their funds, just as anyone else might do, and they could stand the risk or make gains, whichever happens, but they will not take any financial risk. This \$69,000,000 profit is not just left in the bank: it is used certainly for making more profit, but it is also used for further development.

Mr. Keneally: What is the ultimate end to this—more development?

Mr. CARNIE: The ultimate end is more development, more jobs, and a higher standard of living.

Mr. Mathwin: And better jobs!

Mr. CARNIE: Yes, and more money. On the other hand, if a company does not show a profit or there is no expansion (perhaps even a regression), there is a loss of jobs, and Uniroyal is a case in point. However, let us return to the South Australian industrial situation. Last year the Australian Labor Party was elected in this State (the workers' friends), but what has happened to industrial relations since this Government has been in power? All members would have recently received the *Quarterly Abstract of South Australian Statistics* which, dealing with industrial disputes that occurred between June and December, 1969, states that there were 42 such disputes, and 81 industrial disputes (almost double the number) occurred in the same period last year. In the 1969 half year, 11,573 workers were involved in industrial disputes, compared to 30,900 workers in the same period last year. Working days lost, which include working days lost by people who are not directly involved in work stoppages but who are put off because of the actions of their workmates, were 30,111 in the half year in 1969, compared to 41,400 in the 1970 half year; losses in wages were estimated to be \$415,000 in 1969 compared with \$486,000 in 1970.

That is the situation since the Labor Government has been in power. It has been proved, and can be proved by going back over the figures in this book, that there is more industrial stability under a Liberal and Country League Government than there is under a Labor Party Government. Industrial disputes of this type add to costs which are already rising steeply in this State. I wish to point out where the markets of our industries are: there are 35 per cent in Sydney; 30 per cent in Melbourne; 14 per cent in Brisbane; 8 per cent in Perth; and 13 per cent in South Australia. Therefore, over 80 per cent of our markets are outside the State. The Premier talks continually about bringing industry to South Australia; that has been his constant theme. What inducements can he now offer to bring industries to South Australia?

Mr. Keneally: They are still coming.

Mr. CARNIE: Although there has been conjecture, there have been no firm announcements. In the article to which I have referred, the Professor of Economics at the University

of Adelaide (Professor E. A. Russell) states that South Australia is still a low-cost State in terms of housing, wages and so on; it is still the lowest State in these terms. However, is there enough difference to warrant the increased charges which are necessary to get our goods to the markets in the Eastern States? If we have not already reached it, we are rapidly reaching the stage when the cost advantage that South Australia has enjoyed for so many years will be eroded by the actions of the unions. Members opposite cannot have it both ways. We have industries because we were a low-cost State.

Referring to the Governor's Speech, the member for Adelaide said that he looked on it as an account of the Government's performance and indication of its legislative intention. Last evening, the member for Mitcham also said that that was what a Governor's Speech should contain, but he was surprised that this Speech was not what he thought it would be. I am surprised that the member for Mitcham was surprised, because this Speech is similar to the one we had last year; it is a document with little in it, and certainly does not contain much indication of where the State is going. Last year's Speech was similar.

This is a negative document in regard to action. We have noticed that in Governor's Speeches and Budgets the Government leaves its options open, and does not spell out firmly what it intends to do. This Speech is an open-ended sort of thing. As a member representing a country district, I was naturally extremely interested to know what the Government had in mind for primary producers. I must admit that the Speech this year has given more attention to rural matters than it did last year: this year we have seven lines, whereas last year we had four lines. Therefore, it is necessary to go back to the speech that the Deputy Premier delivered on behalf of the Labor Party before the last State election, because nothing in His Excellency's Speech gives us any idea of the Government's intention. A report of the Deputy Premier's speech in the *Advertiser* of May 12, 1970 below a good headline, "Labor pledges new deal for State's farmers," states:

All the powers the State possesses will be utilized in an effort to create strong, vital country communities supported by buoyant rural conditions and markets.

The words "all the powers that the State possesses" are strong words, indeed. The Deputy Premier is also reported as saying:

We will not increase land tax.

During a debate last session, I said that many farmers had incomes of less than the basic wage and I got the usual reaction from the Government benches to a remark of that kind. They laughed at what I said. However, I assume that they did not mean that, because the report of the Deputy Premier's speech last year also states:

More than 80,000 Australian farmers had taxable incomes of less than \$2,000 and just under 40,000 had incomes below \$1,400, Mr. Corcoran said.

Obviously, the Deputy Premier accepts that many farmers have incomes of less than the basic wage.

Mr. Payne: You slipped a cog. You spoke first of an income of less than the basic wage and then mentioned a taxable income.

Mr. CARNIE: The difference would not be great, but we will get down to incomes of less than \$1,400. I will not argue with the member for Mitchell. Does it satisfy the honourable member if I say that some farmers are on extremely low incomes? These incomes are particularly low when one considers the capital investment in their properties by way of plant, buildings, and so on.

Mr. Payne: The ordinary worker in that position has to set up and try again.

Mr. CARNIE: The ordinary working man has not an investment of \$150,000, either. The subject of land tax has been rehashed in this House and outside many times, but it still warrants mention. The Deputy Premier promised that there would be no increase in land tax. His Excellency's Speech last year stated that reductions would be given, and the Premier repeated that at the farmers' march last year. Certainly, the Bill that was introduced gave remissions of 40 per cent on primary-producing properties, but it was on increased valuations, so the net effect was greater. The Premier still insisted that the Government would collect from rural land tax less money than it had collected in the past. The Opposition continued to probe the Premier on this, but he maintained his statement that the Government would collect 9 per cent less in land tax. We did not accept this, and we hammered the point as much as possible. I asked the Premier to say in what areas the reduction would take place, but he did not reply. He said that, as a result of the reduction, the Government would be collecting less tax—a little less than \$1,000,000. Ultimately, this matter was the subject of a no-confidence motion moved by the Opposition. During the debate on that

motion the Premier quoted from three foolscap pages of figures that he said were random samples taken from the Valuation Department. He quoted these at length to prove his point that there would be a reduction in land tax collected from primary-producing properties. I will not deal with the values of the actual properties he mentioned, but they were certainly not realistic figures—for farms in my area, anyway.

Because I was not satisfied with the figures he gave, I, too, obtained a set of figures from the Valuation Department. I did not get as many figures as the Premier had obtained: I got 34. When I compared the tax currently collected with the tax that would be collected, I found a 69 per cent increase. I will accept that the taking of two lots of figures from the one major set will cause a variation—statistically, it could be as much as 10 per cent. However, I refuse to accept that a difference of 78 per cent is due merely to statistical variation. Obviously, one of us was wrong, and the Government's new proposal shows who was wrong. In his Speech, His Excellency said:

My Government also intends to introduce a short amendment of the Land Tax Act to authorize a special revaluation of primary-producing land as at June 30, 1971, to form the basis for current land tax levies, in lieu of the out-dated 1970 valuation.

So, we have another embarrassing reversal, in addition to the reversals connected with entertainment tax and the towing of trailers—three embarrassing reversals in a short time. Now, we have been told that a Bill will be introduced to reduce land tax on primary-producing properties. It remains to be seen whether the Premier's earlier promise will be kept. I assure the Government that Opposition members will be watching this matter closely.

The Government has been extremely inactive in trying to relieve the problems of primary producers. It must be remembered that the primary industries are very important to this State; I do not think that Government members realize just how important those industries are. Even today, with the depressed rural situation and low prices, primary products still account for more than one-third of South Australia's total production and more than one-half of our exports overseas. So, primary industry is a very important facet of the South Australian scene. I warn Government members that, if this situation continues, metropolitan dwellers will feel its effect in two ways: first, there will be a loss of customers for secondary industries and,

secondly, there will be more people on the labour market. Farmers and their sons will be forced to leave the land through no fault of their own.

Education is one of the most difficult problems with which any Government has to deal. It is safe to say that in no other section of Government spending is there such a demand for increases in expenditure and for changes of methods. The days when school meant learning the three Rs are long gone, although there is still a place, and always will be, for this. We can be proud of what our Education Department has done in keeping abreast of world changes and thought in the changing needs of education. Our children are staying at school longer. They want to, and they are learning more and different things. It is most important that our education system should keep ahead of changing thought in this regard and more important, it must afford to all children an equal opportunity to obtain the education that will enable them to develop any abilities they may have.

It should not make any difference whether a child lives in the country or in the city, in an affluent or a non-affluent district, whether he has parents sympathetic to education or not, because every child is entitled to the same opportunity of education. Our State education system has tried to achieve equal opportunity for each child and, by international standards, it has been reasonably successful. However, areas of inequality still exist, and the obvious ones are caused, generally, by the subsidy system, by which schools in more affluent areas, or in areas perhaps not affluent but with dedicated and hard-working committees, have more facilities than do schools in the poorer areas. In my maiden speech I said that too many items that I consider to be basic educational facilities were only provided when the school could raise half or more of the cost of the items, and that this situation caused inequality. I was pleased to see a recommendation of the Karmel committee that the subsidy system be discontinued and that the cost of buildings essential to the operations of the school and the cost of maintenance of school grounds should be provided out of public funds.

For all other purposes the committee recommended that schools be given an annual budget assessed on pupil numbers. I wholeheartedly support this concept, and I hope that this will be one of the recommendations of the committee that the Minister intends to

introduce. The formation of the Karmel committee (or more correctly the Committee of Inquiry into Education in South Australia) by the member for Davenport, when she was Minister of Education, was one of the most forward-looking moves in the field of education that was ever instituted by any Minister, and I recommend a full study of this report to all members. I do not agree with all its recommendations, and some of them are impracticable (as the committee would be the first to admit) from an economic point of view at this time, but, nevertheless, it is a comprehensive and far-reaching report.

The present Minister must have every reason to be grateful to his predecessor, because this report will provide a sound basis for planning for many years. Pre-school education is a problem and an area in which there is inequality of opportunity. Because the setting up and operating of a kindergarten depends on local fund raising, it is rare to find kindergartens in areas of greatest need, and where kindergartens are established all too often parents do not consider them in the right way. Mothers often look on them merely as child-minding centres at which the children can be left whilst they go to work, and not as an essential part of the child's total education. The committee recommends more Government expenditure on pre-school education and the setting up of a committee to report on the needs in this field. Even if money could be made available now and a programme started it would be many years before it would be possible to provide adequate equality for pre-school education. For this reason, I hope the Minister will give consideration to another recommendation of the Karmel committee—that this State join with the Commonwealth to finance the Australian Broadcasting Commission to produce a suitable programme for use in Australia along the lines of *Sesame Street*. This programme, which is at present being shown by the Australian Broadcasting Commission on television, has achieved worldwide recognition and is, I understand, very good. Nevertheless, it is oriented to an American viewing public, and so it would be much better if a programme specifically designed for Australian children could be prepared. I ask the Minister to consider this matter and consult with his fellow Ministers in other States and in the Commonwealth, to recommend such a step.

The question of curricula for schools at all levels is important. The Karmel committee felt that its terms of reference required it to

concentrate on an assessment of the provision for education in South Australia and on the organization employed in its management. Consequently it did not make any recommendations on specific matters regarding curricula, but it did recommend the setting up of advisory boards to keep this matter under constant review.

I mentioned that all children throughout the State should have equal opportunities for learning. I believe this to be the ideal to be aimed at. To me, it has always seemed unfair that a child, for example in a country area, may not always be able to do all the subjects that he wants to do, because of the lack of a teacher of a subject at its school. I know that, from an administrative point of view, this presents grave difficulties, but it is a goal that must be aimed at. Until we have a situation where a child can do any subject it wishes to do in any school in the State, we cannot say we have equality of opportunity in education. Until this situation is reached, boarding allowances should be paid to children who attend another school to be able to study subjects they want to.

I had a case brought to my attention recently of a child from Cummins who wanted to do some subjects but she could not do them at the Cummins Area School. I may add that this child wants to teach, and wants to teach these subjects. So that she can do them, her parents have sent her to the Port Lincoln High School, and she boards in that city. Her parents were quite happy to do this, so that their daughter could do the course of study she wanted to, but they are not eligible for the boarding allowance simply because the subjects she wants are not taught at her home school. There has to be some other reason.

I should like the Minister to look into this matter because, to me, it is unthinkable that here is the possibility of losing to the profession a person who wants to teach. Returning to the question of curricula, I do not pretend to know very much about what should or should not be taught, but there is one very obvious lack. Our ties with our neighbours to the north must inevitably grow stronger. The bulk of our trade already goes to countries in that area and, with the imminent entry of the United Kingdom into the European Economic Community, this must and will continue to grow. I will give due credit to the Government for setting up agencies in Tokyo, Hong Kong, Djakarta and Singapore to

try to improve this trade. We have not had much result yet, but we can continue to hope.

Mr. Hall: There has been a lot of talk.

Mr. CARNIE: Yes, but nothing positive yet; but the thought was there. The point I make here is that we must have a far greater understanding of Asian culture and languages than we have now if we are successfully to make full use of these markets. In the past, our heritage has been connected with, and naturally our thinking has been directed to, the United Kingdom and Europe, but times and traditions have changed and we must change with them.

The *Sunday Review* of June 27 last stated that only 5,000 Australian students in secondary schools are learning an Asian language, compared with 240,000 learning French. This is the finding of a Commonwealth advisory committee on the teaching of Asian languages and culture in Australia. The committee found that no State taught right through secondary school a subject wholly concerned with Asian culture and went on to say that this was a most serious defect in the education of young Australians. The committee decided that a teaching programme on Asia should be developed with close co-ordination at primary and secondary levels, and it is interesting to note that this was also the finding of the Karmel committee. I ask the Minister therefore to institute, as soon as possible, the recommendations of both these committees by introducing at primary level a full study of Asian culture and by continuing this, plus the teaching of Asian languages, at secondary level.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Karmel committee, the Minister recently announced that a continuous entry into primary schools, whereby children commenced school on the Monday following their fifth birthday, would be tried on a pilot basis. The Kirton Point School in Port Lincoln is one of the schools to be used in connection with this pilot scheme, which seems to me to be a good scheme, as it has been successfully applied in New Zealand for many years. However, it must be stipulated that the schools being used under this scheme should have adequate staffing, for I believe the scheme would be completely unworkable unless the children concerned received considerable attention in the first few weeks until they were ready to take their place in the class. I assume the Minister has given sufficient thought to this aspect, although there already seems to be a shortage of teachers.

The Minister also recently announced the department's intention to alter the system of supplying books to students in the higher grades in secondary schools so that, instead of there being a straight subsidy on the purchase of books, the school will receive a subsidy and the books will be on loan from the school. I agree with the member for Kavel, who referred to this matter last evening, that the scheme could be fraught with difficulties. I have tried to ascertain the feeling of headmasters and book suppliers regarding this matter and, from a reply given to a question asked in the House, there obviously is not full agreement among headmasters. When trying to find out more about this subject, I came across an interesting thing, which really has no bearing on the workability of the scheme as such but which seems to indicate that pressure tactics are being used in fields other than in the case of unions.

I spoke to the manager of a book supply company that has contracts with the Education Department and, being opposed to the scheme, he said that he considered it would be unworkable, but he refused to give me any documentation of this or to allow his firm's name to be used in any way, saying, "We want to keep the contracts we have." Does this mean that anyone who criticizes the Education Department or the Minister may be victimized?

Mr. Gunn: Of course it does.

Mr. CARNIE: I should not like to think so, but that is the only interpretation that I can put on a remark such as that. This gentleman may be quite wrong but—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What basis has he for saying that?

Mr. CARNIE: If the Minister will wait, I point out that the gentleman may be quite wrong—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why did you make the charge?

Mr. CARNIE: The gentleman concerned may be able to speak out against the scheme without losing contracts, but something has given him the idea that he will suffer if he does speak out, and I am only repeating what he said. Are we being ruled in this State by a democratic Government, or not?

I want to deal briefly with one other matter. I consider that too much time has been taken up in this House on matters that do not concern us. At State level we are not concerned with foreign affairs. What I say applies to members on both sides of the House. The State Government has enough problems of its own to deal with without worrying about what

other Governments in other countries are doing. However, I shall take up a little time to deal with two of these matters. The Premier said that the Government would not recognize or support the Springbok tour. He is entitled to his view, but so is everyone else entitled to a view. I strongly oppose apartheid, but I do not think we should take it out on a team of sportsmen who come to our country. No thinking person approves of apartheid as we understand it to be, but I do not think any member of the House has actually been to South Africa to see it. I oppose apartheid as I understand it, but I reserve final judgment until I have seen it. What would this Government think if Prime Minister Vorster said that he did not like what the South Australian Government was doing?

Mr. Hall: In the case of the Builders Licensing Act, for instance.

Mr. CARNIE: Yes. I remind honourable members that Prime Minister Vorster has a far greater weapon to use than the boycotting of a sports team. Our export sales to South Africa are worth \$12,500,000 and already there are reports that South Africa holds us in bad odour. This attitude could cost South Australia dearly.

The member for Mawson gave us his usual carefully worded academic exercise which normally does not warrant great attention. Towards the end of his speech, he made an impassioned plea to members on this side to join in the anti-war march on July 31. I do not doubt that the honourable member is deeply sincere in this matter. The whole point is that many people, possessing the same facts as the honourable member has, place a different interpretation on them. We are proud in this country of the fact that everyone is entitled to his opinion: we have freedom of thought. I happen to believe that we should be involved in Vietnam. I do not care who asked us to go there: I believe it is in Australia's interests to have been there and to be there still. I deeply resent the implication that we have actively encouraged this war. I have a more personal reason than has the member for Mawson to dislike war. I appeal to the member for Mawson and everyone involved in the anti-war march on July 31. I concede the right of people to demonstrate, but I ask that in doing so they respect the rights of others in the community who may not have the same views as they have. Surely the member for Mawson respects that. I support the motion.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): At the outset I make clear that, probably, I will upset the member who has just resumed his seat, because, contrary to what he thinks are the duties of members of Parliament in this House and contrary to his ideas about the little compartments into which he tries to put affairs, such as State boxes, Commonwealth boxes and International boxes, I and the members of my Party put it under one term.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have you read—

Mr. PAYNE: Earlier the member for Whyalla drew attention to a church pamphlet that referred to the brotherhood of man, and that is the sort of thing which we subscribe to and which members opposite find hard to understand. The member for Alexandra, who has always been critical of other people, has started interjecting already.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I just asked whether you have read the Australian Constitution.

Mr. PAYNE: Of course I have read it. The Governor's Speech lists many things that the Government has already carried out for the benefit of the people of this State, and also other items that we intend to bring forward. Before proceeding further, I record my sadness at the passing of Mr. Sam Lawn and I offer my condolences to his relatives. At the same time (and I know that Sam would understand this), I congratulate the new member for Adelaide on the great victory he achieved at the by-election a short while ago. He is here to stay and he will add considerably to the obvious strength of the Government in this House.

Paragraph 7 of the Speech refers, amongst other things, to conservation and pollution, and at least two other speakers on our side have covered this matter well. However, I wish to deal with a different kind of conservation. I am speaking of conservation of people, particularly our elderly citizens. The position of these citizens who are on the bare pension today is terrible. The Liberal Commonwealth Government, after being in office for 20 years, has reduced the income of these people to a mere pittance and has reduced their lives to a misery. Persons like some honourable members opposite would not have a clue about what it is like to get along on \$16 a week, so they can sit back and listen. I consider that the Commonwealth Government is hastening the death of many of these people.

I have frequent contact with many pensioners in my district and I know that pensioners are being driven to their graves because of the worry about making ends meet as a result of the lousy allotment that they get from the Liberal Government in Canberra. I see this as a horrible euthanasia and, unfortunately, the "mercy" part is dished out with a great amount of pain. These pensioners come mainly from working people, and they are no longer wanted. The Commonwealth Government gives them a miserable few dollars a week. It is clear that the Commonwealth hopes they will go away and die somewhere. I am not saying this idly. When Mr. Gorton was Prime Minister he refused to talk to the pensioners' representatives when they accumulated enough money to go to Canberra to see him. That cannot be denied, and it must be remembered that Opposition members belong to Mr. Gorton's Party.

Mr. Wardle: What do you know about it?

Mr. PAYNE: My father lives on the pension and many people in the Mitchell District try to live on it, too. So, I do know something about it. The Commonwealth Liberal Government is sentencing pensioners to a slow death through the way it is treating them. We must remember that Australia is one of the most prosperous countries in the world.

Mr. Venning: South Australia used to be prosperous.

Mr. PAYNE: I agree that any deterioration has resulted from 20 years of Commonwealth Liberal Government. I should like to quote some figures.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wish to raise a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The honourable member is referring to a matter that comes under Commonwealth jurisdiction and has no connection whatsoever with His Excellency's Speech. I therefore suggest that the honourable member be called to order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It has always been the practice during the Address in Reply debate to allow considerable freedom to members to discuss any matters that they believe are of concern to this State. I ask the honourable member to link his remarks to the Governor's Speech.

Mr. PAYNE: I shall link my remarks to the Speech in a way that has been used by Opposition members. Many of the people I am talking about live in my electoral district in this State. In 1949 the average weekly

earnings in Australia were \$19.40, and the pension for a single aged pensioner was \$4.25—21.9 per cent of the average weekly earnings. Twenty years later, in 1970-71, the average weekly earnings are \$81, and the pension for a single aged pensioner is \$16—only 19 per cent of the average weekly earnings. So, that shows what 20 years of Commonwealth Liberal Government has done for pensioners. The proportion that the pension for a single aged pensioner bears to average weekly earnings is the lowest it has ever been. An increase of \$4 in the age pension would bring it to only 25 per cent of the average weekly earnings—and that would not be excessive.

Let us consider what other countries have done in this connection. In terms of the gross national product, the amount spent on pensions and welfare elsewhere is as follows: Western Germany 17.95 per cent; Sweden 17.45 per cent; and then through France, the United Kingdom, Canada, and New Zealand, until we reach the bottom of the list, where Australia uses 7.09 per cent of its gross national product for the welfare of pensioners. This table shows clearly what each country and its Government thinks of its aged people. Australia can afford only 7.09 per cent, yet Western Germany, which lost what was said to be the greatest war ever fought, can afford 17.95 per cent. This is a disgraceful situation and must be changed.

I make two appeals to members opposite. First, to the medical profession in this State, which is most constantly in touch with pensioners and has intimate and first-hand knowledge of the situation under which they are living and the struggle they have to stay alive, I make a plea to bring this matter to the attention of the Commonwealth Government. My second appeal is to Opposition members, and I appeal to them to get their Canberra mates (if they have any) to give the pensioners a fair go.

Mr. Venning: What is your Government going to do in South Australia?

Mr. PAYNE: I will deal with that point presently. The mates of members opposite must have a conscience, and if they are approached this may help. It is known that South Australian Labor members of the Commonwealth Parliament have tried their utmost, by questions and other means, to shame the friends of the Liberal Party in Canberra into acting, but to no avail. It is known that the L.C.L. Caucus had

directed that pensions were not to be debated in the Commonwealth Parliament during the recent session, and that is one reason why we have not succeeded in making our point. However, I make this appeal to members opposite.

Mr. Harrison: Most likely it will fall on deaf ears.

Mr. PAYNE: No, because I do not think everyone on the other side is completely heartless. I know that some of them are listening to me: they should get Messrs. McMahon and Snedden to unzip the purse and take out more money for pensioners. On the same theme of the conservation of people, I turn now to the question of demonstrations, a subject very dear to the heart of the member for Mitcham. It is a pity he is not here. Yesterday, I had the doubtful privilege of listening to him make a most savage and spiteful attack on the Premier of this State in his absence.

Mr. Hall: Whose fault is that?

Mr. PAYNE: This is the sort of tactic that we have come to expect from the member for Mitcham. He has attacked the Premier for his absence before the previous demonstration, but he waited until the Premier was absent to do it.

Mr. Gunn: It is the first opportunity he has had.

Mr. Evans: The Premier is always absent.

Mr. PAYNE: Where is the member for Mitcham now? The same member concocted a fabric of circumstances calculated to smear the Premier, but he will not succeed, because Mr. Justice Bright in his findings has fully vindicated the attitude of the Premier and the Government on that matter. In his tirade the member for Mitcham carefully avoided referring to the findings of Mr. Justice Bright, although it was issued in terms of the conduct at the time. Much has been said in this House and elsewhere by both State and Commonwealth members of the Liberal Party about demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, and so on. We know how the line goes, and it is still the same: "We must stem Communism and contain the Red hordes." But how many Liberal members (there are plenty of young ones in Canberra and there are some in this House) back their belief by joining up and fighting for that belief? I do not hear any answers to that; I did not expect to hear any answer.

Mr. Hall: The man you criticized.

Mr. PAYNE: In answer to the Leader, I have been in the Regular Army in recent times and have had contact with the member he

referred to, in his Citizen Military Force capacity. I will just leave it at that, but I do have some knowledge of the activities that go on. So there we are: people are professing a certain view and, when they have a chance to do something about it and prove it, they prefer to get someone else to do it for them. They send the sons of the workers to fight for them, as they have done from the beginning.

Mr. Gunn: That is not true.

Mr. PAYNE: It is the luck of the draw. I do not intend to rehash the whole thing again, but the plain fact is that this war was entered into by the Liberal Government in Canberra in an endeavour to cement the Australian-American alliance—"All the way with L.B.J."—and it used Australian blood for the cement. Altogether, 400 Australians have been killed and 4,000 have been injured. Just how much that great American alliance was worth was amply demonstrated this week when Qantas tried to inaugurate a certain air service to the U.S.A. We have seen what that sort of alliance can bring.

Mr. Crimes: That is what the Americans think of a satellite.

Mr. PAYNE: There is no doubt that that is the kind of treatment we get when we approach people in a fawning and supplicating way. Australia has not had the attention it should get as a nation that can stand on its own; it is treated as a satellite. The so-called Pentagon papers have clearly shown the truth of what the A.L.P. said all along and what Arthur Calwell was vilified for at the time. The whole thing was a gigantic swindle. The efforts of Johnson, Nixon, Menzies, McMahon and others to get out from under would be comic if the situation was not so tragic, for they have used the dead to build a screen around what has been going on. The whole thing is just a dirty business. Did you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, notice the damning effort of the U.S. State Department to block the publication of the Pentagon papers? Not once was the truth of those papers questioned. All that department tried to do was to stop them being published on grounds of secrecy and security. Not one member of the United States Government questioned the truth of those papers; that is something to be kept in mind.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I refer you again to the question of relevancy of matters that are not our concern but that of the Commonwealth Government, those matters being the Commonwealth Government's responsibility.

Erskine May, dealing at page 449 with relevancy in debate, states:

The existence of independent territories within the Commonwealth possessing large delegated powers provides difficult problems in relation to the application of rules of relevancy. Matters affecting the domestic affairs of an independent territory cannot be raised, but where it has been claimed that the interests of this country or its contractual relations are being affected by an independent territory, discussion has been ruled to be permissible.

That cannot be claimed in this instance. I therefore suggest that reference to this matter is quite irrelevant and that this line of argument should not be pursued.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Alexandra has raised a point of order regarding the relevancy of the subject matter referred to by the member for Mitchell. It has been the practice and procedure of this House over many years that the Address in Reply be an open debate, with members having the right to deal with matters concerning the State, especially where those matters concern the member and his own district. Therefore, I ask the member for Mitchell at least to link his remarks with the subject matter as it concerns the State generally, together with comments made by other members during this debate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a further point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In the course of this debate we have had discussions on a wide range of topics by every member who has contributed to the debate, and no objection has been taken. Even the member for Alexandra himself ranged widely over matters dealing with immigration policy, Singapore, and goodness knows what else. The member for Mitcham dealt with the Canadian Bill of Rights.

The Hon. L. J. King: And said that he was debating one of the great issues of the day.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education is on his feet raising a point of order, and any interjection made while the Minister is explaining his point of order is definitely out of order. The Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As members in this debate have been permitted to range over the great issues of the day, if one may use that term, without any hindrance from the Chair or from other members, I submit to you respectfully, Sir, that it would be grossly unfair

to limit in any way the remarks that the member for Mitchell wishes to make on a similar subject matter that has been covered, in the main, by every other member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I have said, during the Address in Reply debate over many years it has been open for members to debate any subject that is relevant to or comes within the jurisdiction of the State. If the member for Mitchell can bring his remarks within that category, he is in order. The member for Mitchell.

Mr. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have noticed in the past that no member opposite has ever appeared to consider the most important aspect of demonstrations. I suppose that the member for Alexandra will agree that we had a demonstration in South Australia.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Address the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections must cease. I will not repeatedly stand up and call members to order. If any honourable member interjects, he will have to put up with the consequences.

Mr. PAYNE: In all the raving of members opposite about law and order, they have never asked the most important question, which is: why are the people demonstrating? These people wish to show that they are against the wholesale death and destruction that goes on in Vietnam. I believe I have successfully linked up that remark. Is it wrong for people to demonstrate and show their repugnance at what is happening? I am sure it is not. I do not remember any member opposite ever giving credit to people who demonstrate. Another curious aspect typifies the Liberal Party's attitude of political expediency above all else. In this connection, I refer to the twin questions of apartheid in South Africa (I recall that the member for Flinders referred to that) and the Vietnam conflict. Both of these matters concern the policies of other countries. The Commonwealth Government rushed headlong into the war in Vietnam but, when the question of South Africa is raised, that Government says that it is an internal matter and not our responsibility. It is curious the way Liberal members approach those matters, which I believe are in the same type of context.

Mr. Jennings: Do you think they should be consistent?

Mr. PAYNE: I should hope they would be, but obviously they are not. I remind mem-

bers opposite that this is the sort of attitude that nurtured the rise of Hitler and all that followed. In this debate, the member for Mitcham said it was unfortunate that individual freedom was not as highly prized as it was a generation ago, and he went on to criticize the Australian Council of Trade Unions for becoming involved in social issues. Does he think that workers do not have the right to the individual freedom he was talking about? Does he think that they do not have the right to group together, if they so desire, and have a viewpoint? Does that not come under the terms of the freedom he was talking about? I think he must have been advocating that only the members of the League of Rights should have these freedoms. I cannot understand what he is driving at. If, as a result of the demonstrations that have occurred in Australia in the last few years, the war in Vietnam was shortened sufficiently to save the life of one human being, those demonstrations would have been justified, and I am pleased to say that they have been worth while, as we all know. They have resulted in a scaling down of the fighting, and have saved lives, even though the war has not yet ended.

Another remark by the member for Mitcham (and he was referring to the September moratorium) was to the effect that the police were in difficulty because they did not know the plans of the marchers, and so on. How weak can one get? What does his statement imply? Does he try to suggest to us that bank robbers and other criminals notify the police of their plans in advance? Are not the police retained to anticipate situations and carry out their job? How weak can one get?

Then, of course, as usually happens in most of the honourable member's speeches in this House, we were given the master plan. This was the master plan for society in South Australia according to the gospel of St. Mitcham, and it was very good to hear. It was what we would expect, of course; everyone and everything in their places, and all is well. The honourable member made a big spiel in saying that, but that is, in effect, all that he said. He was not quite satisfied with that, because he said, "Let us have some alteration of the laws to prevent the ordinary people from getting so uppity as to protest against wrongs and injustice." He used a couple of legal terms that he digs up occasionally, but he was saying, "Let us leave things as they are." It was the old *status quo* argument

all over again. He says, "Let us be conventional about these things, not unconventional."

I suppose the honourable member suggests that these people should write a letter to the Prime Minister. A fat lot of good that would do! Even our Government has trouble getting replies to letters that it writes to the Prime Minister, so how would John Citizen get on? The honourable member wants the people to be conventional about it. He also said that he was alarmed at public protest trends today, and if I was in his position I think I might get alarmed, too. He is in the position of trying to prop up the facade of the so-called L.C.L. liberalism, which we do not see much of now. I would get worried, too, because that is on the skids, on the way out.

The honourable member gave us a bit more of this and tried to support his line by quoting the President of the American Bar Association. However, if I may dare be so

bold as to try to tell the honourable member what I know and what the ordinary people in this State know, the way to sustain our system of democratic Government is to maintain and improve the condition that allows it; that is, the freedom of the individual to express his opinion publicly. That is what will sustain the type of Government that we already understand and some of us enjoy. We do not need any more special laws or anything like what the honourable member is suggesting that will cause protests to occur in a nice conventional way, such as that, if a person opens his mouth, he is in the clink. We do not want that sort of thing. I tell the member for Mitcham, "We prefer to stay as we are, thank you very much." I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 22, at 2 p.m.