

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 22, 1971

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

QUESTIONS**DARTMOUTH DAM**

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Works say what alternatives to the Dartmouth dam, if any, the Government is considering? The Minister will recall that in the previous Labor Administration between 1965 and 1968 the then Premier travelled to other States and talked about a possible alternative to the Chowilla dam. Since then, a well-known public and Parliamentary debate has taken place on this issue, and now the other States of Australia concerned with the River Murray Waters Agreement are waiting for the South Australian Government to ratify the Dartmouth agreement, which it has not yet done. It seems that the Government has decided that the Dartmouth dam is not obtainable under the conditions it places on the agreement and, if it has given away the prospect of obtaining the Dartmouth dam, as it seems to have done, I ask what provision, by way of undertaking alternative considerations, the Government is making in regard to the water supply needs of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader will be well aware that last session this Parliament passed legislation details of which, together with an explanation of it, were forwarded to the other interested Governments (those of New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth). We asked them to consider whether or not they would be prepared to proceed on *that* basis with the construction of Dartmouth. We have not yet heard from the Victorian Government or the Commonwealth Government, but on Monday of this week I received a letter from the New South Wales Government. Before we consider the matter further, we are awaiting replies from the Victorian and Commonwealth Governments. The Government has not considered an alternative to Dartmouth, because, as the Leader has said, we may be out of time if something is not done, but we are not satisfied yet that every course has been pursued in protecting the future of Chowilla.

Mr. Millhouse: What future?

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the Government receives the replies it is awaiting from the Victorian and Commonwealth Governments, it will further consider the whole matter.

KARMEI COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked earlier this week about school organizations obtaining copies of the Karmel report?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At this stage we do not intend to make available complimentary copies of the Karmel report to each school, the cost of doing this for the 700 schools involved being beyond current financial resources.

ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Deputy Premier say whether it is intended that legislation will be introduced this session to amend those sections of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act concerning abortion? I ask this question of the Deputy Premier as it is a matter of Government policy, whatever the contents of that legislation may be. I remind honourable members that the Deputy Premier personally has often expressed his opposition (he did so in this House) to the provisions that were inserted in the Act—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —in 1969, and the Attorney-General has also expressed his opposition. Last session a suggestion was made that a private member, even from the front bench, would introduce amendments to the Act, but no such amendments were forthcoming. The member for Hanson having raised this matter in this House in the last few days, this morning's *Advertiser* at page 3 contains a report partly of what the honourable member said and partly of what has been reported by the President of the Australian Medical Association (Dr. Hecker). I know that some of the amendments that may be contemplated as a result of this report will not affect the grounds, which are the main points of contention with the Deputy Premier. As I have said, the question of the residence provision and so on bear re-examination. Therefore, I wonder whether the Government intends to introduce a Bill on the subject or whether the situation is as it was last session: that is, that this is a matter for a private member's Bill. If it is up to private members, I ask the Deputy Premier whether he intends to introduce a Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government does not intend to introduce, this session, the amendments to which the honourable member has referred. As he has said, it is competent for any private member to move the amendments to the Act that have been discussed often. My concern in this matter has not lessened: in fact, it has increased because of the activity that has gone on in this area since the Bill that had been introduced by the member for Mitcham passed this House. At this stage I cannot say whether I will proceed with amendments to this Act.

SALISBURY POLLUTION

Mr. GROTH: Has the Minister for Conservation inquired into the report that the Salisbury district has the highest solid pollutant fall-out in the metropolitan area and, if he has not, will he institute such an inquiry?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Recently I have seen the report to which the honourable member has referred and which resulted from readings of pollution fall-out taken throughout the metropolitan area. I was somewhat disturbed to see that such a high figure had been recorded at Salisbury. I have not had an opportunity to study the effects of this, although I noticed a comment accompanying the report in one of today's newspapers that the situation at Salisbury had been unusual because of associated factors. However, I assure the honourable member that I will study the figures that were taken recently and establish what action, if any, is required to ensure that the pollution fall-out in that area and in other areas where the reading is unusually high is reduced. I point out to the honourable member that figures released at the same time as a result of similar tests made in the same area established that the sulphur dioxide content in the atmosphere in all areas tested was completely satisfactory, when compared to the standards adopted in America for the various readings. However, I will consider this matter and give the honourable member a further reply.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Deputy Premier say whether, in view of the announcement in the Governor's Speech about the agreement to supply natural gas to New South Wales from Gidgealpa and associated fields, enabling legislation to give effect to this agreement will be introduced?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Offhand, I cannot reply to the question but I will inquire for the honourable member and let him know as soon as possible.

PARA HILLS EAST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked him on July 15 about access to the Para Hills East Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am aware of the need for an access road from Milne Road to the school buildings at the Para Hills East Primary School, and the Public Buildings Department has been requested to provide a report and recommendation on the most suitable portion of land for this purpose. A report is expected soon. Action will then be taken to initiate negotiations to purchase the land recommended by the Public Buildings Department to provide the required access.

NARACOOORTE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Education ask officers of his department to investigate the inadequacies of the staff room at the Naracoorite High School? The room available for use by the staff is a standard-size wooden frame classroom measuring 24ft. x 24ft., and provides facilities for 37 staff members. It is totally inadequate for this purpose, the staff being crammed into it and being greatly inconvenienced. Further, it is separated from the school buildings and situated on the northern side of the quadrangle. As the Minister knows, this part of the State has many days of inclement weather, and the staff have to make their way to the staff room under all sorts of weather conditions. I shall be pleased if the Minister will ask his officers to consider this problem so that more suitable staffing arrangements can be made.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The problem of staff accommodation at many schools is a difficult one, and from the honourable member's description of conditions applying at Naracoorite (and I have no reason to doubt its accuracy) it seems that difficult conditions are being experienced at that school. I shall be pleased to see what can be done.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what he or Cabinet intends to do with that part of the report of the Wheat Delivery Quotas Inquiry Committee that recommends an amendment to the Act to provide for the transfer of quotas

on an annual basis? You, Mr. Speaker, will know that the Government set up a committee to hear evidence throughout the State concerning wheat quotas. Having travelled throughout the State, conducted meetings, and taken evidence, the committee has made certain recommendations, one being that there should be a hard wheat quota for South Australia and another that there should be a contingency reserve of wheat to be allocated by the committee in hardship cases. Other recommendations have been made, but the specific one with which I am concerned is that quotas should be transferable on an annual basis. However, we have heard nothing of what the Government intends to do in this regard, and as the coming harvest is fast approaching I would welcome information on what the Government intends to do about that recommendation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

HOSPITALS INQUIRY

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, give members an assurance that the names of those nurses who gave evidence before the hospitals inquiry committee will not be divulged? On July 13, the member for Bragg asked a question in this House about this inquiry. The honourable member had several things to say about the inquiry before that date, particularly during the last session. It has been pointed out to me by people who represent nurses that, as a result of these probings (which were in no way improper) and of possible Government reaction to them, the names of nurses who gave evidence before this committee could be made public or divulged to those in the hierarchy whose position might be threatened as a result of the recommendations of this committee.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Undoubtedly, discussions and consultations will take place as a result of the inquiry and of the committee's report, but I assure the House and the honourable member that in no circumstances will the identity of persons who gave confidential information or evidence be disclosed.

Dr. TONKIN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Mawson has referred to my part in making inquiries in respect of the hospitals inquiry committee. As has been said, a reply was given in July last year.

Mr. Hopgood: This year.

Dr. TONKIN: Although a copy of the report was offered to me, I have not read the recommendations, other than those that have been published.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to my question of July 15 regarding disabilities and employment by the Public Service? The other information regarding a certain individual, for which the Minister asked, is still being compiled for his use.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Chairman of the Public Service Board reports:

There is certainly no general directive against the employment of persons in the Public Service with physical disabilities. Whilst the Public Service Act (section 39) requires the Public Service Board to be satisfied as to the health and physical fitness of appointees to the Public Service, this is deemed to be met if the board is satisfied that, despite the physical disability, the applicant is capable of performing the duties of the office to which he or she is being appointed. Persons with a variety of physical disabilities are already employed in the Public Service, and while the board does not consider that the Public Service should be expected to absorb more than its share of physically handicapped persons, a sympathetic attitude is adopted. The board believes that the Government as an employer should set an example to other employers in this matter where it is practicable to do so. In the absence of the name of the applicant to whom the honourable member has referred, the board is unable to say why this applicant has not obtained employment up to the present.

As the honourable member has indicated, that information will soon be forthcoming.

BREAD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to my question of July 13 concerning bread prices in the Belair and Blackwood area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Prices Commissioner reports:

Over-the-shop-counter prices for bread are the same in Blackwood, Belair and adjacent areas as those applying in the Adelaide metropolitan area. However, for many years a surcharge has applied on home delivered bread in the Blackwood area (currently 1c a 2lb. loaf above the Adelaide delivered price) because of higher costs incurred by bakers. The position has been examined on a number of occasions, but the factors which justified the surcharge originally are still present, namely:

- (1) Compared with the normal suburban round, the delivery time is longer in this area, with rounds slower to cover. As a result, the number of loaves delivered each round is lower.

- (2) In many parts, the hilly nature of the land, with steep roads, results in fuel costs being above normal, and vehicle repair costs are also higher.
- (3) Because of these conditions, heavier vehicles are necessary because lighter vehicles capable of carrying the actual bread load cannot stand up to the demands of the terrain.
- (4) The actual cost of delivery is well in excess of the difference between the shop and the delivered price.
- (5) It is considered important that home deliveries be maintained despite the high costs incurred.
- (6) While considerable development has occurred in the area, withdrawal of the surcharge is not warranted at this juncture, but the position is being kept under review.

SALISBURY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mr. GROTH: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about constructing a primary school at Salisbury Downs?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A brief has been forwarded to the Public Buildings Department for a proposed new school at Salisbury Downs with a request that it be available for occupation not later than January, 1975. The urgency of other projects makes an earlier date of occupation impracticable. The need to provide additional accommodation in the meantime at Parafield Gardens school has been recognized and the Public Buildings Department has been requested to include, as a matter of urgency, a 210-pupil unit on the design list for the Parafield Gardens school. If the development warrants it, an additional 140-pupil unit will be provided for Parafield Gardens.

PRICES BRANCH

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Attorney-General say what effect the recent amendments to the Prices Act which give more protection to consumers have had on the activities of the Prices Branch and its officers?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The passing of the amending Act to which the honourable member refers has had a considerable effect on the work and activities of the Prices Branch, and I can supply the honourable member with certain details regarding those expanded activities. The amendment to the Prices Act in December, 1970, to give more protection to consumers has resulted in a further increase in the consumer protection activities of the Prices Branch. For the six months to June 30, 1971, 2,643 inquiries of all types were received. Of these, 802 were accepted as complaints from consumers and were investigated. Appropriate advice was given in the other 1,841 cases.

Complaints investigated in some of the main classifications were as follows: excessive charges for services, 279; excessive charges for goods, 178; unfair dealing, 119; fraud or misrepresentation, 49; misleading advertising, 41; and door-to-door sales, 28.

One particular trade group deserves comment: there were 201 complaints investigated concerning used car transactions. The types of complaint were as follows: excessive prices, 56; defective condition, 57; misrepresentation, 41; unfair dealing, 34; and misleading advertising, 13. Most of the complaints were against a small number of dealers, 102 being against seven dealers and the other 91 against 62 dealers. Of the complaints where excessive charges were found, reductions or refunds were obtained in 325 cases, amounting in total to \$22,716. Appropriate action was also taken on other complaints: for example, the arranging of work to be redone; faulty goods replaced; correction or elimination of misleading advertisements; and contracts cancelled on door-to-door sales.

ATHOL PARK LAND

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Railways Commissioner whether the department is willing to sell a strip of land that extends through Ely, Gateshead and Cambridge Streets, Athol Park? This area was previously reserved for a railway line, but I believe that it will not now be used for that purpose. Further, will the Minister ascertain whether this land may be sold to the Woodville council? Reports have been made to me by residents in this area regarding the disgraceful state of the land in question, and I have been informed by a member of the Woodville council that for a considerable time the council has been negotiating with the Railways Department to purchase this land, so that it can improve it in accordance with the wishes of local residents. However, as the council has not made much headway with the department, I have been requested to ascertain whether the Railways Commissioner will sell this land and, if he will, when it may be sold.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will take up the matter with the Railways Commissioner to find out what is the position concerning this land. As I obviously do not have that information on hand at present, I will inquire and then notify the honourable member so that he can inform his constituents.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr. SIMMONS: Has the Deputy Premier a reply to the question I asked on July 13 about acquiring land from the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Premier was asked whether there was any constitutional barrier to the Commonwealth Government's taking over, for airport purposes, any of the land held by the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust. The answer to the question is "No", although the present constitutional power of the Commonwealth has not been exercised to permit acquisition of land that has been reserved as a public park or otherwise for the purposes of public recreation. Section 6 (2) of the Commonwealth Lands Acquisition Act, 1955-1966, provides:

The Commonwealth shall not acquire either by agreement or by compulsory process land which, under the laws of a State or territory of the Commonwealth, is dedicated or reserved, or is vested in trustees, as a public park or otherwise for the purposes of public recreation.

I have no doubt that the land known as the West Beach Recreation Reserve is land that is presently exempt from the land that the Commonwealth may presently acquire pursuant to the provisions of the Act quoted. However, by an appropriate amendment to that Act or by the passing of a special Act to apply to the West Beach Recreation Reserve, the Commonwealth could acquire that land, so long as the acquisition was on just terms, for a purpose in respect of which the Commonwealth Parliament has power to make laws (section 51 (XXXI) of the Commonwealth Constitution).

CITY MARKET TRAFFIC

Mr. WRIGHT: Does the Minister of Roads and Transport know whether an investigation has been conducted into the need to install traffic lights in Grote Street near the car park entrance at the city market? If there has been no such investigation, will he undertake to have this matter investigated? I have received complaints from some of my constituents about safety in this vicinity and, as I have personally noticed that pedestrians are sometimes in difficulty when trying to enter the market, especially on Thursdays and Fridays, I think an investigation is warranted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although this matter comes within the jurisdiction of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, I will ask the corporation and possibly the Road Traffic Board to examine this problem, which

certainly causes much concern to many people. The area referred to is a busy area and I know that confusion arises as a result of the large volume of traffic moving in and out of the car park. I will obtain the information required and bring it down for the honourable member.

LONSDALE SPUR LINE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport indicate the likely future of the Lonsdale spur line, which was originally built as a spur from the old Hallett Cove terminus, on the Willunga line, to the Port Stanvac oil refinery? In recent years there has been considerable speculation about the possibility of extending this line southwards to the Christies Downs area to provide better public transport for the residents there.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The extension of the railway line was one of the matters referred to by the Governor in his Opening Speech, in which he indicated that the Government intended, this financial year, to introduce legislation enabling this line to be extended, as part and parcel of the overall policy of the Government to upgrade the public transport sector of South Australia.

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT:
INDUSTRY**

The SPEAKER: This morning I received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition:

I wish to inform you that it is my intention to move this day: That the House at its rising this day adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock p.m. for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that in view of the gravity of recent reports of South Australian industry moving to other States, the Government should immediately and publicly express its support for those industries which are subject to industrial disruption.

Is the motion supported?

Opposition members having risen:

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that, in view of the gravity of recent reports of South Australian industry moving to other States, the Government should immediately and publicly express its support for those industries which are subject to industrial disruption. Unfortunately, there is plenty of evidence to support my motion.

This afternoon's newspaper outlines the chaos that is abroad industrially in South Australia. The editorial therein perhaps expresses what many people think. Headed "Losing Our Reputation", it refers to a shift of industry from this State. The front page of the newspaper also tells a dismaying story. This report is headed "New Moves Fail To End Strike", and the subheading is "Lay-offs Begin, Fuel Dwindling". A photograph indicates that rubbish is mounting up, no doubt a most discouraging item for the newly appointed Minister for Conservation. Since we have been in Opposition, I have repeatedly warned the Government about the effect its policy would have on the community, especially the industrial community, as we have come to know it.

In press statements and speeches in this House I have warned the Government of the consequences of its actions. However, I know that the Government ignores my warnings, as it has already shown that it is unwilling to take advice. If it continues with its present industrial attitude, more factories will empty in future. Not only will enterprises not come to South Australia: existing concerns will pack up and leave. I hope for nothing more than to be proved wrong in this prediction, but what do we find since I made my previous prediction and warned the Government? Newspapers have had headings such as "South Australian Firm Might Go to Victoria". That article states:

The Chairman of Rubery Owen Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd., Mr. William Gwinnett, said today his company was seriously considering shifting a major part of its operations from South Australia to Victoria. "We may do this because uncontrolled union militancy is destroying our ability to manufacture and market our products," he said.

Another heading is "Firm To Cut South Australian Output", under which the following article appears:

Uniroyal General Products said yesterday that it was transferring part of its Edwardstown 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."

Today the following announcement was made over the Australian Broadcasting Commission news service:

Severe restrictions have already followed this morning's attempts to settle the Transport Workers Union strike. As mentioned in the national news, officials of the T.W.U. and the Bus Operators Association conferred for nearly two hours and then announced that they were unable to reach agreement. Later a conference in the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission was adjourned until tomorrow when the Bus Operators Association declined to attend. The A.B.C. industrial reporter says a number of companies are now restricting operations, as reported earlier. Kelvinator (Aust.) Ltd. has already stood down 500 employees, and Simpson, Pope has put off 120 employees. Chrysler (Australia) Ltd. will begin closing down its S.A. plants later this afternoon, but G.M.H. said today that continuity of operations at all its plants could be maintained until tomorrow night.

The A.C.I. group has announced that it will have to consider closing down sections of its operations at the weekend. The State Administrative Officer, Mr. Bone, said today that if the T.W.U. strike continued another 24 hours the supply of raw materials to the glass manufacturing section would become critical. Mr. Bone said it was possible that between 300 and 400 employees in the glass-making sections could be affected by any stand down. At Whyalla the B.H.P. Company has stood down a number of employees, but it is not yet known how many are involved. The strike has stopped all local bus services, and has affected the transport of steel to Port Augusta. The A.B.C. political reporter says that three senior Government Ministers cancelled a number of engagements this morning to take part in talks on the dispute.

So far, we have only a further solidification of the dispute as we know it. Over the years South Australia has become used to strong industrial leadership. If anyone doubts that statement, he can peruse *Hansard* and newspapers in which he will find statistical proof that the height of South Australian industrial development was in 1963-64. At that time, employers and employees knew exactly where they stood in relation to development and their jobs. They knew both sides of the question, and they knew they had the protection, support and encouragement of the State Government. How different it is today when we no longer have the strains of taking into the community the tremendous number of people from across the seas who wanted to come here and share in our development. Where today is the strong encouragement and leadership that we grew used to in respect of industry? I can tell members where it is.

Government leadership resides in the type of statement that appears in the *Advertiser* of May 26, as follows:

The State Government intervened yesterday in the grim strike situation which has brought the Port Pirie smelters to the brink of closing. This would put nearly 1,500 men out of work.

A little later, the report states:

Mr. McKee's press statement said the State Government had received a request from the employers' representatives to send a conciliator.

The *Advertiser* of June 1, a few days later, contains a report of a statement by the Minister about a company that was acting entirely within the law and honouring its industrial agreement. That report states:

The Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. McKee) said last night he was surprised that the Broken Hill Associated Smelters was not prepared to negotiate with Commissioner W. C. Lean, who had gone to Port Pirie last week to help the industry, the people involved in the industry and the community. The company is being unreasonable in not agreeing to have discussions, he said.

This is the leadership that this Government is giving to an industry which has a proven and proper industrial record and which is abiding by the agreement that it is supposed to abide by! The Minister attacks it. Of course, we have had the famous statement by the Minister in February this year, when he practically encouraged industrial disruption in this State by saying that the then Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) deserved whatever retaliation the workers decided to adopt. That was a statement by a supposedly responsible Minister in this Government. On March 18, the Premier, when replying to a question about the 35-hour week, spoke in general terms of the Government's regard for arbitration and stated:

The Government's industrial policy is that the normal processes of law in conciliation and arbitration should be used in relation to industrial disputes and that nothing could be more disastrous than for the Government to try to intervene to by-pass that system.

That statement was made after the Minister of Labour and Industry had practically told the workers of this State to take direct and illegal action. Therefore, we have a Government today that is willing to (and, in fact, must) put its outside Party policies before the interests of the State. We are seeing, in relation to the transport workers' strike on compulsory unionism, what is, in effect, a Government-inspired work stoppage. The House should note that, and I shall come back to that point.

What did we achieve under our previous strong industrial leadership? I do not have to speak in detail of the successes in those

years, of how we could not get sufficient funds in South Australia to keep in time with the tremendous demands on services, and how we took a tremendous percentage of British migrants coming to Australia. Our businesses were booming and relied on one another for their operations and advancement, not only as suppliers to the South Australian market (and this is important) but to the total Australian market.

We saw the first break in this continuity of advancement in 1965 and the break reached its height in 1966 and 1967, when, as all members who were then in the House will recall, we had between 500 and 700 empty houses at Elizabeth. It is somewhat ironical that, whilst we have an afternoon newspaper reporting a tremendous downturn in our prospects, a report on the bottom of the same page states that 300 additional houses are to be built. I am reminded of the recession that occurred under the Labor Government in the period from 1965 to 1968 and I wonder whether we shall be able to have those houses occupied. Unfortunately, we have a repetition of the conditions that brought disaster to many thousands of South Australians. Many had to leave the State then to secure a livelihood so that they could support their families.

We remember the factories that emptied under Labor because when we came to office in 1968 we had the challenge to fill them and we did that in less than two years, to such an extent that we were involved in building many new factories of the type and size of the Nyllex Corporation venture, which was one of the major industries that we succeeded in getting to come here after we had filled the factories that Labor had emptied. We now have an alternative Government to the Government of those days that gave proper industrial leadership, and we are getting alternative results.

I have said earlier that this dispute is to all intents and purposes, a Government-inspired industrial disruption. Why do I say that? Ministers know that in November, 1970, the Minister of Roads and Transport took to Cabinet a recommendation that, in all Government contracts, a provision for preference for unionists be included. The Minister of Roads and Transport, who was then, I think, President of the Labor Party in South Australia, brought his instructions to Cabinet. They were approved in Cabinet and we know the sorry history of the way he has tried and, I consider, is succeeding with a watered-down version. First,

he tried to intimidate employees of his Highways Department by that instruction. He has a strong influence in Cabinet and, under his direction, all Government contracts contain what amounts to a compulsory unionism clause.

Whenever we protest in this House we get a defence of activities in disruption, and it will be interesting to see whether this afternoon the Deputy Premier defends the Transport Workers Union. It will be interesting if he terms as bludgers (which his colleague called them last week in this House) those who will not be intimidated. Although the Deputy Premier may be able to do that, perhaps he can consider the damage and injury being done, not only to the future of Australian industrialists but to people who depend on industry in this State for their jobs and livelihood. It is also ironical that one of the people involved in the bus employees' dispute has been a victim of those that he helped. This morning's *Advertiser* shows Mr. Barnes standing beside his idle buses, and the report states:

Mr. Barnes said the situation was farcical and employees of his company had told him that they were sick and tired of being told by their union what they should do. Mr. Barnes said his company had always employed union labor practically from its inception in 1931, and "that is all the thanks we get."

That is a report about one of the men who long ago agreed to demands by unions for a closed shop, and they have rewarded him by shutting up that shop. That is the pay-off to one person who has co-operated fully with the demands and intimidatory tactics of unions in South Australia. A letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* this morning states:

Strike gains: Misery, loss of pay—All that has been achieved by unions in strikes in the past 12 months is a lot of misery and loss of pay. I am sure housewives and bread-winners will agree. I don't think the average Australian working man wants these sort of leaders controlling him although they are by some mysterious force compelling him to join their outfits.

That letter speaks for tens of thousands of South Australians who are being pushed around by these strong-arm tactics, and we see today a denial of essential services to much of the community in South Australia. The responsibility sits squarely on the shoulders of government, and it sits especially squarely and effectively on the shoulders of this Government because of this Government's intimate relationship with the union movement, and it sits there because, every time we protest on behalf of the people of this State,

Government Ministers defend illegal actions and the breaking of the Industrial Code, which was passed anew and afresh in this House by the Labor Government in 1967. Therefore, we have an attack by this Government on all South Australians, on their personal living standards and their economic future in relation to the industries that may or may not operate here. Whilst this is continuing and the matter becomes urgent we have the Leader of the State Government travelling through Asia and telling the story of how industry will be built up in this State. A newspaper article on July 20 states:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, has been carrying out investigations into the possible establishment of a petrochemical plant near Port Augusta.

It also states:

The plant would involve very considerable investment, and Mr. Dunstan was not prepared to forecast whether the Port Augusta scheme would go ahead.

The Premier then denied that an industrial development war had broken out between South Australia and Western Australia over the establishment of the petrochemical plant and said, "I know of no such war." Therefore, he was denying the newspaper reports on that subject when he was quoted as saying:

There is room in Australia for only one new major petrochemical plant and that must be in my State.

He was denying his own statement at the time his Government at home was rescinding its own regulations, and the Premier was acting in the characteristic manner that we have come to expect of this Government, of saying one thing one day and denying it the next. It may well be that the Premier's press secretary was trying to justify the cost of his airline ticket. However, we know that it is futile for the Premier to prate overseas and talk about the possibilities of expansion in this State when we can pick up a newspaper and read of the present disaster in this State that has been fostered and fomented by this Government. I am reminded of the words of a song that was popular some years ago, "And the bravest man was Captain Brown, who played his ukelele as the ship went down." This is shown by the Premier being overseas today whilst the ship is sinking under the heavy hand of totalitarianism supported by this Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I am not surprised that the Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to move his

motion of urgency today. I should have thought that in the present circumstances it would have been proper for him to wait until a settlement had been achieved rather than to inflame an already dangerous situation. The Leader has made great play of the fact that in the Walsh-Dunstan Labor Government's term of office a run-down in industrial activity occurred in this State. He is trying to claim that the same sort of thing is happening because a Labor Government is in power at present.

I take the Leader and his colleagues back to 1961. Each and every member in this House will clearly recall the very severe recession that occurred not only in South Australia but throughout Australia. Again, in 1965 and 1966 a further slight recession occurred not only in this State but throughout Australia. Also, it seems to me that we are not in a rosy position at present. Obviously, every five to six years, because of the fiscal policies of the Commonwealth Government, which is of the same complexion as the Party of members opposite, we have a recurrence of this situation.

Mr. McAnaney: What has this got to do with it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pointing out facts to the honourable member, and I hope that he will not become impatient. Surely Opposition members are aware that, if they are to claim that increased costs in this State are driving industries to other States, they must also recognize that the Government not only in this State but in every State in Australia has been forced to increase costs that would not normally be increased, because of the policy of the Commonwealth Government. If, as the Leader claims, this is forcing industries out of South Australia (and he has referred to two of them and I shall deal with that point later), I can only say to him and to his colleagues that they probably will find a similar situation developing in other States if it does not exist already.

We had an example of that the other day when cost of living increases were published. We saw clearly that the two major factors that caused increases in South Australia were increases in hospital charges and bus fares. This had happened only in Adelaide and not in other States, but these increases will have been imposed in those States now. Also, electricity and rail charges will be increased in other States. I should like to discuss the Leader's point that the South Australian Rubber Mills Proprietary Limited is transferring part of its operations to Victoria. As I said in reply to

a question from the Leader, I think on Tuesday last, I have had discussions both with representatives of the unions involved and with the Managing Director of the rubber mills about this matter, because I did not want Opposition members or the public to think that the Government was not concerned about these matters: we pay due attention to them.

I make it perfectly clear that part of the operation has been transferred to an already existing plant belonging to the company in Dandenong in Victoria, because of freight costs that could be eliminated if the product was produced alongside the company's largest market, the Ford Motor Company at Dandenong in Victoria. We are disappointed at losing this industry and we did not want to see it go, but there is an element of management that has to be considered, not overlooked. The Managing Director of the company pointed out to me that the company's research indicated that, because of the growing population in the Eastern States, it might be necessary, from an economic point of view and because of the closeness of the markets, to shift more of the company's operations.

I emphasize that it is not a significant part of the operations at Edwardstown that is being transferred to Victoria. The Managing Director told me that, contrary to what the Leader has said, there would be no retrenchment as a result of the transfer of this operation to Victoria. The Managing Director (Mr. Footner) told me the other day that there would be no retrenchment at the Edwardstown factory.

Regarding the announcement by Rubery Owen and Kemsley that it might have to transfer some of its operation to the Eastern States—

Mr. Jennings: The *Advertiser* missed something out.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, because I have the press release from this company in my hand. It was issued to the media and states:

We do not attach any blame whatsoever to the South Australian Government. Mr. Dunstan appears to be doing everything within his power to attract industry to this State.

Mr. Jennings: Why wasn't that in the *Advertiser*?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The press release continues:

It is very unfortunate for South Australia that these efforts are being severely hampered by unwarranted stoppages caused by a few vocal agitators.

That indicates that industry generally recognizes that the Government is doing everything in its power to make things as easy as it can for industry here. The Leader made a great play not only about the run-down in industry here during the terms of Labor Governments but also about industrial stoppages and the effect these have on our industry. I quote the following figures because I think they will indicate to the House that the Leader has not been quite honest in this matter. In 1961, 17,300 man-days were lost out of a total of 606,800 for the Commonwealth, the South Australian percentage being 2.8. In 1962, 14,600 man-days were lost in South Australia, representing 2.9 per cent of the Commonwealth total. In 1963, only 9,000 man-days were lost, representing 1.5 per cent of the Commonwealth total. In 1964 (the year before Labor came into office), 63,800 man-days were lost, representing 7 per cent of the Commonwealth total. In 1965 (the first year of the Labor Government), only 26,400 man-days were lost, compared to 63,800 in the last year of the Playford Government, and the 1965 figure represented 3.2 per cent of the Commonwealth total.

In 1966, only 20,900 man-days were lost, representing 2.9 per cent of the Australian total. In 1967, only 18,700 man-days were lost, representing 2.7 per cent of the Australian total. In 1968 (when the Hall Government took over from the Labor Government), the total jumped to 51,100 man-days lost, representing 4.7 per cent of the Australian total. In 1969, 129,000 man-days were lost, representing 6.6 per cent of the Australian total—and that was the second year of the Hall Administration.

This Government took over in June, 1970, and 93,300 man-days were lost in that year. So for the Leader to suggest that industrial strife is generated when a Labor Government is in office can be proved wrong by the figures I have given. I should like to hear the Leader answer those figures, which were supplied by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. I fail to see how the Leader can claim that, because a Labor Government is in office, the number of industrial disputes and man-days lost increases, because the figures I have given prove that it is not so.

The Party opposite always tries to attach the blame to a Labor Government for any industrial strife in the State. Every Labor Government believes in conciliation and arbitration. What can the Government do and what lawful action can it take in this dispute?

Will the Leader tell the House what action he took when the cement strike occurred or when certain companies left this State (Rosella was one) during his term of office? What steps did he take to see that those companies did not leave? I have been in touch with both parties concerned in the present dispute, not because I can do anything legally but because I thought it fit and proper that I should try to do something, if possible, to resolve the dispute in their interests and in the interests of the people of the State.

I have tried to appoint an independent arbitrator, to whom both parties would go and whose decision they would accept, because it is not possible, as I understand the present position, for a voluntary or a compulsory conference to be called by the State Industrial Court, as the terms laid down for such conferences do not cover this dispute. This morning, the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union (Mr. Nyland) agreed that he would accept this course of action. The arbitrator I had in mind and to whom I have spoken is Mr. Justice Bleby of the State Industrial Court. Mr. Thomas, of the private bus operators, to whom I spoke several times this morning, preferred to take another course under the terms, I think, of the 1929 South Australian Conciliation Act. This would mean that the matter would have to go back to Mr. Justice Hogarth, of the Supreme Court, who issued an order restraining the union.

Mr. Hall: Do you believe the union should obey a restraining order?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not dealing with that matter at present: I am saying what steps I have taken. The Attorney-General handled this matter capably when replying to criticism yesterday. The present stage of negotiations is that, if Mr. Thomas will go before Mr. Justice Bleby, with the secretary of the union, and accept the offer I have put to him, I believe the dispute could be settled. If, however, I cannot obtain the agreement of both parties, I cannot set up such a conference. I hope that we can settle this dispute before it goes any further.

I say this simply to let members and the people of this State know that the Government is vitally concerned in settling this dispute, and I hope that the steps the Government has taken may lead to something. I believe a meeting that is taking place this afternoon at the Trades Hall may also throw light on the dispute and lead to an early

settlement. The Government has taken a reasonable and sensible course in this matter. Members know that the Government has no distinct power to act and that the only way this problem can be solved is by getting people together to talk, irrespective of the issues involved, in the hope that they will see reason and resolve the matter to their mutual satisfaction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Leader's request for this debate reflects the extreme uneasiness which members on this side feel about the present industrial situation in South Australia. I think our uneasiness, if I measure the temper of the whole House during the debate so far, is the same, and I believe that that feeling of uneasiness is spread, right throughout the community, and it has justifiably spread throughout the community, because the situation that we face in South Australia is one of the most extreme gravity. The Leader has already pointed to the serious long-term outlook for South Australian industry if this sort of situation continues. Every member can look in the paper this afternoon or this morning to see the short-term results of what is going on at present, namely, disruption, inconvenience, and people being thrown out of work (a situation that will soon be with us even more strongly than it is now). I need not go over those things again, for they are self-evident.

We have now heard from the Deputy Premier the apology of the Government and what it has done. The Deputy Premier made, I think, only three points (maybe four) that are worth replying to. First, he said that we on this side should have waited until a settlement had been achieved. Why, I do not know. How long that will take, we do not know; and that, of course, is the very point of our raising the matter at this stage. This is a matter of urgency, and we raise it as a matter of urgency. Secondly, the Deputy Premier did what has been the practice of this Government from the day it came into office: he blamed the Commonwealth Government. He tried to get back to the early 1960's; he quoted statistics, and tried to justify what happened in regard to this State's economy between 1965 and 1968, when his Party was in office previously. To rebut what he said, all I will remind him of is the phrase which was current at that time concerning South Australia: an island of stagnation in a sea of prosperity.

Mr. Hopgood: What a rebuttal!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I come now to the third point the Deputy Premier made: what about the present situation? The figures he quoted will be of no consolation to those who are likely to lose their jobs tomorrow because of the stoppage, or to those who are already out of work because of the stoppage. The one thing that this Government should be doing is saying that it will uphold the law of this State. The Deputy Premier has said that this Government believes in arbitration and conciliation but, if it does, why is it not now prepared to support the legal machinery already operating in this State regarding the settlement of disputes? Why does the Government believe that it must go outside that machinery and try to have appointed an independent arbitrator to deal with this dispute? In saying that, I do not for a moment reflect on the ability of His Honour fudge Bleby in these matters. If this course is to be taken, there is no-one I would choose before Judge Bleby to carry out that task, but the whole point I make is that there are laws in this State that should be obeyed, and the crux of this matter (and I will develop this in a moment) is whether or not the law is to prevail.

What position have we here at present? We have an example of the most extreme unfairness to the bus proprietors, who are caught between two fires. They are bound by section 91 of the Industrial Code, which prohibits their effecting the employment of any of their employees on account of membership or non-membership of an association. By law they are prevented from putting pressure on their employees to join a union, yet at the same time they are being urged, bullied and pressured by the Transport Workers Union to do that very thing. As a result, they have taken proceedings in the Supreme Court, and the Attorney-General will be familiar with the tort of intimidation of which they complain in their proceedings (*Rookes v. Barnard* is the case, I think, in 1964 *Appeal Cases*; and there are others). They have gone to the court for what is their proper legal remedy, and now they are being intimidated by the union for doing that. They have taken or are contemplating proceedings in the Industrial Court as well. How that will affect the position of Judge Bleby as a conciliator, I do not know.

Yesterday, I asked the Attorney-General whether or not the Government would see that the remedies that are given by the law of this State to those who obtain an injunction would be enforced. One would have expected that

the Attorney-General, who is the Chief Law Officer of the Government (a man who has been in the legal profession for 20 years or more and who, before he came into this House, made it his job, his profession and his daily occupation to uphold the law), would give an unequivocal assurance that the law would be enforced and that those remedies which are available would be made available, as a matter of course, to parties in disputes before the court. But what answer did we get from the honourable and learned gentleman? All he would say when I asked for that assurance was that any decision on whether an order of the court would be enforced by the Sheriff and his officers could be made only if and when the situation arose. In other words, he avoided giving an answer to the question whether or not the Government would uphold the law if it came to the point.

That, from a man of the background of the Attorney-General, was a surprising and disappointing attitude, and I know that many people in the profession and in the community are disappointed, as I am, that that is the attitude he takes. We were chided last week, during the debate on the confidence in the Government, with not being able to produce instances of victimization of those who are not at present unionists. It is not, in the nature of things, easy for us here to produce instances in which people can be identified. Frankly, I (and I think this goes for my colleagues) do not trust members on the other side, or trade union officials, not to victimize those who may be identified through our giving instances in this House, but that does not mean to say that we are not aware of instances.

I am personally aware of instances of this, and we all know that they are going on. I have had reports from two sources of the meeting of the Transport Workers Union at the St. Clair Youth Centre last Tuesday morning. Because this was a large meeting, attended by some thousands of employees who were members of the union, I shall give the House some information given to me about the meeting to illustrate the way in which this dispute is being carried on by the union and the way in which members of the union are being swayed. I understand that a motion was written out beforehand and moved at the meeting which condemned the action of the court in the matters to which I have referred and which called for a general strike. The Secretary of the union (Mr. Nyland) then

spoke to the motion using, on my information, the most extraordinary argument to support what the motion proposed. He referred to the writs that had been issued against him. He implied that the only way to save the union assets from being acquired by the bus company, the only way to save his own personal assets from being seized, and the only way of saving him from immediate gaol was to pass the motion. I do not know what kind of idea he must have of the law and legal proceedings to use those arguments which, to me, seem most extraordinary. However, those were the arguments he used.

I am told that the temper of the meeting was not favourably inclined towards the motion until someone got up at the front of the hall and said that the Transway bus company had threatened that any of its drivers who attended the meeting would be dismissed. That statement was not supported in any way by evidence or anything else but was just an assertion. When that had been said, someone on the platform got up and said, "We are not going to let this happen to our members, are we?", and immediately a vote was taken in an emotional atmosphere, the motion being passed by about a 2 to 1 majority. I am told that—

Mr. Wright: You say you were not there. You are a lawyer, and yet you are using hearsay evidence. Tell the truth!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If this is the standard we can expect from the new member for Adelaide, it will not be very high. I expected better from him. I am told that those who had not arranged to speak previously could not get to the microphones to make themselves heard. From the information I have been given by two sources, it looks to me as though the meeting was fairly well organized beforehand but even so it came to grief. That is my information on the matter, and it does not show the union in a good light.

I support what the Leader said about the Government's encouraging this situation through its own attitudes and actions with regard to preference to unionists. What we want is an assurance from the Government that it will do its best to get this strike settled. Everyone knows that a Labor Government, because of its connections with the trade union movement, is always in a weak position when there is industrial trouble. I have put that at its lowest, because actually the Government is dominated by the trade unions. We see this every time a Labor Government is in

office, and we see it now. A Labor Government, which is supported and maintained by the unions, cannot afford to offend them, and that is why unions are encouraged and why there is much more industrial unrest, such as we are witnessing now, when a Labor Government is in office.

The Hon. L. J. King: That is an unfounded assertion. Why don't you give figures to back it up?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The figures show the exact opposite.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know that the Attorney-General does not like what I said about him, and I am not surprised. I hope he will take part in this debate and will give an unqualified assurance today, even though he was not prepared to give it yesterday, that the law will prevail—

The Hon. L. J. King: You are determined to inflame this dispute.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You want it to go on for as long as possible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and that the remedies which are available to any litigant in this State will be available, if they are requested, to the bus proprietors or to any other party. That is what we want to hear from the Attorney-General and the Government.

The Hon. L. J. King: You would like to hear anything that would inflame the dispute.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Government cannot give lip service to the law and at the same time refuse to enforce it.

The Hon. L. J. King: And you can't give lip service to industrial peace and at the same time try to inflame unrest.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The dilemma in which the Attorney-General and the Government find themselves is that, on the one hand, they have their friends and supporters and, on the other, there is the law, and their supporters are in collision with the law. For the good of the South Australian community, I hope that we will get the Government's assurance that the law will be upheld, for it provides for conciliation and arbitration, and that, in our view, is the way in which this dispute should be settled; we hope and pray that it will be settled speedily.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for Conservation): I wonder why this matter is before us today. Last week we had an exhibition from the Leader and the member for Mitcham on a similar issue.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Where is the Minister of Labour and Industry?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: He is attending a conference in Tasmania.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Isn't this important enough for him to come home?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is regrettable that, normally in cases such as this, the Opposition tends to wait until a Minister goes away before it makes an attack. Last week the Leader tried to deny that he holds an intense hatred for the trade union movement and that he takes every opportunity available to attack it, yet once again, within a week, he has brought forward another matter simply to give him the opportunity, not to do anything constructive for South Australia or about the problem currently facing the State, but simply to attack the trade unions. In view of the explanation of the Deputy Premier, in which he pointed out the steps he has taken at the industrial level to try to solve this problem, it is most unfortunate that the member for Mitcham should then say that his only reason for making the speech was to get the Government to do something to solve the problem. The Deputy Premier had already pointed out that, in view of the current industrial dispute, he had spent considerable time yesterday and had, with me, spent all this morning doing what he could to try to bring together the parties involved so that there could be some useful settlements of the dispute. I believe the member for Mitcham did the Deputy Premier a great injustice by then suggesting that that explanation was insufficient and that the Deputy Premier could have done more.

The Hon. L. J. King: The honourable member was sabotaging the efforts being made to settle the dispute.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Attorney-General, by interjection, suggested earlier that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader, in bringing this matter forward today and knowing full well (as they should have known) that all avenues were still being explored to find a satisfactory solution, could well be trying to inflame the situation. They may have convinced themselves, by the weak arguments they put forward, that industrial unrest reacts against the Labor Government. The Deputy Premier completely answered that argument when he pointed to the excellent industrial record that South Australia has enjoyed under Labor Governments. I noticed

that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not attempt to explain that in any way. Unfortunately, under Labor Governments or Liberal Governments industrial disputes will occur. In some instances it is the employees who contribute to the dispute and in other instances the employers are the major contributors. I recognize that, but it seems that the Opposition concludes that, whenever there is an industrial dispute, it is the fault of the unions or the employees. The Opposition constantly adopts that very regrettable attitude.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you saying that this is the fault of bus proprietors?

Mr. Groth: Yes.

Mr. Millhouse: Now we know!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I say that this current industrial dispute is the fault of the Liberal and Country League. I shall explain how that has happened. It is clear that this dispute has come about as a result of problems connected with union membership. Unfortunately, many industrial disputes in Australia and throughout the world are brought about through such problems. In the past in South Australia under Liberal Governments and under a Liberal-dominated Legislative Council we have been unable to obtain the kind of legislation that applies in most other States. As a result, the question of union membership is constantly causing disputes here, and the current problem centres around that issue.

Most members will recall that on many occasions, and as recently as 1968, the Labor Government attempted to introduce (in fact, did introduce) legislation to give the Industrial Court power to provide for preference to unionists, but at present there is a complete restriction on the court's authority to be involved in this matter. As a result, if such a dispute is referred to the Industrial Court, it is unable to act on it because the Industrial Code prohibits it from being involved in what is obviously an industrial matter. Legislation to correct this situation was introduced by a Labor Government, but it was thrown out by the Legislative Council.

Mr. Rodda: In what year?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not sure of the year in which that happened. Such legislation will be reintroduced when the Industrial Code is next amended. If that had been passed, steps could be taken to call a compulsory conference of the parties involved to sort out this matter, but no power exists in the Industrial Code for that to happen, because

the definition of industrial matters prevents the Industrial Court from involving itself in what is a critical industrial matter. Until that matter is adjusted, the Opposition and its colleagues must share the blame for industrial disputes such as that we are experiencing. We must have such problems if there is no suitable machinery to correct them. It does not do the Opposition any good to involve itself in a debate that is based on the principle that it will not permit the Industrial Court to adjudicate on such matters. It is a great pity that the industrial machinery of this State, unlike that of other States, is unable to function. It is the fault of the L.C.L., not the Government. The sooner the matter is adjusted the better.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: In your opinion, is this strike justified?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Does the honourable member suggest that we did not try to amend the Industrial Code in this way and that such amendment was not rejected in another place? This is the basic problem that confronts us today. If the Industrial Code had the provisions that were sought by the Labor Government, the Industrial Court could handle the matter adequately.

I want to defend the Deputy Premier against the charge levelled against him that the Government has not taken all possible steps to bring together the parties to this dispute and the parties to other disputes. The Deputy Premier spent some hours yesterday in my company and most of this morning dealing with this matter. I believe that, had he had the necessary machinery that was denied us by the Legislative Council, he would have been able to settle this matter prior to this stage; certainly, he would have been able to bring the parties together under an arbitrator. The fact that he has been unable to do that is no good reason why this Government should be criticized for not taking sufficient action; it is not the Government's fault.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that industry in South Australia was not progressing at a good rate but, if he looks at a document placed before this Parliament recently, he will see that the activities of the Housing Trust alone in establishing new factories in this State have increased dramatically since he ceased to be Premier. I hope the Opposition will adopt a more realistic attitude to industrial problems and will not attempt to inflame them. I hope the Opposition will do what it can, as this Government is doing, to ensure that industrial relations in South Australia are conducted properly.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I should like to emphasize again some of the remarks made by the Deputy Premier because, unlike the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader, I believe that it is absolutely vital that no action be taken that would inflame public opinion and upset the parties involved in the dispute. In circumstances where it is so difficult to get the parties together at a conference where the matter can be arbitrated, any statements that make that task even more difficult have to be avoided. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that it is inappropriate in these circumstances to make the statements, based purely on hearsay evidence, that he made in relation to the meeting of the Transport Workers Union. I repeat what the Attorney-General told him by interjection when he implied that the Deputy Leader, as a lawyer, ought to know better in relation to this. It seems to me that the figures given by the Deputy Premier of days lost through industrial disputes need some emphasis, because the record of the Labor Government in industrial relations is better than that of the L.C.L. Governments, and the Deputy Leader should have been willing to admit that. The Labor Government does not handle industrial disputes in a worse way than L.C.L. Governments handle them when they are in power, and the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics figures show that clearly.

South Australia, compared to the rest of Australia, normally has an extremely good industrial record, and the days lost here, as a percentage of the total days lost throughout Australia, have reached nearly 7 per cent in two years: in 1964 the figure was 7 per cent and in 1969 it was 6.7 per cent. They were both years in which an L.C.L. Government was in office. During the three years of the previous Labor Government, 26,400 days were lost in 1965, 26,900 days were lost in 1966, and 18,700 days were lost in 1967. In the two years immediately following those three years, which were two years of the Hall Administration, the figures of days lost through industrial disputes increased to 51,100 in 1968 and to 129,000 in 1969.

Mr. Rodda: Was there a proportional increase in the work force?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: South Australia's percentages of days lost compared to the whole of Australia were 3.2, 2.9 and 2.7 under the Labor Government, and 4.7 and 6.6 in the years of the Liberal and Country League Government. I point out to the member for

Victoria that the normal percentage increase in the work force each year is about 2 per cent or 3 per cent. If days lost double between one year and the next, the difference made by the slight change in the size of the work force is not very significant.

Strikes and industrial disputes are dramatic matters and newsworthy items. However, members opposite may not know that, so far as working time lost is concerned, industrial disputes in South Australia are relatively minor when compared to industrial accidents and absenteeism. During the period from 1961 to 1970, working days lost through industrial accidents have varied between 188,300 and 219,300 a year. They tended to average at about 200,000. In every year except 1969, working days lost through industrial accidents have been more than double the working days lost through industrial disputes. The only year in which working days lost through industrial disputes increased above half the figure of working days lost through industrial accidents was 1969, the year of the Hall Government. Therefore, it is vital to get this matter into proportion.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: In New South Wales, 402,000 days were lost during the last quarter through industrial disputes, under a Liberal Government.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. I think it is vital to get this matter into proportion, because, once we do that, our desire to make inflammatory statements and our desire to see taken legal action that would only make the dispute worse, not better, will be much less. Our willingness to remain calm in situations that turn out to be as difficult as the current one will be much greater and our ability to make an effective contribution to the solution of industrial disputes will, therefore, be enhanced. This is what the Deputy Premier has tried to do on behalf of the Government.

The Minister for Conservation has explained clearly that the Industrial Court is not able to intervene in this matter to get a compulsory conference, and he has explained that this arises because of features of our Industrial Code relating to preference to unionists that have been insisted on by L.C.L. Governments or by an L.C.L. Opposition in the Upper House. Why should not the Industrial Court be able to adjudicate on the issue of preference to unionists if it arises? Surely, as has been shown in the last few days, this matter is of such a character that it is vital that the Industrial Court should have the

power to adjudicate. In current circumstances it has not that power and, consequently, the only thing the Government is able to do is try to get the parties to the dispute to go to a voluntary conference; the Deputy Premier has explained how he has discussed the matter with His Honour Judge Bleby and asked him whether he would be willing to adjudicate at such a voluntary conference. He has asked the parties to the dispute whether they will take part in such a conference, and the Transport Workers Union has indicated that it will. The bus proprietors so far have not been willing to accept.

Mr. Millhouse: Have they undertaken to abide by his decision?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not been a party to the deliberations. I am basing my remarks only on what the Deputy Premier has told members this afternoon. I should have thought, however, that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who doubtless has some influence with the bus proprietors, would have been willing to use his good offices to try to get them to agree to such procedure, but apparently he is not willing to do that.

Mr. Hall: Why don't you support the law?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader has had his say and I ask him to listen to me for a while. The Leader knows full well that, in the current situation, the fact that the Industrial Court is powerless and that certain action has occurred elsewhere is one of the reasons for the dispute. I want to deal now with the matter of firms moving from South Australia.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you going to stonewall the debate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader has had his say and I am now having mine. The member for Alexandra can mind his own business. I will have my own say in the matter.

Mr. Hall: You can't take a wind-up.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Alexandra does not want to hear the details.

Mr. Millhouse: And you don't want to hear the Leader in reply, do you?

Mr. Clark: Who would want to?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has spoken to this motion and the member for Mitcham has had his say. There was a reasonable amount of quietness then, and I ask that the same courtesy as was extended to those in the Opposition who initiated the motion be extended to the Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that the record on this matter has to be put straight. During the period of the Hall Liberal Government Rosella Foods shifted from South Australia; Davies Coop closed down its South Australian operations as a direct consequence of a decision taken by the Hall Government; Freighter Industries was forced to retrench 100 members of its work force; the electrical contracting firm of H. H. Green reduced its activities during this period; Hume Proprietary Limited, pipemakers, reduced its staff substantially during the period of the Hall Government; the electrical contractors W. J. & V. Booke closed down; Adelaide Ship Construction Proprietary Limited retrenched more than 200 men between November, 1969, and May, 1970; and Diecasters was another company—

Mr. Coumbe: That company went out in your time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, it may have gone previously. However, I think it is fair to say, if we want to adopt a balanced view of this matter, that in any process of industrial expansion (and industrial output has expanded each year in South Australia virtually since the Second World War; in some years the expansion has been greater and in others less) there will always be periods in which some firms have to make adjustments.

Mr. Clark: No matter who is in Government.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Of course. This business of saying that, because someone makes an adjustment in a firm's operation, the fault is with the Government of the day gets a bit rich. As members know, the actions of a State Government have little impact on the position of firms. When considering the question of electricity costs or water and sewerage rates, the percentage of total costs that those elements make up for most firms is very small indeed. It is only when there is a certain type of production, where, say, natural gas, as well as being a fuel, is a basic component, that fuel costs become a high percentage of the total costs. This is the correct way to consider this situation, and I think the member for Torrens (if he thinks about it for a moment) will appreciate the low percentage of total costs taken up by fuel costs and water and sewerage rates.

To suggest that the reasons firms give publicly for their decisions are always the correct interpretation as to why the decisions have been taken, is also a matter that should be questioned. I have seen many instances where firms have announced an increase in

the price of a product and stated that the increase had been as a consequence of changes in taxation. However, when one examined the change in taxation one found that the cost position might have been altered by half of 1 per cent, whereas the firm had increased the price of the product by between 5 per cent and 10 per cent. One knows that when a firm has to increase its price it likes to have an excuse and, if a tax change or a wage rate variation occurs, many firms consider that this is a suitable occasion on which to make what they regard as an appropriate adjustment in the price.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Leader of the Opposition to have 15 minutes in which to reply to this debate.

Motion carried.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): In thanking the House for its courtesy, I draw its attention to the usual courtesies allowed during an urgency motion and always observed in my time here.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is simply not true.

Mr. HALL: That is in every recollection I have of an urgency motion.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Check the facts.

Mr. Curren: You have a short memory.

Mr. HALL: I will stop thanking members. It is of little consolation for those who will lose their jobs tomorrow or next week in G.M.H., Chryslers, or in associated industries to know that this Government has tried to divert the argument from the urgency motion we introduced to one of statistics. It is of little consolation for a person to take home nothing for the week or fortnight and say to his wife and family that the Labor Government has said that it does not matter and that it is not nearly as bad as it was under the Liberal Government. We obtained the real key to Government thought and the real meaning of its action from the member for Salisbury, who has been noted, in his short time as a member, for being unable to restrain himself and for bringing Caucus feeling into this House, when he said that this strike was the responsibility of the bus operators. He said that twice. In this case we have had the Caucus feeling aired on the floor of the House. I wonder what Government members will do to him when

they get him in Caucus again, but I am indebted to the honourable member for the information that he so freely gave.

The answer to the diversionary tactic used by the Deputy Premier is simply that unemployment was less under Labor in 1965 to 1968 because jobs were hard to get and people in this State did not have the luxury of fiddling around industrially because jobs were not available. The people in Western Australia have said that so much of the development of the North-West owes its strength and speed to the technicians who came from South Australia. These people had been forced out of this State by the Labor Government at that time and had to obtain sustenance for themselves and their families. The situation is clearly set out in today's *News* and the Deputy Premier need not try to divert attention from it. A paragraph on page 3 is illuminating:

The TLC decided at a meeting last Friday that the trade union movement must impress on Governments the necessity of amending legislation to grant unions immunity from civil actions for damages.

Mr. Wright: The same as Queensland.

Mr. HALL: No wonder the Attorney-General is feeling uncomfortable. It is not just that his fellow Ministers have been tricky and twisty; that is not the only thing that makes the Attorney feel uncomfortable. He feels uncomfortable because his bosses, the people who move him like a political puppet, have demanded that this Government not support civil action that the companies concerned in this dispute are using as a means of defence. Obviously, the Attorney felt uncomfortable after being misrepresented by his colleagues on the front bench and by being twisted from behind by the movement that put him into Parliament. He owes his political future to that movement, and he dare not express his opinion here because he would be expelled if he did—and he knows that. To give one instance—we are still dealing with the diversionary tactics—we saw the Minister for Conservation, who used to be the Minister of Labour and Industry, in action in this House when dealing with the Government's decision on shopping hours; we noted how he twisted its meaning. We also saw the Deputy Premier today going back to before 1961 and trying to blame the Commonwealth Government for everything and we saw today the Minister for Conservation trying to blame the L.C.L. for this strike. I think this left even his own supporters aghast.

The Attorney-General heard his colleague say that the Housing Trust under a Labor Government has this year increased its activity in the erection of industrial buildings. He heard him say that, but he knows that nearly every one of those projects was negotiated by the previous L.C.L. Government; he cannot deny it. We saw him squirming and clearly uncomfortable, and he has my sympathy. He has been twisted, forced, and restricted by every part of the Party that supports him in office. The general contention of the Minister for Conservation was that everyone should come into a union—that is what he said. The Government wants legislative machinery so that courts can adjudicate on whether union officials can rush into the lunchroom of, say, a factory and say, "Join up or we will declare you black." The Minister wants the courts to adjudicate on that and say, "Yes; you will have to join the union." That is what the Minister said, and let us not have any double talk.

The Hon. L. J. King: What is wrong with joining a union?

Mr. HALL: Will the Attorney-General support the action that is required by the Supreme Court injunction? Does he believe that that is correct or incorrect? Does he support it? Perhaps he supports his Leader, who has said frequently in this State, "You can break the law if you want to."

The Hon. L. J. King: We will give you a chance to change the law later this session.

Mr. HALL: Does the Attorney-General support or not support the injunction granted by a Supreme Court judge?

The Hon. L. J. King: I do not support your efforts to intensify this dispute.

Mr. HALL: The Attorney has answered eloquently, but not in his usual style, that he does not support the injunction given in the Supreme Court that the unions stop their illegal action. Because of his silence, he supports that illegal action. This is what the urgency motion is about. We have gone the full circle and returned to the origin of the motion—that men were unemployed, that people were being intimidated, and that industries were leaving South Australia and going to other States. It has gone the full circle—the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Conservation, and through the Minister of Education (who in his typical way is building up a case that does not exist so that he can then knock it down) and back to the Attorney-General, who will not support the court of the land which,

I understand by the office he holds, he is obliged to support. So there we have it—a most disreputable Government that is not only fomenting but is also the cause of this dispute. The urgency of this matter is fully proven, but not by this side of the Chamber. If we want proof, we have it on the opposite side. I thank the member for Salisbury again for bringing to the fore in this House Caucus thinking. Members opposite create and support an illegal action and then blame those who resist it. That has been the course of action of this Government through its entire unhappy 15 or 16 months of office. It supports attacks on freedom. When it can do it by legislative action, it can succeed by crushing opposition in this House, but now it faces the whole population of South Australia, and it is on behalf of that population that I have moved my motion. I now ask leave to withdraw it.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mrs. STEELE

Mr. EVANS moved:

That two months' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Davenport (Mrs. J. Steele) on account of absence overseas.

Motion carried.

CARRICK HILL VESTING BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to effectuate a certain generous donation of property by Sir Edward Waterfield Hayward and Lady Ursula Hayward to the State of South Australia, and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to give effect to an extremely generous benefaction to the State by Sir Edward and Lady Ursula Hayward. Sir Edward and Lady Ursula Hayward entered into a deed on June 12, 1970, whereby each undertook to execute testamentary instruments which would, upon the death of the last surviving spouse of the marriage (who will, in view of Lady Hayward's death on August 6 last year, be Sir Edward Hayward), vest the respective interests of each in the property

known as Carrick Hill at Springfield in the Government of the State for certain specific purposes. The deed provided that Carrick Hill could be used as a home for the Governor, as a museum, as an art gallery, or as botanical gardens. The Government was empowered to accept the gift for any of those purposes.

Carrick Hill consists of a beautiful stone residence set in grounds of approximately 96 acres. The home is exquisitely furnished. The grounds are planted with exotic and Australian species of vegetation. The property extends to the east with wooded slopes into the face of the Mount Lofty ranges. The Premier, on behalf of the Government of this State, gratefully accepted this benefaction which will, I am sure, be regarded with pride and gratitude by the people of the State. The Government would like to place on record the intense pleasure and gratitude it feels in accepting this magnificent gift.

The function of the Bill is to facilitate the transfer of Carrick Hill to the Crown upon the death of Sir Edward Hayward. The Bill provides as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out a number of definitions necessary for the purposes of the Act. Clause 3 provides that, upon the death of Sir Edward Hayward, Carrick Hill shall vest in the Crown. The clause also provides that registration of the transfer shall not be effected until the Government's obligations in terms of the deed have been duly fulfilled. Clause 4 provides that Carrick Hill is to be held and maintained as a residence for the Governor. Clause 5 provides for the Treasurer, in terms of the deed and subsequent testamentary instruments, to reimburse the trustees of the estates of Sir Edward and Lady Ursula Hayward for any amounts of succession duty and Commonwealth estate duty for which they become liable in respect of Carrick Hill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 21. Page 268.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, at the outset I express my condolences to the families of Sir Collier Cudmore, the Hon. Colin Davies Rowe, Mr. John Lancelot Cowan, and Mr. Samuel James Lawn, the first three of whom I knew as members

of another place. I knew Mr. Lawn as a member of this place, and he was one of those people who will be remembered by those who knew him as a character, because there are very few people like him. As things change there must be other changes, as in the case of the member for Price, who is now Chairman of Committees in place of the late Mr. Lawn. I congratulate the new Chairman, who I am sure will carry out his duties as well as his predecessor did in an honest and unbiased fashion towards all members of the House.

The mover of this motion was the new member for Adelaide, Mr. Wright. I congratulate him on the two speeches he made in the one day and for the complete confidence he showed when speaking, despite the fact that many of us on our first appearance here are overawed by the atmosphere of the House. I also congratulate the seconder of the motion. It would be futile for me to introduce any emotion into this debate at this stage after what has preceded it. I should like to say how much I appreciated the honour conferred on me by this Parliament in appointing me to the position (a much greater position than I had imagined at the time of my appointment) of executive representative of the members of this Parliament and the other Parliaments of Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific Islands and New Guinea on the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Executive. Many people look on this organization as a means just to obtain an overseas trip. It is regrettable that this is the attitude expressed by many people towards an organization that has so much influence in the international sphere of politics. This is an association of people of all colours, all religious beliefs and some quite extraordinary political views, at whose meetings people meet and discuss problems and learn to appreciate the opinions of other people without having to be told what those opinions should be by the Leaders of their Governments or by other people such as the press or other media.

As the member for Ross Smith and other members know, at these conferences one gets to know people from other places intimately and one can discuss things on a completely different level. Some extraordinary Parliaments are involved in the association, even though they all follow the Westminster system of Parliament which, as the member for Mitcham has said, possibly needs some slight changes. However, change has already taken place in other Parliaments, and they do not necessarily follow the procedures that we

follow here. Basically, they follow the same procedures we follow, whether they are in Western Samoa, New Guinea or elsewhere. They also have some unusual views on democracy. Western Samoa is a republic headed by a Head of State, who has been appointed for life, but his successor will be elected for five years. The republic consists of one House, whose members are elected by the island's property owners.

I also visited Tonga, which is ruled by a King, although it is still called a republic. Its Prime Minister is the King's brother and its Cabinet is appointed. The Governors of the two principal islands are *ex officio* members of Cabinet, which also consists of six representatives of the nobles and four representatives of the people. Tonga is a Parliamentary democracy of another type. Fiji has another system altogether. It is a dominion with a Governor-General, and I know that this will not appeal to this Government: having had a single House, Fiji has now elected to adopt the bicameral system of Government.

Mr. Clark: They will regret it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not think so, because they have done it for good reasons. Fiji has problems that can be resolved only by having a second look at many of the matters that arise. It has ethnic problems, as well as others. The people have been wise in creating a second House.

Mr. Crimes: What sort of franchise operates there?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It has open franchise for the Lower House, but the Upper House is appointed. All these Parliaments work in extraordinary ways, but they have one fundamental function: to legislate and administer the laws of the land in the interests of the people they represent. Because the people are different, the Governments have different bases on which to operate, but they operate to the satisfaction of their people. I had the good fortune this year to travel to Canada to attend an executive meeting, and I am grateful to the Government for making it possible for me to visit a few other countries *en route*. I visited Israel, and the principal reason for going there was pertinent as far as this Parliament and the people I represent are concerned. In 1967, a very serious situation existed along the Murray River. The question of providing dams has been the subject of much debate. The tragedy is that it is now 1971 and we are still no closer to settling this argument or to getting additional storage on the Murray River. Inevitably,

before there is additional storage and additional control of the river, we will again be confronted with major salinity problems.

As members opposite know, one can easily be taken out of context, as I was when I reported to one of the papers on my return home. I was reported as having said that I did not consider we need worry about salinity and that salinity was not too high (I think that was the statement that appeared in the press); but that is not true: I am extremely concerned about salinity and about the problems it will create once more along the river unless something is done about this problem. I went to Israel with two objectives, one being to inspect the system that certain people in that country have evolved in relation to trickle irrigation at the kibbutz near Beersheba, known as the Chatzerim kibbutz. A kibbutz is a community of people who have collected together of their own free will and accord. The members of this community can come and go as they wish and, in most cases, there are intelligent people in this sort of community, many of them being academic people, who are involved in matters of the sort to which I am referring.

Mr. Keneally: They're Socialists.

Mr. NANKIVELL: They are nearly all Socialists in Israel; that is their way of government, but that does not get away from the point I make that at this kibbutz the people concerned have evolved this system of watering whereby they can use extremely saline water by keeping the soil continuously damp. Although there are drainage problems in this area, they are different from the problems we encounter along the Murray River, involving clay soil. Soils in that part of Israel to which I am referring are deep sand-blown soils known as loess. This clogs up and does not drain properly. However, by using a system of watering a little at a time almost continuously, these people found that it is possible to use waters of much higher salinity than can be used under the conventional systems. Of course, these systems are costly to install. Most of the people confronted with salinity problems along the river water their properties either by the furrow system or by the overhead system, and this is one reason why there was so much damage in 1967.

Now, as recommended by the committee set up to examine the salinity problem, people are tending to change to under-tree watering. However, it is much easier to change to under-tree sprinkler watering when there are installed mains than when it involves an entirely new system. Iplex Plastic Industries at Elizabeth is

manufacturing under licence the components of the trickle system to be used here. I have not checked with that organization to see what sales it has made or how it is promoting this system, but where I saw it working it worked effectively and economically on soils that were difficult to irrigate.

At the arid zone research laboratory in Beersheba, a Professor Loeb is doing much work in developing a membrane to assist in desalinating water. This gentleman, who came from America on a scholarship and stayed in Israel, presumably because it is his home country, has now designed a cheap membrane that can be carried dry. Most of the problems encountered previously were because this membrane had to be continually kept wet. By using this membrane, the salinity can be reduced to a reasonable concentration, or water can be distilled and mixed with other water to produce water of a usable quality. This would possibly have some economic uses in areas where the salinity level is just outside the level that certain plants can tolerate. It could possibly be used also in an emergency when a sudden increase in salinity occurs during the watering period of citrus orchards along the river,

I was also interested in the problem encountered in Israel regarding fruit fly. The problem in that country is so serious that spraying must be carried out every year in order to control the pest. When one realizes the cost involved to the industry in that country, one realizes the tremendous achievement of South Australia's Agriculture Department in its policy of controlling fruit fly in this State. I sincerely hope that the Premier is successful in convincing the Japanese, who do not at present buy any oranges from us, that they need have no fear of their fruit areas being infested through importing from this State fruit that may be affected. When one examines the present export figures regarding citrus one realizes the urgent need both to gain new markets and to do something about improving our old markets.

I hope our Agent-General in London (Mr. Taylor), if he does not already know, is told that in 1968-69 South Australia exported 3,081,140 lb. of oranges to the United Kingdom, the total value being \$296,311. However, last year we exported only 298,360 lb., the value being \$14,751. What has happened to this market? I do not know, except that when I was in London last year I was told that there was criticism of our presentation and that we were tending to grade down to a standard

and not up to a standard. Therefore, we are having difficulty in competing with countries that market a high-quality product. Whether we like it or not, South Africa presents a first-class product on the international market, whether it be citrus, apples or pears. This matter caused me some concern at the time, and I had not seen the figures at that stage.

However, there must be some reason for this situation, and I hope that the legislation referred to in His Excellency's Speech, giving the Citrus Organization Committee more powers, will in some measure help lead to the establishment of a board, State or Commonwealth (I would prefer an Australia-wide board), that can establish and maintain quality and proceed to expand our markets wherever possible. It is no good saying that all boards do this. We have an Apple and Pear Board, and it is rather frightening to read the *World Agricultural Report*, a publication put out in Australia, I think bi-monthly, which contains interesting articles on various aspects of agricultural production. I was interested to read the following with respect to apple marketing in the United Kingdom:

Prices were very good earlier this year—up to \$8.60 a carton wholesale. Yet despite the relatively high prices consumption was very high, reflecting (according to some in the trade) the very high quality of produce, especially from New Zealand. As the Australian crop began to arrive, prices started to tumble in early May. From a peak of \$7.10 a bushel for South Africa, Jonathans slumped to \$4.90 by the third week of May, and they're expected to come down to \$3.80 shortly. The way the Australian crop started to arrive this year was hardly designed to help matters.

I think that is one of the things we have to be concerned about when we set up statutory marketing boards. Having seen how they function in New Zealand and South Africa, we can see that there is no question about their ability to stabilize a product. They can present a quality product and market it on a controlled basis so that good markets are not spoilt by indiscriminate dumping or ill-considered marketing, such as appears to be the case here from reading the report to which I have referred.

In California, I spent two days with a member of the South Australian Agriculture Department, who was studying at the University of Los Angeles on a research grant. Together we visited the United States Agriculture Department salinity laboratories and went farther south into the Imperial Valley in the Arizona Desert. I want to put the record

straight about a couple of matters. In the Imperial Valley at Thermal, New Indio, I saw people using water the salinity level of which was 900 parts a million. That water came into a canal from the Colorado River storages and was being mixed with other water and used for irrigation. We were concerned in South Australia when the level of salinity in the Murray River reached 350 p.p.m. This shows clearly that it is possible either through the system of trickle feeding, or through mixing and proper application and management, to use fairly highly saline water safely and effectively. The water finally being applied in that area was a little over 200 p.p.m. The secret here was that the area had been completely drained with an underground drainage system before planting. The water was applied in large quantities, frequently up to 24 in. a watering season, and it was applied on a weekly watering basis so that the ground was continually damp and the drainage was continually being effected. They were not applying too little infrequently, causing salt to build up in layers so that it could be toxic to plants. With this water they were growing citrus and vines. It is interesting to note that the vineyards were in difficulties because they had been marketing table grapes, and the Mexicans were underselling them and marketing these grapes earlier. Therefore, those vineyards were going out of production. Citrus fruits were being grown successfully. One of the biggest nurseries in the world (Willis and Newcombe) is in this area.

In those two days I also visited the United States Agriculture Department salinity laboratories at Riverside where I met Dr. Leon Bernstein, who was brought out as a salinity expert by the Government in 1967. I was able to discuss with him the question of using saline water for irrigation. He understands the problem here and realizes that it has become worse. Incidentally, his words, and not mine, were quoted in the newspaper. He said, "I do not believe that in 1967 the salinity in the water was really the problem. I believe that the problem was possibly one of management and that many of the trees were old and could not stand stress. Secondly, the area being irrigated is difficult from the point of view of drainage," and we know that this is the case in South Australia. It is vitally necessary, if we are to continue productively in this area, to install a permanent system of underground drainage through the area so that we do not get waterlogging and accumulation of salts at the roots. He said, "I believe that you are

spreading the water too thinly, trying to water too many acres with too little water. I believe you need to apply heavy watering under certain conditions. I am presently working on experiments." We saw them try to establish an added quantity of water to improve the nutrient supply in the soil by ensuring a proper leaching through and washing out of the soil. He said, "We are presently arguing about this in the United States Agriculture Department, but my considered opinion is that you need an average watering plus 30 per cent to ensure you get proper leaching of your soil."

I believe that in 1967 trials were designed by the Agriculture Department but, because of good years since then, no work has proceeded. It is difficult to get people to accept right now, with the water in the river at only 80 p.p.m. (it is almost like rainwater) and with the trees so healthy, that there is likely to be a recurrence of the problem of 1967. However, I am concerned that there could be a recurrence and that we would not have the information available to advise people how to treat such an emergency. I should like to recommend strongly to the Government that it critically examine the question of establishing experimental trials at the Loxton research centre so that something more can be learned about the problem of the management of soils at various levels of salinity. If it is possible to avert the situation that developed in 1967, we should do so, arming ourselves with the information necessary to achieve that. This is an important project. Obviously we will not have a control of salinity through the Chowilla dam or the Dartmouth reservoir before we are likely to have a recurrence of a dry year, such as the one we had in 1967. I do not know whether we fully appreciate the calibre of our Director of Agriculture, because he is a very quiet and unassuming man. However, when one considers what he has achieved for the State, one wonders why the efforts of Mr. Irving have gone unnoticed and unheralded since he has been in South Australia. As a result of his efforts, the pleuropneumonia situation in our northern cattle areas has been virtually brought under control; it is no longer a threat. That has been largely his doing.

Then, the Director of Agriculture dealt with foot-rot. No-one can say that the work that has been done in this State on that problem has not been of tremendous value to wool-growers in the South-East and the wool industry elsewhere in South Australia. The programme has achieved almost a 100 per cent solution of the problem, which was said to be insoluble.

Now, we are tackling the problems of tuberculosis and brucellosis with very effective campaigns; and we are moving much faster than the other States are. We are drawing on the tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication fund that was set up with Commonwealth and State Government moneys. In this connection the State that is first in will get the money first, and I understand that at present South Australia is getting more than its share of the money because we have mounted an effective quarantine campaign that is greatly benefiting the cattle breeders of the State.

I have never heard this outlined anywhere before and, as a result, few people realize how valuable the policies of our Director of Agriculture have been to this State. I am sorry that the Premier did not take one of his Agriculture Department officers with him to Japan, because, if he had, he may not have made the following statement that was reported in this morning's newspaper:

According to a spokesman for C. Itoh and Co., Mr. Dunstan suggested the possibility that Japan would step up joint agricultural development ventures in South Australia to grow feed grains such as maize and sorghums for export to Japan.

What does that mean? Are we going to invite the Japanese to come here and be one of the take-over groups whilst our primary industries are depressed? The Japanese will have to buy properties if they are to undertake a joint agricultural development project, because there is no unused development land left in South Australia. Where will we grow maize and sorghum in South Australia? The member for Stuart is always talking about this matter; perhaps it has rubbed off him on to the Premier.

There are only two areas where maize and sorghum can be grown, and even then they must be grown under irrigation—the Upper Murray and the Lower South-East. Does the Premier's announcement mean that the Japanese will take over the Lower South-East and use up the water resources there that have been developed as a result of wise husbanding and property management? The Premier's statement is completely stupid. It is only because of the transport costs that it is economic to grow these crops in South Australia and not import them from other States. Maize and sorghum grow very well in New South Wales and Queensland without irrigation—and much more cheaply. Consequently, it is ridiculous to talk about exporting maize and sorghum.

The Japanese business men suggested that beef imports were advisable, because raising livestock is costly in Japan. How astute they are! They do not want to have to build up that industry. Their agricultural attache here says that they are looking closely at the beef industry in Japan, because it is taking up labour and is costly. Now, particularly since they can buy beef from America similar to Kobe beef, there is no reason why they have to produce their own.

I hope someone will get the message back to the Premier before he leaves Japan that, if he wants to do us some good, he should talk to them about removing the 25 per cent *ad valorem* tax on meat and removing the additional tax of 80 yen a pound. If that were done, the cost of our beef would be reduced and we might be able to sell more on the Japanese market. These import restrictions are impeding the sale of our beef and are very significant charges, particularly in the light of the American charge of 3c a pound. Because the Japanese levies are substantial, it would help our beef industry considerably if they were removed.

I shall turn now to the question of the Gepps Cross abattoir. We have had several good speeches from Government members on pollution. Can anyone suggest to me that an abattoir at Gepps Cross, which is now becoming part of the metropolitan area, is not a source of pollution? Certainly it is a cause of obnoxious smells. Furthermore, as the member for Alexandra pointed out, traffic congestion is created because stock transporters from the south find great difficulty in moving stock through the whole length of Adelaide to get to Gepps Cross. The abattoir is in a very valuable redevelopment area, and anyone talking of the asset value of those run-down worn-out old buildings is completely out of touch with reality, especially when one realizes what the value of the land would be if the buildings were demolished.

It has cost and will cost us a fortune to maintain the abattoir. It has been out of commission for exports of mutton and lamb to America for 12 months and it has been out of commission for beef exports for six months. It is inadequate, and I understand one still cannot drive a forklift truck into any of the freezers. It was built 50 years ago and it is not in keeping with modern thought on abattoirs, particularly when one considers the abattoirs at Noarlunga and Murray Bridge and the proposal for an abattoir at Naracoorte. The

Government should consider assisting in regionalizing abattoirs. This is one of the few industries that can be decentralized.

The first thing that councils advocate in connection with decentralization is the establishment of an abattoir in their district. When a committee inquired into decentralization in 1965 a proposal for an abattoir was made in nearly every place it visited. Such a proposal can be feasible, as has been shown at Murray Bridge, and I believe that it can be shown to be feasible at Naracoorte, too, provided that assistance is given.

They do that in most other countries in the world. In America, abattoirs are no longer placed near the main cities but out in the country.

Mr. Venning: Do you think Gladstone would be a good place for one?

Mr. NANKIVELL: We could have one in the south and one in the north and encourage them with finance, provide the opportunity to develop by taking away the competition and reducing what they have to pay to bring meat into the abattoir. Then we would be getting somewhere. We would remove a source of congestion and pollution and we would be establishing industry in country centres, creating a modest form of decentralization, and doing the city a good turn.

I hope that before long we will accept the principle of selling stock on a live-weight basis, as is the case in other countries, instead of on the present guess-weight basis. When I told people in America how we sold stock in Australia, they would not believe it and I understood why that was so when I saw the way they sold their stock. They sell only a percentage of their stock through market, because a big percentage is sold direct. However, it is all sold on a live-weight basis, and in some packing houses provision is made to pay a premium mark-up for quality after the stock has been slaughtered and assessed. We should consider this. We look at agricultural reports about the present situation in rural industry and the one bright spot seems to be the possibility of the beef market, but one must also consider figures relative to this situation.

We are expanding production by about 7.6 per cent a year and, to keep this up, we will need to increase export output by about 11 per cent a year. When we increase the market, it will not all be done by manufacturing beef. We must consider producing prime quality beef and marketing and handling it in the most economic way. Regarding farm problems, I

think most members know that the situation has become extremely critical in certain areas. It is most unfortunate that circumstances have been allowed to develop to the point that they have now reached without there having been a realization and rationalization of the situation. In today's *Financial Review* we see a report headed, "The rural crisis outpaces the wool brokers." The report sets out that the finance houses have \$349,000,000 outstanding in the rural community and that the major trading banks have \$898,000,000 outstanding in that industry, and the position is not improving.

We see in the stop press in this afternoon's *News* that some agreement has been reached over what is termed a minimum price for wool. I do not think that is enough and I am not sure that a minimum price is in the best interests of the industry, because it means that a premium is not paid for quality. I commend the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia (Inc.) for rationalizing that organization's recent conference as it did. There was much militancy at that conference, and I thought that those at the conference had every reason to be militant. I would have gone along with them if they had proceeded. In this industry, which has only 8 per cent of the work force, they must be militant if they are to make their voices heard. I commend them on appointing a committee to make representations on their behalf and to try to get some solution of their problems.

We try to jump away from responsibility for agricultural problems in this State. The Minister said at a conference that his door was always open and that he would do all he could to help. However, all we get from the Minister is words. He says that it is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government to do this or that. I can suggest quickly some areas in which I consider it is the responsibility of the State to Act. I should like the Minister of Lands to ask his department to consider Crown land rentals. Much injustice is done in this area, particularly amongst those people who took up land in the last seven or eight years. The previous Government made some concessions, but they were made in the light of the conditions prevailing then and conditions have changed markedly since.

I think we must consider these rentals in the light of changed land values. A fixed in-perpetuity land value is completely unrealistic today and a completely unfair imposition on those involved. The matter of succession duties has always been thorny. The idea was that

capital tax was the way to cut down the "tall poppy" and level out the social structure. That does not work, for the simple reason that we never catch the big man and we catch only the poor man in the middle, who represents the majority. If the Government has any concern for the majority, it will find a system of collecting this tax other than a system that taxes a man after he has died and taxes his estate, possibly jeopardizing the future of his family.

We hear of many cases in which it has been necessary to sell a property that was a profitably-operated business, one that did not have to pay interest and was providing only a living. Once that property was obliged to pay interest and principle as well as providing a living, it could not support those who originally lived there. That was never the intention of this sort of legislation, in my opinion. If it was, it is time we changed the intention. Let me tell Government members a few things. When someone mentions an amount of money, everyone thinks that the man concerned has won a lottery and is extremely wealthy. However, it is no good having an asset in the form of money in the bank, because you cannot eat it. If you have the asset in land, it is harder to realize on that.

If a man gets a job in industry, someone provides the money to build and equip the factory and provide the amenities and raw materials for the job. Someone must have capital for the job, and this is the principle on which we work. A person employed in an industry has every right to obtain from a bank a housing loan on a long-term basis, in most instances on terms adjusted to meet his capacity to pay. That man has a job and a house. Has anyone considered the minimum amount of capital needed today in a rural investment to provide a man with a comparable job and a house in which to live? That is something that should be considered, because all sections of the community have entitlements. Because primary industry is an industry in which people have to provide their own employment (and I hope that this system will never change), they should not be penalized or forced out of business by an unfair and unjust capital tax that deprives them of their right to a livelihood. There must be a way of getting the money. Has the Government considered a pay-as-you-earn system?

Mr. Keneally: People other than primary producers also pay these taxes.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Of course: this applies to small industries and not only to primary producers, but I represent primary producers and speak for them. Any person employed in private industry in his own right is faced with this problem. I believe that if the Government must have this money there are other ways in which it can be obtained. One way I suggest is a pay-as-you-earn system, and another is to make a slight adjustment to the present Act, which provides that the Commissioner may allow the money to stand uncollected at an interest rate of 6 per cent. Why cannot a State instrumentality take over that liability on a long-term interest repayment basis and transfer the capital to the account in which the Government wants it if we must have capital taxes. In that case a person would not be obliged to go to the market for money and have to get it at 9 per cent for 10 years, or at some impossible rate of interest that makes the situation completely ludicrous. There must be some way in which we can develop a new system that would be fair to everyone.

Mr. Payne: The worker has to pay the current rate of interest if he wants a housing loan.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, but he can go to the State Bank or Savings Bank and obtain a credit foncier loan for most of his money.

Mr. Payne: What if he has to get bridging finance?

Mr. NANKIVELL: In the matter I am speaking of the bridging finance would be permanent finance, as no other money is obtainable. The house purchaser uses bridging finance only until other alternatives are available, but the primary producer has no alternatives.

The Hon. L. J. King: Then private banking systems are not meeting the needs of the community in this instance.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I agree with the Attorney, because at present no-one is adequately meeting the needs of primary producers. I believe that this aspect of finance should be considered seriously: perhaps the State Government Insurance Commission may consider it, but I shall not suggest in what areas it could assist, because I think it should do its own thinking. In association with this rural problem we will have the educational problem of retraining. The Commonwealth Government has made some move to set up a limited retraining organization for people who have become redundant in industry. This is important in the light of

today's developments, because it is not only people who have been displaced from the land who will need retraining and re-employment. There will be a continual problem in industry of automation moving in and systems of operation being changed, so that people will be phased out at the age of 40 years or 50 years, although they should not be.

People so displaced in the rural industry are seldom equipped for anything else, because their skills are unwanted elsewhere, so they need retraining. We should be considering this matter now in conjunction with our adult education system, in order to ensure that even if we are not ready now at least we are planning to be ready when the situation develops to this extent. I believe that there is a need to teach farm management, and to assist farmers to budget and how to understand the management of their properties. They are not getting much advice except from private sources, because the Agriculture Department has not been properly geared for this.

Mr. Keneally: Would they accept it?

Mr. NANKIVELL: If it is presented in the same way as it is presented through the county officers in America, it will be accepted, will be asked for, and will be appreciated. This is, in itself, a matter of education.

Mr. Keneally: These are independent people.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I know, but they are no different from people anywhere in the world. Because they were independent in Russia they were eliminated, but I shall not go into the history of that. We will never change the independence of these people, but it is important that the Minister does not wait too long before releasing the report on Agricultural Education, Research, and Extension, because I believe that there is a need to think clearly about where we are going and what we are going to do with rural education.

If the pattern of population in the country is to change we may have to think along similar lines to those adopted in Tasmania: provide hostels and concentrate senior students in one regional centre, and make it possible for them to complete their education somewhere near their homes. Generally, their parents cannot afford to send them away, and I do not think the Government would want to meet the cost of sending them elsewhere. It could be cheaper, more satisfactory, and better for the community in the long run if something were done to regionalize fourth and fifth year students in what we could call

a rural education centre, incorporating an agricultural training course, which I have heard about but about which I do not know any details.

Mr. Keneally: Did you see the Minister's recent statement about scholarships?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I heard it and I think it is a good move, but we may have to go one step farther. We should consider a concept of improving adult education in anticipation of retraining, the preparation for retraining not only in the rural industry but for all industry, and do some serious thinking about how we should spend money in the country to give the best education possible to children of families who will stay there and who want to stay there and who, in the best interests of society, will be kept there if we do what we should be doing. I regret that I have spoken for so long—

The Hon. L. J. King: You have used your time much better than some other members.

Mr. NANKIVELL: —and I support the motion.

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): I, too, support the motion and, like previous speakers, I congratulate the mover, the new member for Adelaide, for the excellent and forthright manner in which he made his maiden speech. A by-election for the seat of Adelaide had been caused by the sad passing of Mr. Sam Lawn, who represented this district for about 21 years with loyalty and devotion to his constituents. Sam Lawn was a tower of strength to the trade union movement for many years, and we regret his passing. He was a stalwart particularly of the vehicle building industry, where he served as an official in the following capacities: federal Secretary, State Secretary of the South Australian branch, federal councillor and federal court advocate, thus earning himself honorary life membership of the federation. His efforts were tireless in the interests of his fellow workers. I extend to his family my sincere deepest sympathy in their sad loss. To the families of other members whose activities in the State Parliament I was aware of but whom, unfortunately, I never met personally I extend also my deepest sympathy.

Previous speakers have covered much of His Excellency's Speech, leaving me in the position of possibly reiterating remarks already made by Government members. Much mention has been made by members of the Opposition of compulsory unionism. I make it quite clear, particularly to the member for Hanson, that it only shows their ignorance of the trade

union movement when they repeat and insist on the phrase "compulsory unionism". Perhaps, if they had the interests of the workers at heart and studied the question of trade union membership, they would come up with the following answers: (1) preference to trade unionists; (2) closed shop agreements; and (3) trade unionists' appreciation of the service rendered and the voluntary joining of their appropriate union.

Perhaps I should briefly outline to some members of the Opposition what those three answers mean. Some major employers in South Australia confer with trade unions and adopt the attitude that for better employer-employee relationships they prefer that their employees become and remain financial members of their appropriate organization with coverage in the particular industry, and they provide every assistance in their efforts to bring about this gentleman's agreement.

The second answer, the closed shop agreements, means exactly what it says. After conferring, the parties sign an agreement with the unions which are parties to the award covering their industry. A number of clauses are inserted, the main one being that before an employee can commence employment he must produce his current union membership card, or if not already a member he must sign an application card indicating that he is prepared to become a member whilst so employed with that employer.

I instance readily two of the large motor car manufacturers in South Australia that operate under this closed shop agreement. The General Motors-Holden's agreement was arranged in, and has operated since, 1928. The agreement with Chrysler Australia Limited, strangely enough, was not entered into until 1958, so it has been in existence some 13 years. Recently, agreements were reached for closed shops with Denning's bus manufacturers, which recently arrived in this State to take over a contract with the Municipal Tramways Trust, and with Leyland commercial body-builders, without any pressure. Both these concerns without any pressure readily agreed to a closed shop agreement.

The third answer is a still common approach by trade unions whereby officials visit establishments and enrol members after holding meetings where they point out the benefit of belonging to a union. From the attitude of some members opposite, it would appear that they prefer that the other fellow should pay and get their benefits for them, just as when

we are fighting a war in Vietnam they are not concerned about who goes there and are quite happy as long as they themselves do not have to go there.

Finally, the procedures outlined regarding union membership have the backing of the industrial courts of Australia. There are clauses in that arbitration system whereby there is no bar to an employer and an employee organization getting together and making contracts between them for the people they either employ or serve. This is a democratic approach to overcome a serious problem that I consider has been with the trade union movement for far too long.

To emphasize that it has been far too long, I will briefly outline one problem facing us today, a very serious matter that has already been discussed earlier today in this House—the problem arising where one organization has been seeking legally and in a proper and fit manner to gain union membership in a certain organization for 15 years. Trade union officials did not go into a canteen during a lunch hour and say, "There is a black ban on you if you do not join." For 15 years the non-unionists have been living on the backs of their fellow workers. Is it any wonder that the trade union movement is frustrated, when there are people today prepared to live on the backs of their fellow workers?

It is indeed pleasing to note that the programme for 1971-72 outlined in the Governor's Speech for the South Australian Housing Trust will be maintained at the highest possible level, having regard to the financial resources available. It is a little over 12 months, almost 15 months, that I have had the honour of representing Albert Park in this House, and I say without fear of contradiction that one of the biggest problems facing me and, as far as I can gather from discussing this, other members of this House, particularly Government members, is the housing problem. I read with great pleasure that continued efforts would be made to maintain the great work that the Housing Trust has done over the years it has been in operation.

I congratulate the Premier and his Cabinet Ministers on their efforts in regard to the successful negotiation of an agreement to supply the Sydney gas market and the agreement reached with the Commonwealth Government for the connection of Adelaide to the Sydney-Perth standard gauge rail system. This is a feather in the cap of the South Australian Government in both instances. It is with great

interest that I look forward to the coming session, in which it is planned to introduce legislation to give effect to further Government policy. I consider it a great honour to be a member of the South Australian Labor Government in view of its efforts in the legislation it has already brought down and in the legislation envisaged in the Governor's Speech, so well presented by His Excellency. One measure will make proper provision for the safety, health and welfare of persons employed in industry and commerce in this State.

I congratulate the member for Playford on the forceful and informative manner in which he dealt with that legislation. I am sure we applaud the announcement that the Government has approved plans to reorganize and revitalize the welfare services of the State, which for many years have come in for much criticism. Concerning social welfare, I refer to a dedicated section of the community that should receive some assistance, namely, foster parents, who play a great part in relation to social welfare in this State. These people care for children who have unfortunately been thrust on the Government; they house, feed and educate these children, yet they receive from the Government out of the social welfare fund only 90c a day for each child. Something should be done about increasing this payment so as to lighten the burden on these foster parents. Contrary to what Opposition members would have people believe, the State Government is conscious of the problems affecting the rural sector of the community and will be doing something about these problems.

Mr. Becker: When are you going to do something?

Mr. HARRISON: I sincerely hope that Opposition members will fully support the relevant measures and that they will not delay the legislation designed to help in this regard.

The Government will continue to take steps to solve these problems, and it will introduce legislation to establish a board and to provide for the orderly marketing of oats. Also, further steps will be taken and legislation introduced regarding the further protection of people who purchase goods and receive services, and this refers particularly to the sale of used motor cars and door-to-door sales.

I am looking forward to the revision of the law relating to consumer credit and to certain other law reform measures. Government members who have already spoken in this debate have covered the various matters adequately and, indeed, capably. The Government will introduce a Bill to continue the operation of the Prices Act, and that is most important; indeed, I hope that when the relevant Bill is introduced Opposition members will support it in its entirety. Paragraph 27 of His Excellency's Speech states:

New legislation dealing with the valuation of land will also be introduced. This legislation will co-ordinate in one measure valuations for rating and taxing which at present are dealt with under several Acts and are governed by different procedures. My Government also intends to introduce a short amendment to 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.

I am sure that Opposition members who rant and rave in this House about rural problems will welcome those two measures. In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I look forward to the introduction of the legislation foreshadowed in His Excellency's Opening Speech.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 27, at 2 p.m.