

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

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

QUESTIONS**POKER MACHINES**

Mr. HALL: Will the Deputy Premier assure the House that the Government will not approve the introduction of poker machines in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Most certainly I assure the House that the Government does not intend to introduce poker machines in this State.

ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General say whether he intends to introduce, in this session, any amendments to those sections of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act that concern abortion? Last week I asked a similar question of the Deputy Premier. I asked him whether, as a Government matter, such a Bill would be introduced or, in the alternative, whether he would introduce a Bill. His reply to the first part of the question was "No" and the reply to the second part was equivocal. The Attorney has identified himself publicly on several occasions with opposition to the legislation which was passed in this House and in another place and which became law early in 1970, having been passed during the 1969 session. Because the matter is of very great public interest, I ask the Attorney this question about his intention.

The Hon. L. J. KING: True, as the honourable member has said, I have many times expressed opposition to the law which he introduced by a Bill in this House and which legalized abortion in South Australia in certain circumstances, and I adhere to that opposition. I make that statement speaking personally as a private member of this House and, of course, not in any way intending to commit the Government to any attitude in that regard. My personal intention as a private member of this House regarding any course of action on that law or any other law is a matter entirely for me to decide and, if I decide to take any action in this regard, I will make the announcement when I think it appropriate to do so.

FESTIVAL HALL

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Deputy Premier tell me whether the building programme for the festival hall is on schedule, whether any delay has occurred, and whether any escalation of costs has occurred recently?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Offhand, I cannot give the honourable member a reply, but I will obtain a report for him as soon as possible.

PRISON INQUIRY

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Attorney-General say whether a committee to inquire into prisons has been set up? Whilst delivering the Labor Party's policy speech in May last year the Premier said:

We would also undertake an inquiry into State prisons and detention centres to ensure a rational plan for the subsequent development of appropriate modern and humane institutions. On September 22 last year I asked the Attorney-General a Question on Notice about what progress had been made in this regard and, in reply, he said that negotiations to obtain a suitable person were proceeding but had not yet been completed. In March of this year I asked substantially the same question, without notice, and was told that there were difficulties in the way of appointing this committee. The Attorney said that he was still working on the matter and hoped to see the committee operating soon. Because of the importance of this matter, once again I ask the same question of the Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government intends to adhere to the statement made in the policy speech. It has not yet been able to set up the inquiry, but it will do so as soon as practicable.

CLEARWAYS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the question of declaring King William Street and North Terrace to be clearways has been considered, and, if it has, what was the decision? I believe that the present clearways enable traffic to enter the city in the morning more rapidly, and they have proved successful. The original concept was initiated during the time in office of a former Minister. However, traffic is becoming congested in the city, and I believe that declaring King William Street and North Terrace to be clearways would help relieve pressure in the city proper during peak traffic periods.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board is the body that initially makes surveys

and conducts such investigations as may be required. It was on the board's recommendation that the clearways that were declared as from July 1 became effective. I am not aware of consideration having been given by the board to King William Street, North Terrace, or any other street. I remind the honourable member that streets within the city of Adelaide are in a different category from other thoroughfares throughout the metropolitan area. I am pleased to hear the honourable member acknowledge the success of clearways, but I point out to him that, whilst he desires to gain credit for the former Government for introducing them, it did not do so. Clearways were introduced many years ago on Anzac Highway but, subsequently, for some reason of which I have no knowledge, they were removed. I think that was a retrograde step, and I congratulate the former Minister on re-introducing them there and so paving the way for additional clearways. However, many councils have virtually declared clearways: Marion council created a clearway on the South Road by introducing parking prohibitions on the side of that road used by city-bound traffic from 7.30 a.m. to 9 a.m. It has thereby created the same conditions as apply to a clearway.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ENROLMENTS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Attorney-General ascertain the cost of advertising undertaken by the Government with a view to obtaining additional Legislative Council enrolments last year? Although I asked the Premier for this information on three occasions last year, for some reason or other he would not give it, so I hope the Attorney-General will be able to give it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will try to obtain that information.

POP MUSIC

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to request officers of his department (this could involve officers of the school medical services) to investigate a possible programme in regard to informing young people of the permanent damage to hearing that can result from prolonged exposure to loud pop music?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a reply from the Minister of Health.

SCHOOL CHEQUES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about details accompanying school cheques?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is normal Education Department practice to supply advice regarding payments with cheques paid to all creditors but, where the payment is based on a claim submitted by that creditor, it has been considered sufficient to supply details only in cases where adjustment to that claim has been found necessary. Additional information will in future be given with per capita grant payments to indicate the "needs scheme" content.

RAILWAY LIGHTS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether officers are currently considering providing additional safety measures, particularly flashing lights, in respect of railway engines and/or rolling stock? There are still too many accidents involving motor vehicles and railway rolling stock, although I do not suggest that, in most instances, this problem lies with anyone other than motorists. However, two constituents of mine were killed as a result of an accident at Angle Vale only a few weeks ago, and there are many reports of near misses, especially at night, when background lights make it difficult to discern railway rolling stock on country crossings. In addition, there are instances where railway rolling stock is left stationary on a crossing, especially the crossing on the main Lyndoch-Williamstown road, for periods in excess of 10 minutes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter of light identification on railway vehicles has been considered over many years and, regrettably, it involves a problem, the solution for which has not yet been found, there being all sorts of implications and complications associated with this matter. It has been suggested that reflectorized materials should be placed on the sides of brake vans so that they will be shown up by headlights, but it was subsequently pointed out from a legal point of view that, if this were done and the reflectorized strips were covered by tarpaulins, which often cover railway trucks, and if the reflective strip was not visible, the Railways Commissioner could be held liable. The provision of flashing lights has some merit up to a point but, in the instance to which the honourable member refers (where the brake van is perhaps 20 yards on one side of the crossing and the engine is 20 yards on the other side, with trucks in the middle), they would be of little or no help to the person who did not see the trucks. At present the Railways Department is experimenting (I think that is the correct term to use) with various paints to see whether

the position can be improved. A further complicating factor is that trucks from Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia and even the Commonwealth use the lines in this State; consequently, it is not just a matter of solving the problem in relation to South Australian trucks. This complex problem has not been shelved, but it is fairly difficult to solve and, at this stage, no solution has been found. I will continue, as have successive Ministers in the past, to probe this question, for I believe that all of us, being fully aware of the dangers, would dearly love to solve this problem.

COOBER PEDY KINDERGARTEN

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Education say whether, when the new school at Coober Pedy is built, classrooms from the old school can be made available for a pre-school kindergarten? Recently, when I was at Coober Pedy some parents asked me to see whether the Education Department would make two of the old classrooms available for this purpose, as they are anxious to commence pre-school kindergarten education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look at the matter raised by the honourable member and see whether anything can be done.

LIBRARIES REPORT

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made with regard to the Mander-Jones report on libraries in South Australia? As the Minister will be aware, the report was prepared by a former Director-General of Education (Mr. Mander-Jones) on the suggestion of Mrs. Steele, when she was Minister of Education, and it was presented to me, as Minister, about 15 months ago. I now ask the Minister whether he or the Government has yet decided what action is to be taken on the recommendations in that report.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Since the publication of the report, copies of it have been widely circulated and submissions have been made by most of the many parties concerned with the provision of library facilities in the State. The submissions cover a wide range of subjects and extend to the provision of subsidized libraries. Considerable work must be done to collate the material in the submissions before making a final decision. I also point out that what is intended to be done will to some extent be subject to the limits imposed by finance.

Mr. Coumbe: Will legislation be required?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think so.

NARACOOORTE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 22 regarding the Naracoorte High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The lack of adequate staff room facilities at the Naracoorte High School is recognized. This has occurred because of steadily increasing enrolments at the school. As the school also lacks suitable library accommodation, a solid-structure standard unit will be provided that will include not only a library resource centre but also staff quarters containing a common room, a teacher preparation section, and a combined senior staff room and conference room. In addition, one floor of the proposed building will be occupied by open-space teaching areas and a practical activity area. This project is on the current design list, and sketch plans are scheduled to commence shortly. It will not, however, be available before mid-1974.

LANGHORNE CREEK BASIN

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the activity on and investigations into the artesian basin in the Milang and Langhorne Creek area and on the possibility of repairing the unused bores in the area that are causing considerable damage in the district?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member.

EMERGENCY FIRE SERVICES

Mr. CARNIE: Although I address my question to the Minister for Conservation, I am not sure whether it has to do with his department, because it also involves the Emergency Fire Services, which come under the Minister of Agriculture. However, perhaps the Minister will confer with his colleague, if necessary. Can the Minister say what can be done to exempt certain bodies from paying the fee required under the Planning and Development Act? My question is the result of a case that was brought to my attention a few weeks ago in which a farmer in the Verran district, near Cleve, donated to the District Council of Cleve one-quarter acre of land on which to build a shed to house the local Emergency Fire Service. The gift of land was subject to the council's paying all fees required to transfer the land to

its new ownership, and the council agreed to do this. The land was surveyed, the plan was submitted to the State Planning Authority, and the council was told that the transfer would be approved on payment of a \$40 fee, although the land is worth only \$15 to \$20 an acre. Even more important than its value is that the service plays an important role in country areas. Its work is done voluntarily by local people. Because of this, I ask the Minister to inquire whether there is some way in which the council could be exempted or at least required to pay only a reduced fee for this service.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to examine the matter that the honourable member has raised and to bring down a report for him.

PORT NOARLUNGA SOUTH SCHOOL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Education ask the property section of his department to investigate the early provision of a primary school in the Port Noarlunga South area? Although I took this matter up briefly with the Minister last year, people in the district have since made various complaints to me about the transport problems involved in getting children to the old Port Noarlunga Primary School. They are more than three miles from this school but less than three miles from the Noarlunga Primary School, to which there is no public transport; therefore, these people do not qualify for assistance in respect of transport. The State Planning Office projections suggest that, whereas the population of the Seaford area is 101 this year, by 1976 it will have increased to 864. The early provision of this school, for which I know there is a site, might also save the department money in redeveloping the old Port Noarlunga Primary School.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am aware of the problem to which the honourable member refers regarding the transport of children from Port Noarlunga South to the old Port Noarlunga school. Because of his question relating to the possible early provision of a new school at Port Noarlunga South, I shall be pleased to examine the matter for him and to bring down a report as soon as possible.

ANDAMOOKA ELECTRICITY

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works say what plans his department has to provide a 240-volt power system at Andamooka? I have been told that a private company is interested in supplying a limited service to Andamooka and, as this company has made

inquiries in the township of Andamooka, I ask the question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am tempted to reply "none", but I will not do that. I take it that the honourable member is referring to plans that the Minister of Works Department has.

Mr. Gunn: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There have been negotiations between a private supplier and the Electricity Trust on the matter but, as I am not certain what stage the negotiations have reached, I will have the matter checked for the honourable member and will let him know.

ROAD SAFETY

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether any specific inquiry has been made about, or whether he has any further information on, the causes of accidents to pedestrians since the statistics relating to these injuries were released earlier this month? I understand that Mr. Boykett has stated that 55 people were killed and 827 injured in pedestrian accidents in South Australia last year. I think several matters would be of interest in the prevention of these accidents, such as the involvement of alcohol and whether the fault is basically that of the driver of the vehicle or whether the accident is caused by inattention on the part of the pedestrian. In other words, I should be grateful for the Minister's continued interest in the problem.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member and all other honourable members can be assured that they will get my continued interest in any matter associated with road safety. If the honourable member would like me to bring down specific information, I shall be pleased to do so.

DARLEY ROAD

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question regarding work on Darley Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Design work is well advanced for the reconstruction of Darley Road, Campbelltown, including the realignment of the approaches to the proposed bridge over the Torrens River. This work should commence late in 1973. Following the realignment of the Torrens River during 1972-73 it is intended that the bridge will be constructed during 1973-74.

PORT LINCOLN HARBOUR

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked on July 21 regarding a deep sea port at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The design work for the Port Lincoln deep sea port has been in hand for many months. Materials are soon to be ordered and work on the site should commence about September next. It is expected that \$450,000 will be spent this financial year on the project.

VISTA TANK

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works say whether construction of the 2,000,000 gall. reinforced concrete water tank at Vista will be completed and in service by the latter part of 1971, as previously expected? On February 2, the Minister told me by letter that work on the construction of this tank had commenced and that, to meet the demand that would be placed on the tank, Cabinet had approved the expenditure of \$65,000 to lay permanent distribution mains in Dillon Road, Tea Tree Gully, which mains would link up with the adjoining tanks at Athelstone and Steventon Estate to provide flexibility of operation and distribution.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have the matter checked by my officers and will bring down the information for the honourable member.

GLENELG TRAMLINE

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport recommend that a feasibility study be made of the building of a third track on the Glenelg tramline? A letter to the Editor in today's *News* suggests that a third tram track be laid to provide an express service in peak hours in order to relieve the so-called rat race on Anzac Highway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the honourable member will recall that I have often said that the whole public transport system in South Australia is being reviewed and that I consider that we ought to have operating a different pattern from that operating at present. Information that I got when I was overseas has done nothing but consolidate strongly that view, and I think that the Glenelg tramline has a big part to play in the future transport system in metropolitan Adelaide. I expect that somehow or other we must get grade separation for the whole route to Glenelg. We are fortunate that the previous Government did not throw away that tram and the right of way, as it did in respect of other routes, and I assure the honour-

able member that the existing right of way will not be given away as long as I have breath in my lungs. I think that we must consider grade separation as a first point, and that the second matter we must consider is the provision of modern transfer facilities. I cannot see the logic of having buses cluttering up our high-ways and, having crossed the tram line, not being permitted to pick up another passenger on the way to Adelaide. That is the case in most instances, although there are one or two isolated cases in which it does not apply, where they work around through the District of Adelaide. Basically, these buses come to town merely to fight the battle with other vehicles on the road. I believe that we should provide proper transfer facilities. I do not mean that people should have to get out at the footpath and walk across the road in the heat: I refer to proper transfer facilities for tickets so that people do not have to buy tickets again after getting off a vehicle. They can buy one ticket for the journey from point A to point B in the city. If this were done there would be a great improvement in the flow of traffic of our public transport system. These matters are being considered at present. I should like to be able to say that we will have them operating next week, but it is no good trying to fool even the member for Hanson, because that could not be done.

POLLUTION ALERT

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister for Conservation consider retaining the air pollution alert that has been broadcast at 9 a.m.? I read in the *News* that the 9 a.m. alert may be abolished and the alert given at 7 a.m. Several constituents have told me that two alerts would give greater coverage and be more effective and beneficial to the public, who seem to be interested in this matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOM HILL: The honourable member may not have fully understood the purport of the announcement. We have arranged through the Bureau of Meteorology and the radio stations concerned that, in future, the announcement will be available to the radio stations at 7 a.m., and the stations have agreed that, throughout the day on the hour or whenever a weather report is given, it will be indicated in the weather report whether an alert is operating. When no alert is operating the station will make this clear to the public, so that during the day any person wishing to know whether an alert is operating, and whether he can or cannot light an incinerator, may listen to the weather reports given with

the news reports, and ascertain whether the alert is operating or not. The pollution alert will also be given on the 8 a.m., 9 a.m., and 10 a.m. news services and then throughout the day. Also, it has been decided that the recorded weather information on the telephone service will also say whether an alert has been issued. This will solve the problem confronting some people who wish to co-operate but who are unaware of the position, and I believe the new system will help in informing people of the exact situation.

DOG REGISTRATION

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about dog registration discs?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sure that the honourable member and other dog lovers will be pleased to know that the contract for dog registration discs was let to Half Moon Products Proprietary Limited, a Victorian-based company, on February 25, 1971, by the Supply and Tender Board. No South Australian-based companies were included in the tenderers for the supply of dog discs. The contract required that the discs reached the various dog districts before May 31, 1971. When it became apparent that the dog discs had not been received the contractor was asked for the reasons for late delivery. He stated that the company had recently installed a new automatic numbering machine to consecutively number the discs, and some initial difficulties with the mechanics of the machine had been experienced and that the company was not aware of the many districts in South Australia. It is hoped that in future South Australian contractors will show an interest and tender for the supply of dog discs within this State. I have been concerned with the problems associated with the late delivery of dog discs but, unfortunately, it was beyond the Government's power to rectify the situation. Therefore, I offer my condolences not only to the member for Victoria but also to all the dogs he loves.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. CLARK: My attention has been drawn to a question I missed a week ago when the member for Chaffey sought information from the Minister of Works about constructing a

new building for the Tourist Bureau. In explanation, I quote from what is reported on page 224 of *Hansard*, when the Deputy Premier said:

The present Government did not claim that it initiated moves for this new office, but I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that his Government referred the project to the Public Works Committee, which recommended against the construction of this building.

The Leader of the Opposition interjected, saying:

A Labor-dominated committee.

I inform the House that, apart from the Chairman, the membership of this committee is equally divided. Since I have been Chairman of this committee I have not had to give a casting vote, and the vote on the question of the Tourist Bureau building was unanimous. I point out that the committee recommended against this proposal only because of the legal complications involved. Following this recommendation against it, the Minister of Works made arrangements by which the legal difficulties were overcome, and then went on with the project, something that the Public Works Committee was happy that he should do. To say in this context that the Public Works Committee is a Labor-dominated committee is therefore incorrect.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES

Notice of Motion, Government business:
The Hon. L. J. King to move:

That he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1965-1966.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): On further consideration the Government has decided not to proceed with the measure referred to in this notice of motion, and I therefore do not intend to move the motion.

Motion lapsed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 27. Page 391.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the motion and take this opportunity, as other members have done, of offering my sympathies to the relatives of deceased members of Parliament. Two of these members, Mr. Rowe and Mr. Sam Lawn, have died since I was elected to Parliament. I did not know Mr. Rowe personally, but I knew him by repute and, obviously, he did much for this State. I did know Mr. Sam Lawn and, with other members, I express my sympathy to his family. Other

members have expressed their thoughts about the character of this gentleman and I, too, believe that he was an adornment to Parliament and a person who will be sadly missed. I am sorry to see that Sir Norman Jude has retired from another place. He, too, was a character, and I say that in the kindest sense, as did the member for Playford. I am sure that all members will miss Sir Norman.

Of course, when people leave this Parliament they are replaced by others, and here I congratulate the member for Adelaide on his election to this place. Having known the honourable member for some time, I am confident that he will play a major part in the Parliament in years to come for he is, above all, a man of integrity and honest intentions. I do not think anyone who knows him would doubt this.

Also, I congratulate Mr. Cameron on his election to another place, and I look forward with interest to see whether he will retain the desire to improve that place that he voiced before being elected. I was interested to hear Mr. Cameron's comments on an adjunct of a political Party known as the League of Rights, to which I think he referred as a "lunatic fringe of the political world". Although I am sure that Government members endorse that opinion, I am not so sure that members of Mr. Cameron's own Party endorse it entirely. The Hon. Mr. Geddes, a member in another place, in a recent speech, said:

I wish to place on record the intelligent support that people in the Northern District associated with these principles of the League of Rights have given not only to myself but also to other honourable members of this Council.

Mr. Slater: He's proud of it.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. Another member for the Northern District (Hon. A. M. Whyte) said "Hear, hear!" to that and complimented the Hon. Mr. Geddes on his speech, particularly on his reference to the League of Rights. Another reference to the League of Rights that we should all note was the one made recently by the Hon. Mr. Kemp, as follows:

Recently we have seen an attack on an organization called the League of Rights. I say "Thank God for this organization", which is entirely non-political and does not seek to enter politics, but which is mainly concerned with keeping people aware of the subversive influences operating in this community, which seem to be polarizing so dangerously in our education system.

We have heard that before, and one wonders about the dangers of political thought polarizing when one notes the attitudes and beliefs of

the League of Rights. If that organization had not already been responsible for a polarizing of thought, I should hate to see what polarization really is. In addition, we note the remark made in this House by the member for Eyre, whose district is encompassed by the Northern District. When the Minister of Roads and Transport said last week that the member for Eyre was a colleague of the League of Rights, the honourable member was so incensed at this accusation that he asked that the Minister withdraw, saying:

The Minister has implied that the League of Rights are colleagues of mine. This is in no way correct and I ask him to withdraw it.

This is interesting, especially as the member for Eyre is in this place because of the activities of the League of Rights.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is making an untrue statement and reflecting on members of the Eyre District Committee of the Liberal and Country League. I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: In reply to the member for Eyre. I think I have pointed out previously that the Chair is not responsible for the accuracy of the statements made by members of this Chamber.

Mr. KENEALLY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the member for Eyre is at all upset about the statement I have made, he will have to explain to those people in his district who support the League of Rights why he is so adamant about not supporting it. I will leave that to him, because the responsibility is his, although I wonder how he will get on. I compliment members who have spoken in this debate, especially the member for Elizabeth and the member for Ross Smith, whose entertaining speeches contained much good common sense. They are brilliant debaters; it must be satisfying to be able to say the most cutting things to members opposite and know that those members enjoy having these things said about them; and, indeed, I should like to be in the same position as the members for Elizabeth and Ross Smith. The things they said were true, and I compliment them on their remarks. Having listened intently to the remarks of the member for Light and the member for Eyre, I think it is correct to say that if a certain three-letter word had been cut out of their speeches their contributions would have been considerably reduced.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: This is not a rude three-letter word?

Mr. KENEALLY: No.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: Although I could spend some time on discussing many subjects, I would rather comment on the remarks of the member for Mitcham, who referred to two important subjects, namely, people who are compelled to go into the street to voice a political opinion, and whether or not Parliament has lost the respect of the people. I think that both these subjects are interrelated: the reason why people go into the street to demonstrate a political opinion is that they have lost respect for Parliament. I shall read the reasons given by the member for Mitcham for people going into the street to demonstrate, and I will follow that up by quoting from his statement regarding the loss of respect for Parliament. The member for Mitcham quoted from an article as follows:

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

He goes on to say that, because of this, a heavy responsibility is placed on members of Parliament. He then said (and I disagree entirely with this) that members of this Chamber or of any other Chamber should share in the blame because of their actions and behaviour. I think that that is a lot of rot; the actions of members in this Chamber can well be controlled by you, Mr. Speaker. The people of Australia want decisions made in Parliament and policies formed by Government which are not only progressive in nature and which are spoken about but which are also implemented: it is most important that policies be implemented. As an experienced Parliamentarian, the member for Mitcham criticized the forms and procedures of Parliament and, until I heard the member for Ross Smith defend those procedures, I tended to agree with the member for Mitcham. However, as I have always found the advice of the member for Ross Smith can be followed, I believe there may be some good arguments for retaining these procedures. The forms of this Parliament do not matter one iota when it comes to the decisions that this or any other Parliament makes. Although I do not often refer to *Advertiser* editorials, I

agree with the following editorial from that newspaper:

It is a weakness of the system that it is so open to misuse for narrow political purposes and, if anything, it is this area which needs tightening. But in any area discussion of Parliament, it is more to the point to consider the relationship between it and the people. With the massive growth in the size and areas of responsibility of government, the traditional avenues of response have lost their way. And as demonstrations and public protest increasingly assume the role once assigned to letters and petitions, so the right of such dissent becomes more and more important.

I believe the mass media has a responsibility in connection with the lack of respect for Parliament. If the mass media was less historical in its reports and more critical in its comments on what Governments and members of Parliament do, it would insist on Governments making decisions and having policies in line with the wishes of the people. None of the media in this State has done this. Recently the Sunday newspapers have carried critical comment, but I do not include in that statement the comments of Onlooker whose article in the *Sunday Mail* at the weekend was probably the most ill-informed article that I have ever read. I do not criticize Onlooker (whoever he may be) for making political comment but, if he intends to comment on politics, he must get his facts right.

Mr. Rodda: He was pretty good the week before!

Mr. KENEALLY: The week before he criticized the Opposition, and it is up to members opposite to do something about that.

Mr. Clark: I think they did.

Mr. KENEALLY: That could have been the reason for the article last weekend. All members of the Australian Labor Party know that no-one in this Party believes that strike action should be the first action taken in an industrial dispute; strike action is the ultimate weapon. I do not think anyone would say that unions should not have the right to strike for, without that right, they would have no bargaining position whatever. Any reasonable person will insist that that right be maintained. Therefore, in his attempt to divide the Labor Party, Onlooker was most unsuccessful.

One factor of increasing importance concerning Parliament is that, as the years go by, people are becoming better and better educated and are therefore less likely to accept a Government that says it will do one thing and does something else. Thomas Jefferson had the following to say:

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and what never will be.

Yet we have Opposition members who complain bitterly about the fact that university students express a point of view. That is why we have universities, so that people can be educated and form their own point of view, although it may not coincide with our own standards. I expect that students will find little to agree with in the standards we have adopted, as standards in society change; anyone who resists change will be left far behind.

As I started to say initially, the real reason why people have lost respect for Parliament is the credibility gap. Over the last 20 years Governments have made decisions that have produced this gap. During that period Australia has had in the Commonwealth and the States mainly Liberal Governments. The biggest factor involved in this gap is the Vietnam war. Successive Presidents of the United States and Prime Ministers of Australia have said that the reasons for our involvement in Vietnam are (a) because we were asked to participate in this conflict; (b) because we are a member of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization; (c) because of the Gulf of Tonkin incident; and (d) because we had to prevent the downward thrust of Chinese Communism. I could go on and give other reasons. All these reasons have been proved by the Pentagon papers to be nothing more than lies. Yet for years we have been told by Liberal Governments in this country (and the newspapers have supported this editorially) that we are involved in Vietnam for the reasons I have listed. How can we expect the people of this country to develop any respect for a Government that deliberately goes out of its way to misrepresent a situation, when the issue involved is as vital as is the Vietnam issue? Basically, I think we became involved in Vietnam because the United States, for some unknown reason, believed that it was ordained by a supreme power to adjudicate on the political system that countries in South-East Asia should have.

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: However, the United States no longer adopts this attitude. It has found that even the most powerful countries in the world can no longer dictate to smaller countries, which are entitled to their own political thought. From the very beginning, the A.L.P. has opposed our involvement. I was pleased that the member for Mawson quoted the article by Ray Kerrison on Mr.

Calwell, who had so much abuse thrown at him by Opposition members and their Party elsewhere because of his attitude on Vietnam. However, Mr. Calwell has been proved right.

Mr. Mathwin: Get on to South Africa for a change.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. Most honourable members have already had the opportunity of speaking without numerous interjections being made. They should show the honourable member the same courtesy while he is speaking.

Mr. KENEALLY: I ask members of the Opposition what good it does to send petitions or letters to the Prime Minister asking him to withdraw our troops from Vietnam when they know that we are there because of a lie. How could we expect him to withdraw our troops from Vietnam? People are therefore forced to go into the streets to demonstrate and, when they do, we see the extension of the deception of the Opposition. Instead of debating the issue that gave rise to the moratoriums (whether we should be in Vietnam), the Opposition has ignored the question. Instead, it has preferred to debate law and order. I should like the Opposition to say just once "Yes" or "No" as to whether or not the reasons for going into Vietnam are valid and then they can debate whether they consider it valid for people to go into the street. The Opposition cannot answer one question by asking another, and this is what it is trying to do.

I think the whole unhappy Vietnam experience has done more harm to the credibility of Governments and Parliament than has any other single issue in living memory. I have been asked about apartheid. The Prime Minister has said that he is violently opposed to apartheid but, when he has the living and breathing representatives of apartheid here in Australia, what does he do? He gives them the services of the Royal Australian Air Force and supplies them with Army barracks in which to stay. Although he says he opposes apartheid, he really supports it. Here again, one wonders about credibility. Intelligent people ask these questions.

Mr. McAnaney: The noisy minority.

Mr. KENEALLY: The so-called noisy minority is called on to debate whether apartheid is good or bad, but the Commonwealth Government ignores this argument. The Opposition here ignores the issue of apartheid and debates law and order. I was very much interested to hear the honourable member and the member for Flinders say that we must be careful how

we treat the Springboks because we have \$12,000,000 worth of trade with South Africa annually. I have done some arithmetic by dividing \$12,000,000 among 15,000,000 people, and it works out to less than \$1 for each South African who has no right to elect his Government. If we are to equate \$12,000,000 with the rights and freedom of 15,000,000 people, we should get our priorities right. Whenever there are demonstrations within this country on any vital issue, the reactionary forces of the conservative section of the community objects. Some of the groups who get together to oppose the demonstrators are the National Socialists (the Nazis), who opposed the demonstrations against Vietnam and against the Springboks. The Opposition is therefore in good company. The Nazis are there with their armbands.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: Then there is a group not friendly with the member for Eyre: the League of Rights, the Democratic Labor Party, the Country Party and the Liberals. What a fine group! They get together whenever there is a demonstration. Odd bed fellows, I am sure, but they join together to oppose the people going into the street. They are not interested one iota in the debate or in the issue that forces people into the street: they are interested only in a smoke screen, which they create to cloud the real issue. Another decision taken by the Commonwealth Government that could not have done its credibility any good was the action of Mr. Menzies in purchasing the F.111. I apologize for bringing up these old arguments.

Mr. Rodda: What has this to do with the Address in Reply?

Mr. KENEALLY: It has everything to do with it because it affects the lives of the people. We have had moratorium demonstrations and a Royal Commission on the right of people to dissent. Because of an alleged threat from Indonesia (which did not materialize), Mr. Menzies placed an order for these aircraft. We should have told the Indonesians what the time table was. We would have had to say, "The F.111 won't be ready for at least 11 years." Even that would have been wrong, because I read in the paper yesterday that the F. 111 is now a casualty and that we may not get any of them. The F.111 was introduced as a political trick, and it worked completely, and so the aircraft are of no further use to Australia.

Is there any credibility in the Commonwealth Government's attitude to Aborigines and to pensioners? The Commonwealth Government says that the Aborigines should have the same rights and responsibilities as their white brothers. However, the Commonwealth Government does not do anything about it. The first Australian Government that did anything constructive towards assisting the Aborigines was the Dunstan Government in this State.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the referendum held by the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. KENEALLY: I am glad the honourable member has mentioned that referendum, because that is what I am talking about. We had a referendum that gave the Commonwealth the power to do something for the Aborigines, but it did nothing. It talked.

Mr. McAnaney: That's a lie, and you know it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: The Commonwealth Government's attitude to pensioners only harms the Parliamentary system throughout Australia, when this State Government and other State Governments are criticized by people who speak about the attitude of the Government to pensions. These people do not know how little we can do for the pensioners. They are not aware that the Commonwealth Government has the responsibility for and the capability of doing something for pensioners and bringing them up to a decent living standard. We get the blame and we must take it, along with everyone else, and so there develops this lack of respect for Governments. I again ask where is the credibility of the Commonwealth Government for its lack of attention to pensioners.

A further area where the credibility of the Commonwealth Government comes into question is in regard to pollution. That is a favourite subject with us all, as it should be, because we all have a tremendous responsibility to the citizens of this country and of the world, and further, as the member for Salisbury has said, to the citizens who will come into the world. The Commonwealth Government has a responsibility to do something about pollution. It accepts this responsibility and makes big statements about what it will do. It says that it will appoint a Director and a Deputy Director and that it will establish a research laboratory or research areas to carry out research into this problem, but finance gets a bit tight, and what does the Commonwealth Government do? For the sake of \$25,000, which is what the Director and Deputy

Director would cost, in a total Commonwealth Budget of about \$8,000,000,000, it does not go ahead with the appointment of these officers, although I think it may be forced to go ahead. I ask where is that Government's credibility. It talks about doing something about pollution but it does nothing.

Some members wonder why the more educated and intelligent people in our community are complaining about what Governments do or do not do for them and about the standard of Parliament. I think the people have every good reason to complain. I bring this argument regarding credibility back to South Australia. For many years we have listened to debates about Parliamentary democracy, and we have heard about it particularly from the Playford Government, while it practised dictatorship. I do not want to sound as though I am trying to step into the shoes of the former member for Adelaide by talking about the gerrymander, but I must say that the infamous gerrymander that we had in South Australia for many years did the Parliamentary system in this State much harm, just as Mr. Bjelke-Petersen is doing much harm to the Parliamentary system in Queensland.

I am surprised that members opposite have not said that perhaps Labor Governments at one time or another have also been guilty of similar offences. I am willing to accept that this may be so, if it can be proved, but this does not change the argument, because, whether the Government is Liberal or Labor, if it deceives the people it is guilty of the crime of lowering the standards of Parliament. If we want people to respect Parliament, we must give them good leadership and make the decisions they want. Above all, we must do what we say we will do, not say one thing and do another. This, more than anything that the member for Mitcham has said about activities or behaviour in this Chamber, affects the standard of Parliament.

I think I have covered that point fairly well. Much more can be said about it but I suggest that all members in this House and in other Houses of Parliament should consider carefully this subject of credibility, because it is extremely serious and we cannot continue to go on telling people one thing and doing another. In these days, Parliament is much closer to the people. The people all over Australia know what we are saying and doing. If something is part of our policy, we should give effect to it even if it may not be altogether popular in some quarters.

I think that, in this respect, all honourable members should concede that the Leader of the Government in this State stands as a man of integrity who was prepared to take a moral line. Irrespective of the ravings of hysterical members opposite and those who support them, he has defended his stand. This is what we require in our politicians. Two other subjects have been raised in this Chamber continually, including during this Address in Reply debate. One is the subject of preference for unionists, which members opposite call compulsory unionism. The word "compulsory" is a good emotional word: one can use it to stir up emotions and blind what preference to unionists really means.

I do not expect that there is one member of this House who does not believe in the principle of unionism, although members opposite are not willing to say they believe in it. There is not one Opposition member who does not believe in the principle of unionism or one such member who, in all conscience, believes that every man who should belong to a union and who takes the benefits that a union has won for him should not contribute to the cost of obtaining those benefits. Not one member opposite would say that he should not be expected to contribute. However, not one member opposite has been prepared to stand up and say that such a man should be morally bound to contribute to the cost of winning the benefits. Here again, we have an example of the dishonesty of members opposite. Although they believe in what we are saying and believe in unionism, they are not prepared to say so, and they blind the issue by bringing in emotionalism.

I put it to Opposition members that no greater harm can be done to the industrial movement in this State when there is an industrial dispute over unionism than for members to support loudly those free riders in the union movement who are prepared to accept the benefits but will not contribute. These free riders are reinforced in their belief that they do not have to contribute when they know that a section of political life in South Australia will support them. They ask, "Why should we have to join a union when Liberal Party members support us?" By their attitude members opposite are contributing towards industrial trouble and unrest in South Australia.

There is no doubt (and Liberal Governments in other States and in the Commonwealth Parliament accept this) that there should be preference to unionists within industry, yet

the only people in Australia who oppose this are honourable members opposite. How can they be so secure in the thought that they are right when they are so isolated on this matter? Of course they are not right: it is pure politics. They are trying to embarrass the Government, and they are creating industrial trouble and unrest in South Australia. The sooner they realize that the better it will be, because they are doing no-one any good, let alone themselves. Would Opposition members accept the principle applying in some Commonwealth Government instrumentalities that, unless a person is a member of a union, he cannot participate in long service leave and annual leave or receive sickness benefits? If they are prepared to accept that principle, they may have some argument in saying that a man should not have to join a union if he cannot participate in its benefits. These benefits and privileges have been won as a result of some very hard struggles. People have been out of work and their families have been deprived of an income for many weeks and months in fights for these privileges, but Opposition members seem to accept the fact that someone can free-load on a union and have the privileges without contributing towards the expenses of obtaining them. I ask Opposition members where their morality is in that, because there seems to be no morality in their argument. I also suggest that there is no morality in the argument of the Opposition regarding Commonwealth-State financial relationships.

Mr. McAnaney: This will be good.

Mr. KENEALLY: I hope so. If the member for Heysen listens and tries to overcome his bigoted attitude, he may hear something that will help him. When the Leader of the Opposition was Premier and attended the Premiers' Conference seeking finance to run this State's affairs, he did not obtain what he considered to be a good deal. When he returned he said that he had received a shoddy deal from the Prime Minister, and everyone agreed with him. The then Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, agreed, because he did not wish to make political capital at the expense of the people of this State. What is the present situation? When our Premier went to the Commonwealth Government and asked for sufficient funds to provide all the services that he considered this State should have (and we may possibly be able to look after the rural industry more if we had more finance, but I will deal with

that later), he did not obtain what we considered we were justly entitled to get.

However, when we say that, what is the attitude of the Opposition? Does it support us in our attempt to obtain a better deal for South Australia? Of course not, because it is interested not in the welfare of South Australia but only in making a political point. Opposition members say that the Premier cannot arrange his finances in such a way as to provide all the services that we should have, but everybody knows that to do this is beyond the State's capacity.

The member for Kavel criticized the Minister of Education because he did not tell the Commonwealth Treasurer and the Prime Minister what areas of taxation should be increased and what the Commonwealth Treasurer's priorities should be. I think the member for Elizabeth adequately answered that argument, but I have not yet heard an Opposition member outline what services he requires to be decreased in this State in order to provide the assistance that the Country Party section of the Opposition requires for the rural industry.

Opposition members have not detailed where the additional finance can be raised within the State's capacity to provide these services and what additional taxation should be imposed. When we say that the Commonwealth Government is the only source from which money can be obtained to provide these services. Opposition members say we are playing Party politics and not being truthful. I say that they are not being truthful and that they are doing a disservice to South Australia by not supporting the Government in its attempt to obtain a better deal. As a new member I believe that, above all, Parliamentarians should have integrity, and I am hurt when, after talking privately with members and hearing their views on these issues, I then hear in the House their unreasonable and hysterical arguments in trying to make a political point against the Government. Everyone agrees that the Opposition has the right (and that is the reason it is there) to criticize the Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Constructively, too.

Mr. KENEALLY: This is the basis of my argument. If the Opposition was constructive in its criticism, no-one could complain. We cannot be so good that there is not some aspect in which the Opposition can offer constructive criticism. However, the Opposition seems to find nothing on which to be constructive but

must repeat the well-worn arguments about compulsory unionism and Commonwealth-State relationships. Before leaving the question of credibility I should like to read an editorial from the *Central Times*. This publication has excellent editorials and I recommend them to all members, because the writer displays an attitude that all Christian bodies should have: a responsibility toward the major issues that confront the world today. The editorial states:

There is a great deal of concern among thoughtful people today in regard to the state of the nation and the world. Everywhere confusion and disorder prevail. Protest marches, moratoriums, riots, student unrest, strikes, demonstrations seem to be the order of the day. Law and order are called in question. Tension and frustration are found in every major area of life. What is wrong? What is behind such ferment?

Recently the Commonwealth Government forced through 17 Bills in two days. The Opposition naturally opposed this. Very strong words were also said by two members of the Government. But the juggernaut of Bills rolled on. This incident is a symptom and expression of the sickness of our society. We live in a democracy, but even Governments refuse to act in accordance with democratic principles. In this process, representatives elected by the people, both Government and Opposition, are denied their right to express considered opinions. This allows extremists to say we now live in a semi-facist country.

Another event has deep significance. Every housewife faces the nightmare of constantly rising prices. Despite constant demands to arrest these, nothing was done on a Government level. When the A.C.T.U. and Mr. Hawke took a hand, the Commonwealth Government brought out of cold storage the Bill on restrictive trade practices. At the same time Mr. Hawke was accused of "blackmail". Our concern is simply this. Why did it take "blackmail" to revive this Bill? Also, if such "blackmail" gets results, what is happening to our democracy? And how must others act who desire changes?

Such questions cause deep disquiet and unrest in our community among both young people and mature adults. Follow these things out into the general life of the community and other factors are discovered. Primary producers have probably never had it so difficult. Nor have they ever felt so frustrated. Whatever they do seems to be of no avail. Primary producers do not expect miracles. But they do expect, and have the right to expect, their problems to be taken seriously and measures suggested to meet them to be adequate. It is too often a case of too little too late. So we have marches of protest and other direct action even by farmers.

The same position prevails in principle in regard to the war in Vietnam, to pensions, to health services, to education, to Aborigines, to student unrest and to foreign policy. It is out of the deep frustrations experienced in these things that much of the unrest of today comes.

Such are aggravated by the failure to get anything done by the usual democratic processes.

A step towards cure is to see that democracy works. The mark of a democracy is its attitude to minorities, even a minority of one. We preserve democracy only by being democratic, by due regard to the rights and responsibilities of every citizen. When we do this a great deal of the ferment and frustration will cease, together with their outward signs.

I commend the member for Spence, who said that there was no reason to over-react against demonstrations regarding the law and order issue. The demonstrations will last only for as long as the reasons that cause those demonstrations exist, and if we remove those reasons we will be rid of demonstrations.

I was pleased to note in His Excellency's Speech that it is intended to rename the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department the Department for Community Welfare, which will be decentralized, offices being set up in many country centres. I hope that Port Augusta receives priority in this respect because, as honourable members will appreciate, Port Augusta has special problems regarding community welfare. The people of Port Augusta, who are called on to play a greater part in integrating Aborigines in South Australia than is played by people in any other community in the State, do so willingly, but it is not fair to expect them to perform tasks that are beyond their capacity to perform, and so we vitally need senior welfare officers at Port Augusta to help in this regard.

Speaking perhaps selfishly, I point out that members of Parliament who live in the area are continually called on to help the people in question, and we are happy to help them, but we are not competent to act on every occasion, whereas officers of the department are competent in this respect. We also have a great problem regarding itinerant people, as Port Augusta is a meeting place for people travelling between the Eastern States and Western Australia. As many itinerant people who arrive in Port Augusta need the services of the Department for Community Welfare, I sincerely hope that this area will receive a high priority when the country offices are being established. The department's services are also required in Whyalla, part of which is in my district, and, although there is perhaps not such a desperate requirement for assistance at Whyalla, there is certainly at least a requirement.

I compliment the Government on its programme involving the building of more cottage flats to be let to persons in necessitous circumstances and, here again, I hope that country areas will participate in this scheme. Although

cottage flats are to be built at Port Pirie, we need them also at Port Augusta; indeed, there is a tremendous requirement for housing in South Australia generally and the requirement in my district is no less than that in any other district. State Governments have a problem in trying on a limited Budget to provide the services required, and one wonders here just how effective the federal system is. Some members say that they favour the federal system, as we have it, but I should like to know the cost of this system, as it now operates, to the people of Australia. This system certainly makes the operation of a State Government difficult.

Mr. Gunn: Are you a centralist?

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. I think that, if I were required to pass an opinion, an argument could be advanced in favour of becoming a centralist, particularly because of the difficulties confronting State Governments in providing the required services. Moneys must be allocated for the benefit of the people throughout Australia, and we need to determine correct priorities. However, I suggest that there would be no need to consider centralism if the Commonwealth Government accepted its responsibilities to the people of Australia. We are continually being told what a lucky country this is and what a great standard of living we have. Even the member for Eyre may now realize that some people in Australia are in necessitous circumstances; he would probably argue that people engaged in rural industry come within this category, and I guess they do, but they are not the only people.

In this lucky and rich country of ours, too many people live on a standard of living that is lower than the standard they should be enjoying. If members opposite are not confronted with these people and with this strata of our society, they are blind to reality. I suggest that, unless the Commonwealth Government is prepared to accept its responsibilities to Australia as a whole, a good argument could be advanced in favour of centralism, and the Commonwealth Government would then have to accept its responsibility and would not be able to hide behind the old argument that it is the States' responsibility to provide health, education and transport services, etc. The responsibility would then lie where it should lie. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I endorse the remarks of those members who have expressed regret at the loss from this

Chamber of the former member for Adelaide, Mr. Sam Lawn. I wish to convey my condolences to his family and to the families of other former members who have passed away since the last session. Although I did not intend to answer any Government member who has spoken in this debate, I believe that one or two comments made by the member for Stuart should be answered. He referred to the Aboriginal problems existing in our society. I can only remind him that recently when Abschol had its meeting, at which Professor Tatz of the Armidale university was guest speaker, not one Government member was at that meeting.

Mr. Hopgood: I was crook that night; I did intend to go.

Mr. Millhouse: There are 26 others of you.

Mr. EVANS: That would be the poorest excuse, because the member for Mawson could have got a replacement. I remind the member for Stuart that the Liberal Party of Australia is the only Party that has ever endorsed an Aboriginal as a candidate, enabling him to become a member of a Parliament in this country.

Mr. Keneally: The Senior Vice-President of my sub-branch is an Aboriginal.

Mr. EVANS: Regarding the conscription issue, the member for Stuart and his colleagues tell us that, if we believe in Vietnam, we should go up there and fight. The member for Stuart, who represents a district in which there are possibly more Aborigines than anywhere else, should step down and let an Aboriginal take his place. He should give an Aboriginal an opportunity to represent the district. That is the type of argument that Government members have been using for a long while.

Mr. Keneally: What a lot of rot!

Mr. EVANS: I agree with the member for Stuart: it is a lot of rot. However, that is the type of argument that Government members—so-called responsible people—have been using for a long while. Although I would not use that type of argument normally. I did so today merely to throw it back to Government members to ensure that they stop and think before they say such stupid things in future. For the benefit of the member for Stuart, I should like now to refer to the oration of Professor Colin Tatz in relation to South Africa, part of which was as follows:

In my view there are several aspects of South African practice which Australia could well adapt or even emulate.

Mr. Hopgood: I find that difficult to agree with!

Mr. EVANS: At least they are doing these things to help their aboriginal inhabitants, which is not the case in this country.

Mr. Keneally: Come off it!

Mr. EVANS: Professor Tatz continued:

Two are dealt with in this paper: education and land rights for the indigenous populations. A third, which I have no space for, is South Africa's recognition of what is there called a code of native law and custom, a separate segment of law but one recognized and upheld in special courts.

There are three areas which the apartheid situation covers but which are not covered in this State, and that reflects on present and past Governments. The member for Stuart says that apartheid is completely wrong. We do not live in South Africa, and, if we did, we might find that there was no other alternative to the problem. I am referring to persons that have the same attitude as the Minister of Education, namely, that it may be a good thing to stir up strife within the community so that a communist element may be able to gain control.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member has said that, if people had the same attitude as I had, they would stir up trouble so that the communist element could gain control. I take that as a reflection on me and ask him to withdraw the remark.

The SPEAKER: As the Minister has taken exception to the remark, the honourable member must withdraw it.

Mr. EVANS: I did not call the Minister a Communist, Sir. However, I will withdraw my remark. I ask honourable members to take note of the type of comment that is made against members in this House, and I hope that the remark I was asked to withdraw or any similar remark made by any other member regarding the League of Rights or any other group in this State will be subject to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I made the statement because I thought it was worth the test. Although I did not intend to speak on this aspect, I did so as the South African situation may have deeper implications than most of us realize. Some people would think that those with communistic beliefs naturally have a different ideology to that of most Australians and that they would attempt to gain control of various situations.

As the Minister of Education is present in the Chamber, I should like now to refer to

an aspect of education about which I and many others are concerned: the militant groups that are teaching in our schools and, more often, in our universities. I refer to these people not because I object to them as individuals or because I object to their line of thinking but because they have an effect on the overall education system and the attitude of the community thereto, particularly towards our universities. The member for Stuart rightly said that the members of the teaching staffs of these institutions should be entitled to speak up and to teach what they consider it is right to teach, and that the students should develop their own attitudes of mind towards society from what they are taught.

On the same basis, I say it is my right and, indeed, the right of my colleagues to stand up in this Chamber and try to protect the reputation of our universities from the effects that these groups of militant people are having upon them. There can be no justification for our universities being disrupted at a cost to the general public, which in many cases is paying the bills to enable these people, who become so militant, to teach our young people. Why should these people be permitted to say that they will not teach because they do or do not believe in Vietnam, or because they believe in the Australian Labor Party and not the Liberal and Country League or vice versa? Why should disruptions such as these, which have brought such disrespect to our education system, be permitted?

The member for Stuart also referred to protestors and protest marches. How can we in this Parliament command the respect of the community when we permit persons to camp on the steps of Parliament House? I know that you, Sir, did everything in your power to have protestors remove signs from Parliament House when they were camping there. However, they would abide by your decision for only 10 or 15 minutes and then they would replace the signs in their original positions. Also, how can a member of Parliament command respect when he must walk up the steps of Parliament House in front of persons shouting "Heil Hitler"?

Members interjecting:

Mr. Jennings: Did you criticize Tommy Stott? He was your Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders provide that members are to speak without being interrupted. I warn honourable members that I will not tolerate any further interjections.

Mr. EVANS: Thank you, Sir. In case there is any misunderstanding, I was not taking you, Sir, to task because of any action you have taken. What I said was that you had done everything in your power to try to control the people on the steps of Parliament House. However, members of both Houses of Parliament may have to consider whether there is a method of controlling the actions that take place on the front steps of this Parliament.

I should like now to refer to education. There is one fault in our education system that cannot be overcome quickly. However, eventually time will tell and experience will prove it desirable that students who wish to become teachers should, at the end of their secondary or tertiary education, spend 12 months or two years working in another field. I do not know how teachers can be fully effective when all they have known is the classroom. These people have had to be in the classroom from kindergarten, through primary and high school and then during their tertiary education, after which, as teachers, they must return to the classroom once more. All they know is what they have been told by people who have passed through the same process and what they have read in textbooks. Eventually, when that system is changed, we will have better teachers. Of course, I realize that, as a result of the shortage of teachers, we cannot make the change at present.

I wish to refer now to maintenance orders, a subject that was raised in the press recently. The member for Stuart spoke of the Commonwealth Government's alleged lack of interest in pensioners, but I do not agree with him.

Mr. Keneally: What I said was—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to warn honourable members again. If the member for Stuart interjects again, he will be dealt with. He has had the opportunity to speak. I have warned honourable members that they are not to interject. The member for Fisher will continue without interruption.

Mr. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Commonwealth Government may be responsible for age pensions and pensions in general, but one responsibility that is within the State Government's field is collecting maintenance payments and ensuring that they are regularly sent to deserted wives and divorcees in our community. For the Attorney-General to say that \$300,000 is too great an expense for this State to bear in providing that service is ludicrous. When we receive the Auditor-General's Report for this year there is every

possibility it will show that for the Premier's Department alone there has been an increase in expenditure of over \$300,000. In view of the additional staff members in that department, the increase in expenditure may be nearer \$550,000 or \$600,000. How can the Government increase such expenditure to that extent yet not be willing to spend \$300,000 to supply this service to these deserted people? Such people are not better off than pensioners are. In order that Government members may realize that this problem exists in our community, I shall quote several letters. One states:

It is bad enough when a marriage fails and the problems that arrive after separation, but to have added to this a heavy financial burden through no fault of one's own is more than one can take, and is doubly hard when you have three sons and a daughter to have to put a brave face on for all the time.

The following letter relates to a divorcee with two sons:

Had I not witnessed first hand the incompetent way the Social Welfare Department attempts to handle an order of our law courts, I just would not believe it.

That woman has waited for \$1,100. What hope has she of enjoying a reasonable standard of living? Another letter from such a person is as follows:

I, too, am in a similar situation—perhaps a little worse—having to wholly depend on my husband to remember us once a week. As yet I do not receive a deserted wife's pension but myself and three small children just live on maintenance. This week, however, he has sent us only half our usual amount, and I can tell you it is absolutely heartbreaking.

Those letters were not written by people in my own district, but they were written in response to a newspaper article of last Monday. However, there are people in my own area who are \$200 or \$300 behind in their maintenance payments. Any Government should accept this area of responsibility. After I became a member of Parliament I started to receive setbacks as I tried to negotiate on behalf of needy people. I realized that there was only one area where the responsibility could lie. Even if my own Party was in Government now, I would take the same attitude. Members of the last Liberal Government know that during that Government's term of office I had already started to push for this matter to be dealt with. I am not raising it now simply because a Labor Government is in power.

I wish to refer now to one person for whom I was negotiating with the Social Welfare Department. Maintenance money was paid

into a police station after a warrant for arrest had been issued; the payment was made towards the end of a week on about the 28th of the month (I think it was June). A cheque was then sent from the police station to the court early in the following month. In practice, the court officials do not send such cheques to the Social Welfare Department until the end of the month. Then, if the department receives such a payment after a Tuesday it has to wait until the following week. So, it can take six weeks for a needy person to receive a maintenance payment after that payment has been first handed to the authorities. When I raised this matter with the Social Welfare Department it was co-operative and forwarded the money promptly to the needy person, and I appreciate the help given. The officers of that department are tearing their hair out in trying to solve the problems associated with maintenance orders.

The Attorney-General said that, because in some cases the Commonwealth Government helps these people, if the State Government accepted responsibility the Commonwealth Government would not have to accept it. He spoke as though that would be a crime. Whose money are we spending to help these people? It is the money of the people of Australia! That is where it comes from. It is the responsibility of the large majority who are not in such an unfortunate position, and that responsibility must be met through Commonwealth or State taxation. It is no good saying, as the member for Stuart says, that the Commonwealth Government is the only Government from which we can get this money. The money is not coming from the Commonwealth Government: it is coming from the people, and it is time we realized that.

The Attorney-General's replies to my questions on this matter are available for all to read, but there is one disappointing aspect. One hesitates to say that perhaps the press sometimes takes the wrong approach. The heading in today's *Advertiser* is "46 Men Gaoled on Maintenance". Whose side are we on? Perhaps some people are thinking that these men should be glorified for evading maintenance payments and eventually serving a gaol sentence. Perhaps we should be heading such articles from what is contained in the Minister's reply, namely, "3,200 of the Accounts are in Arrears". Are we saying that it does not matter that some of these women have children whom they are trying to educate and give

similar opportunities to those enjoyed by other children in society? Are we saying that we are not out to help these women but that we are holding up the men as idols?

The headline referring to the 46 men being gaoled could be designed to frighten some men who have not kept up maintenance payments and, if that was the intention behind it, I apologize for what I have said. However, the other side of the picture is that many people are not up to date in their payments. Of course, many of the group of 3,200 to whom I have referred are behind by only a small sum; I suppose that is the only good thing one can say about it. The Minister said that there were about 5,000 current accounts and that the overall increase in the number of maintenance orders handled by the department during the last three years had been about 11½ per cent each year. I believe we can expect even greater increases in the future, in view of present attitudes in society, but I will not go into that; individuals must make their own decisions.

Pollution of the environment has been referred to. We must all realize how important this subject is to the future of the world and of mankind. I suppose the real problem is that there is a human plague; there is no other way to put it. All the animals, birds and beasts of the world would be completely justified in blaming human beings for the position that the world is in. However, sometimes we tend to hit the fields that we think we can hit without being hit ourselves, one of these fields being the mining industry. Those involved in this are the people who conduct the mines and the conservationists, and they must co-operate and work together, otherwise little will be achieved, with members of Parliament needing to make more decisions about regulations and controls. The old extractive industries which were used up to a century ago to produce clay and so on and which in many cases were close to the city, once they had been worked out were then used as receptacles for the disposal of filth and garbage produced in the city. Many buildings now stand on refuse and human waste fillings. Therefore, the holes created in the past by extractive industries have become valuable and are still valuable (until we find another disposal method) as places in which to dispose of human garbage and waste.

At the same time, conservationists ask us to contribute (although we cannot contribute to all worthy causes, it is good to help those that we can) towards preserving, for instance, the old mining buildings at Burra, and I think

they are right in doing this. Those who have the opportunity should help so that as many of these old buildings as possible can be preserved. Have we gone right around in a full circle so that, on the one hand, people condemn all mining and, on the other hand, people say we should preserve some of the old relics of the previous mining boom in specific areas? Environmental change is not always harmful to society. If we examine our community, we will see that some changes that have taken place have benefited us, as human beings: they have been to the benefit of our society. As there is money in mining, it is of economic value, as I think most Government members appreciate, although some of them will be thinking of the return that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited or some other company makes from mining. However, paragraph 8 of the Governor's Speech refers to the assets of the mining industry and its importance to the State as follows:

The value of minerals produced in South Australia for the year 1970 exceeded \$104,000,000, which is an all-time record, the increase over the previous year being 6 per cent.

Later in that paragraph, the Speech states that the exploration for minerals is still proceeding at an unprecedented rate. Therefore, we have not slowed down our efforts to discover minerals in any way, and I believe that it would be wrong to slow down. However, if mineral resources that appear to be economical to operate are found, now is the time when we must balance in our minds whether it is worth developing those resources or leaving the country as it is. If there is something unique about an area in the way of its plant or animal life, or if it has something of scientific or educational value, we must balance this against its possible importance as a wealthy mine. We must make that decision. Not only mining companies have this responsibility: the Government, through the Mines Department, is also responsible.

We must not be emotional and just wipe out all mining. Those who take that attitude, believing that mining is harmful to the community, will often speak about pollution while smoking a pipe, whether or not they are in a closed room. They will do this at a meeting, never caring whether someone else has to put up with the inconvenience. They will leave the meeting, saying that we must stop pollution, and drive home in their motor car, which is made of materials that have come from a mine. They have sat at a table

which, whether it is made of wood or metal, comprises natural materials taken from the environment. I point out that only .4 per cent of the land surface area of Australia is subject to mining lease, and some of the areas under lease will never be mined. Only a small part of the areas under lease is actually mined, because companies do not mine the whole of any lease. In addition, less than half of the mining leases in Australia are being worked. Less than 10 per cent of mined mineral leases are subject to surface disturbance, and from that area comes 25 per cent of Australia's export production.

When we consider this in the light of how much surface area is disturbed, we find it is not a great price to pay. By this I am not saying we should not have controls, even rigid controls, where necessary to preserve as much of the environment as possible. In fact, the area disturbed by mining is only 1 per cent of the area occupied by roads. The member for Mawson quoted Mr. Charles Court. I will quote him, too. He is reported as saying that, without our mineral development, we would now be a country on the verge of bankruptcy. I think that is worth remembering.

Just for the record for those who believe that the mining industry is the biggest spoiler and raper of our environment, our natural herbage, flora and fauna, let me say that there is a greater surface area of Australia covered by licensed places and associated car parks than is affected overall by the mining industry and its associated plant; also, more surface area is affected by urban development each year than is affected overall by the mining industry. Those are things we should be aware of, too.

Those people on the land in the rural sector at times talk rather disgruntledly of the effect of mining on their community. Let us look at the Mallee country and what would happen there if we did not have the mining industry and its production of phosphates, sulphur, copper, zinc and molybdenum; they are products of the mining industry that benefit the primary producer. We are all interdependent, whether one is a city worker and dweller with his own home, transport and means of recreation, or whether one is a rural producer, a mine worker or a person engaged in company management; we are all an essential part of the society in which we live.

One other facet of this matter is the attitude of people themselves. Here, I come to deal with the national parks and the effects on the

catchment areas of controls imposed and the creation of a regional park. However, before I deal with that, I refer to the comments of the member for Mawson on the native birds and animals that have been destroyed and are now extinct as far as this State is concerned. He referred to about 10 species and many other reptiles, lizards and birds. Their destruction is not only the fault of land clearing. What has happened is that we brought the fox with us to Australia, and many ground birds indigenous to the Adelaide Hills have now disappeared. In essence, there are only one or two species of birds that inhabit the trees. The basic ground birds have gone.

We brought with us the domestic cat, which has now become a problem to our native birds and small animals. Cats are wild in many parts of the State. People came and developed the National Park for the recreation of other human beings; but those other human beings have used it for rather irresponsible recreation. The National Park has been used mainly as a playground for the city people. When they are there, they leave fires that can spread. The creatures that the member for Mawson speaks about (the animals, lizards and birds) have all gone; they have been destroyed. The people who go to the National Park break down native shrubs; in other words, they completely destroy the environment, the very thing we are trying to preserve by keeping it in its natural state.

I do not think we can really preserve it: we can only conserve. Preservation has gone out of the window; we can only conserve as much as possible. An example will be in the Cherry Gardens and Dorset Vale area, where the previous Government started a proposition that this Government, through the Town and Country Planning Association, is continuing—to develop a regional park of about 1,600 acres. It will be developed for recreation purposes. What sort of recreation? Are we to open it up and put roads through it and barbecues in it on which people can cook their lamb or beef? What are we going to do with it?

If it is to be left in its natural state as much as possible, we shall have to fence it completely and say to human beings, "Hands off!" If we do not do that, we shall have the same situation there as we have in other national parks where the park keepers are at a loss to know how to control human activities. (Perhaps I should use the expression "destructive human activities.") In the National

Park at Belair, at the main entrance from the Waverley Ridge end of Upper Sturt, the gate has been closed because a survey was taken by the park officials and it was found, on an examination of the traffic going through the park, that local people were using it as a short cut. A time study was made of how long it took to go through the park, and it was found that, instead of staying within the prescribed speed limit in the park, many vehicles were travelling at more than twice the maximum permitted speed. It means that those people at the other end of the park who wish to go into the park and enjoy its benefits cannot do so unless they drive two or three miles around the park to the next gate.

Surely, the park is there for the benefit of people, and for the benefit of people living on the Waverley Ridge side as well as for the benefit of people living on the Belair side; but I do not condemn the park keepers or those who control the park. I believe the time has arrived when we should be charging people for admission to our national parks to help pay for the services of those we employ to help protect the facilities provided. If this were done, it would be mainly those who got to enjoy the parks who would use them. This would do away with much of the rat-bag element. That term may be a little harsh, because some of the people who show little consideration in their use of the park facilities and for local government recreation areas are responsible citizens, but they do not stop to think. They see something that attracts them and, whether it is a shrub or a flower, they must take it home and show it to a friend, who will tell them what it is. They may also think that they have extinguished their fire, but an hour later it may re-ignite. In the main, they are people who have not been educated to respect the environment or the facilities provided.

Connected with the problem of pollution is the control of catchment areas. I have said before that the present regulations covering subdivisions are all right for the time being, but eventually the regulations regarding the 20-acre subdivision limit will have to be changed. Any member who represents a Hills area is no doubt familiar with the problem of non-ratable property and of property acquired by Government departments to supply services or to show a profit from forestry to the benefit of the State—services that otherwise

could not be supplied. Local government in the Hills area this year must think in terms of up to a 30 per cent increase in rates. Part of this is caused by the failure of Government departments to supply fire breaks around national parks and other Government-owned land. I do not include the Engineering and Water Supply Department in this criticism, because that department provides effective fire breaks around its property.

A regional park in the hundred of Noarlunga, in the Cherry Gardens and Dorset Vale area, contains 1,600 acres of non-ratable land. Surely it is the Government's responsibility to reimburse the council for part of its loss of rates. I have made this criticism of my own Government. This is a responsibility we must accept as a community because, if we want the services of any Government department or if we want good quality water, we must be willing to pay the price.

Mention has been made in this debate of Commonwealth Government and State Government responsibilities, the 40-hour week, the 35-hour week, compulsory unionism, political Parties and the church paper *The Central Times*. If any political Party or politician is sincere in believing that there is insufficient money to supply the services that the community is demanding, he should stand up and say that the only way to achieve it is for all of us to work harder. I do not care whether it is the managing director who is out playing golf or sailing his yacht four afternoons a week, whether the next executive down the line of authority is over the road at the "local" spending half an hour more than he should spend at lunch, or whether the next one down the line is playing cards with three of his mates: it means that the rest down the line wonder why they should work harder and try to help the country or their group, whether it be a Government department or private enterprise, and why they should carry the people to whom I have referred. This can start at the top, and it can start at the bottom.

If there is a shortage of money, we must create more effort. If we believe that the age pensioner deserves a greater pension, let us work towards that end. As a result of the generosity of the Commonwealth Government in helping the State, we recently had a favourable balance of \$20,000 in the Treasury, after allowing \$500,000 for retrospective pay to teachers, whereas the Commonwealth Government had a deficit of \$75,000,000. That money

has gone. Some people would say that we should not have spent so much on defence, but that was a decision made by a Government elected by the people. The same thing could be said of my criticism of the expenditure on the Premier's Department and of the substantial increase that will come about. If the Premier can justify it, all right, but why cannot the same argument be used in regard to the maintenance payments being made by the department of the Minister of Social Welfare? Everyone should be working harder and we should be achieving greater things. Australia is worth working for.

Many people believe that the argument about compulsory unionism is a hot potato today, especially because by the compulsory signing of the paper the person is bound to an affiliation to a political Party in which he may not believe; that is the biggest hindrance to many prospective unionists. I was pleased to hear the member for Playford say he believed that a move could be made to have this action declared unlawful and that this could be achieved. I hope that most members in this Parliament and in the trade union movement, especially the leaders, also believe this. I believe it is important in our society that we should protect the freedom of the individual.

Some time ago, I was given a copy of the rules of a certain organization. I shall read some of them, and ask members and people in the community to say whether the rules have any comparison within our society today. To achieve what this group wishes we are told:

Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness.

Get control of all means of publicity and thereby:

1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.
2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.
3. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding the latter up to contempt, ridicule and obloquy.
4. Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.
5. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.
6. Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient, and soft attitude on the part of government towards such disorders.

These are some of the rules, picked up in 1919, of the Communists for revolution. I ask members to look within our own society (not members of Parliament, but members of the community) to see whether this is happening, to see whether we have militant groups in our society that are out to disrupt and to see whether we have people who say they want peace, but only when it reflects an attitude against the Commonwealth Government. We should see also whether they mention these things in relation to other countries that have been suppressed by Communist aggression. Let us see whether they are honest in their approach, whether they have convinced some of our Church leaders that they should take a semi-political attitude.

To me it does not matter, but some of the people in my district are asking where the benefit lies if they are to be plagued with the same kind of comment every Sunday. I do not think there is much of this element in my district, but in other places I visit when I attend special functions I have been told that it will only harm the Church, and the basis of our society is Christianity. It is important that as far as possible the Church should keep away from any Party or semi-Party affiliation. It is important for our society and for our Church as a whole. It does not matter to political Parties; they can be destroyed, and they can and will destroy for personal or for Party gain. If people in the community are not very careful they will be manipulated, and unfortunately manipulated to harm the organizations we believe so important to our way of life.

I refer now to land tax as it applies to land in the hills, and to those areas now exempt under section 12c of the Land Tax Act because the price is affected by potential subdivision. I believe there is now more property affected by low productivity because of wet conditions, cold conditions, and low prices, and that this section of the Act should be extended. Perhaps the wording of the section should be changed to give the Treasurer or the Commissioner power to exempt further lands in the near-Hills area. These lands are all close to the metropolitan area and many of them have been affected badly, to the extent that council and land tax rates are costing up to \$2 an acre a year. I trust that the Treasurer will examine this matter to find out whether the Act can be extended and, in particular, whether the area mentioned can be extended. For the information of the Minister of Education, I want to read from the annual report of the Specific Learning

Difficulties Association of South Australia Incorporated. In that report the President states:

The President, two Vice-Presidents and Secretary were asked to wait upon the Minister of Education to present him with the findings of the Raywood conference, and to ask him to use his good offices on behalf of our members. The meeting was eventually arranged for February 11, 1971. The Minister gave our deputation a good hearing, assured us of his sympathy with our aims, and promised to arrange a meeting between our deputation and a select committee elected from among officers of the Education Department, but warned of the Government's financial difficulties. Unfortunately, the matter seems to have ended there for the moment. Repeated requests to the Minister to honour his agreement to arrange a conference with members of his department have been fruitless and it would appear that more direct efforts may be forced upon us to secure educational justice for the children we represent.

I mention that only so that the Minister will know of the concern of the group that is looking after these children who have specific learning difficulty, and I ask the Minister to arrange the meeting referred to at an early date. I support the motion.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I, too, support the motion and, in doing so, I first congratulate the new member for Adelaide on the excellent job he did in moving the motion. The honourable member has shown, in his two speeches since being elected to this House, that he is an acquisition to this place. I also express to His Excellency my appreciation for the good job he did in presenting his Speech at the opening of this Parliament. His Excellency's job was made much easier by the excellent legislative proposals that the Government has put forward.

Before I deal with several paragraphs in the Speech, I join previous speakers in expressing my condolences to the relatives of these former members of the South Australian Parliament: the Hon. Sir Collier Robert Cudmore, the Hon. Colin Davies Rowe, Mr. John Cowan, and particularly my old friend and colleague Mr. Sam Lawn, who was so well known to us in this House and whose sterling qualities members on both sides appreciated. As I have said, we have a worthy successor to Mr. Sam Lawn in Mr. Jack Wright. Paragraph 5 of the Speech states:

The Government is actively pursuing its policy to promote development of industry within the State. Agencies of the Government have been appointed in Tokyo, Singapore, Hong Kong and Djakarta, as well as a roving trade officer in each of the Northern European and South-East Asian zones.

That is typical of the present Government's positive policy in developing South Australia's export industries, seeing that the products of those industries are sold to appropriate markets, and developing new markets. Of particular interest is the present oversea trip being made by the Premier, who, despite what some members have said, has done much to promote South Australia in that area. I, as the representative in this House of the largest citrus-growing area in the State and one of the major citrus-producing areas in Australia, was particularly interested in the report in the *Advertiser* of July 21, headed, "First step in S.A. citrus sales to Japan". That report states:

The Premier of South Australia (Mr. Dunstan) said today that the major breakthrough of his Japanese visit was the prospect of exporting citrus fruit, particularly oranges, to Japan. Japan before has always treated Australia as a whole when dealing with citrus fruit, he said. New South Wales, Western Australia and Queensland have fruit fly, so the Japanese have not been prepared to accept Australian citrus. Despite this, he had managed to gain Japanese approval of separate treatment for South Australia. Provided that the State could guarantee it was free from fruit fly, and produce acceptable treatments for killing any type of infestation, the import of citrus from South Australia would be recommended to the Japanese Government, Mr. Dunstan said.

We know from the reaction of citrus growers in the River districts that these growers welcome the Premier's announcement of the breakthrough as far as the citrus industry is concerned. All members are aware that at present the citrus industry throughout Australia is going through a difficult time, as are most other primary industries. Unfortunately, the Premier's announcement has not received the full approval of the Secretary of the Australian Citrus Growers Federation (Mr. H. W. King), who is a former member of this place. Mr. King, in a comment reported in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, July 24, makes rather derogatory comments about the Premier in achieving this breakthrough for South Australian citrus, in particular, on the Japanese market. Although Mr. King is also Secretary of the Australian Citrus Growers Council, the Commonwealth body, he is a South Australian and has been associated with the industry in this State in many respects. I consider that he should take a rather more lenient attitude to the Premier's announcement of his success in Japan in this respect. I do not know whether Mr. King's present opinions are coloured by his political outlook.

Paragraph 7 of the Governor's Speech states:

My Government is aware that many problems associated with pollution, conservation and our environment, can be solved by sound town and regional planning. The State Planning Authority will continue with the preparation of development plans for towns and regions throughout the State and my Government proposes to introduce legislation to amend the Planning and Development Act. As the River districts will be affected by regional development and the planning of tourist and similar facilities, the Government's proposal will be appreciated by residents of my district. Paragraph 12 states:

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

An Aboriginal reserve is situated at Gerard in my district, with many Aborigines living on that reserve and others residing in the various towns. They will appreciate the Government's action, as will the people who need additional social welfare assistance. The question of legislation to control powered pleasure craft was discussed fully several years ago but, unfortunately, the proposal was not proceeded with. The Government now intends to introduce a measure for this purpose during the present session. The Government also intends to extend legislation dealing with the sale of used motor cars and with door-to-door sales. These measures are necessary because of the numerous complaints that we, as members, receive from people who have been misled, and I welcome the introduction of this legislation. Concerning land tax, the Government intends to have a revaluation made of primary-producing land in order to consider further the needs of primary producers.

On behalf of all primary producers in this State I welcome that move, although my district is not affected greatly by the incidence of land tax. Most landholders, particularly fruit-growers, are exempt from this tax if they apply for the exemption. With the appointment of an additional Minister, there has been a rearrangement of departments under the control of several Ministers, and the Minister for Conservation and Minister assisting the Premier is doing an excellent job. I have had the pleasure of receiving him on two recent visits to my district, and I am sure that he has gained much knowledge of conditions in the Riverland area and that this knowledge will benefit him during the coming months when conservation legislation will be considered by this Parliament. During the closing stages of the last session the Citrus Industry Organization Act was amended and a new committee

appointed. I said then that I hoped that this committee would be able to bring together all sections of the industry with the prime object of ensuring that growers obtained an economic return for their produce.

I understand there have been many conferences and discussions between the committee and various sections of the industry but, unfortunately, full agreement has not been reached for all sections to co-operate in one large selling organization. Off-shoot selling organizations still retain their marketing ability. I am not advocating that it should be compulsory for all sections to be organized into one selling organization, but I think that that system would benefit all sections, because there would be more co-ordination of sales and supplies to the various markets. With fewer selling outlets it would be possible to control the price that could be obtained in the markets. The Citrus Organization Committee has embarked on a major programme of export development, and I hope that the future of the industry will be assured by this programme, which has been and will be developed in the coming months.

Another industry that is having problems is the wine-grape growing industry. These problems have been caused by the imposition in the last Commonwealth Budget of the iniquitous wine tax, an excise on wine produced in the wineries throughout Australia. As the tax is levied at the source, those who handle the wine on its way to the final retail seller can add their margin of profit, so that the selling price has been increased markedly when the wine is sold. If sales tax were imposed at the point of sale, the middle man would not have had the opportunity to put his margin on the product. Statistics strongly indicate that there has been a decline in sales, but the most injurious effect in my district, where the co-operatives produce large quantities of bulk wine, has been a falling off in forward sales of bulk wine to the bottlers (the people who bottle wine and put their own labels on the bottle).

Although this has not shown up in the statistics, it has certainly shown up in the affairs of the various co-operatives, and in one case there has been an actual decline in sales of 48 per cent. Forward sales apply two years ahead in some cases, and the effect on them is alarming. I sincerely trust that the evidence advanced by all sections of the industry to bring to the Commonwealth Government's notice the injurious effects of this

tax will, in fact, influence the Commonwealth Treasurer when compiling his next Budget. We have been assured by the Commonwealth member for Angas through a press statement that the matter is being considered by the Commonwealth Treasury and, with wine-grape growers in my district, I sincerely hope that the Commonwealth Government will, in its wisdom, see fit to remove this tax entirely so that the one primary industry that has not been seeking subsidies over the past few years to keep it on an economic footing will be allowed to continue with its orderly progress and economic operation.

One matter that has excited some honourable members opposite in recent weeks, causing the member for Eyre to interject continually, concerns the Chowilla dam. As all members are aware, the legislation amending the River Murray Waters Agreement to include a provision for constructing the Dartmouth dam, and also providing for South Australia to retain the right to the construction of the Chowilla dam, was passed by this House and by another place without any amendment or opposition. Following the passage of that amending legislation, the relevant information was conveyed to the other Governments concerned, and various Ministerial conferences were held. However, this State is still awaiting a decision from those Governments. I have been accused by the member for Eyre of promising that we would build the Chowilla dam.

Mr. Venning: That's right.

Mr. CURREN: I should like to disabuse the member for Eyre, the member for Rocky River and others who apparently have this idea, for I have never made that promise.

Mr. Venning: You signed the pledge, though, didn't you?

Mr. Hopgood: What pledge?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Your Leader is on record as saying that he would go and dig it with his own hands.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously stated this afternoon that members must be heard uninterrupted, and I shall continue to enforce that Standing Order, no matter from which side of the House the member is speaking.

Mr. CURREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not mind if members opposite say a word or two occasionally.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to the debate and not try to provoke interjections. The honourable member for Chaffey.

Mr. CURREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker; my apologies for straying from the matter under discussion. The only promise that I or this Government made was that we would continue to fight to retain South Australia's legal and moral right to construct the Chowilla dam at some future date, and I have never expressed opposition to the Dartmouth dam. I agree with all other members of this House that it is essential that we obtain one of these dams soon and the other one at a later date. I am still firmly convinced that the Chowilla dam is necessary for South Australia and, with other Government members, I will continue to fight for South Australia's rights in this respect.

I, like many other people, am especially interested in the action being taken by this Government, through the Minister of Works, in introducing regulations to control building activities and development along and close to the Murray River to ensure that the river will not be polluted. A statement was made, I think last week, about the Government's intentions in this matter, and the reaction to that statement in the River districts has been extremely favourable. I sought from local government leaders and other citizens their views on the statement made by the Minister of Works on this matter, and they all expressed their full support of the Government's action. I believe that this prompt action by the Government will ensure that Australia's one and only large river, which is of such vital importance not only to South Australia but also to other States, will not be polluted as major rivers have been polluted on other continents, especially North America and Europe.

Another matter that is receiving much attention in the Riverland area is the development of tourism and tourist facilities to cater for any visitors to the area. The Riverland Tourist Association, which has only recently been formed, has received massive support from all sections of the community, particularly those interested in local government and in the development of tourist facilities. The annual meeting of this organization, which was held at the Berri Hotel last Saturday night, was attended by the Minister for Conservation and Minister Assisting the Premier (Hon. G. R. Broomhill), representing the Premier, who is also the Minister in charge of tourism. The meeting was also attended by local government leaders from all Riverland areas, as well as by the Director of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau,

The Government's interest in the development of tourist facilities not only in the River-

land area but also in other areas of the State is well known, and much financial support in the form of subsidies from the Tourist Bureau has been and will continue to be given for the development not only of caravan parks but also of recreation areas, national parks and any other areas that can be used to attract and entertain tourists. The matter of conservation is also of particular interest to me. Like other members, I deplore the destruction of our fauna, particularly when it is realized that all the animals that are at present being shot because they are considered pests are species unique to Australia that could, therefore, be exported to zoological gardens as well as to private persons overseas, thereby providing this country with a valuable source of export income. I refer particularly to the wombats, which are apparently causing much damage in certain West Coast areas.

At various times kangaroos have been declared pests, and permits have been issued for the destruction of many thousands of them. The meat from the kangaroos destroyed in this manner can be exported in cans as pet food. However, I should like to see these animals exported live, and I trust that a scheme a little better than that of issuing permits to destroy these unique animals will be worked out in the future. We should be able to control these animals in a more humane manner than by shooting them or bashing them on the head.

I have listened to many members, both Government and Opposition, who have spoken in this debate, one of whom (the member for Alexandra) was a little off beat and did not speak in accordance with the facts. He made some rather scathing remarks about there being no mention in the Governor's Speech of how the Government intended to raise the additional revenue that it said was needed. It seemed to me strange that the honourable member should complain about this matter, so I took the liberty of obtaining copies of the Speeches made by the then Governor when opening the 1968 and 1969 sessions of Parliament. I defy anyone to find in those two Speeches any reference to the Government's intention to raise revenue or to impose any particular tax.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And the honourable member was a member of the Cabinet at that time.

Mr. CURREN: I was about to make that point. It therefore seems rather strange that he should complain about this Government's not indicating what revenue-raising measures

will be introduced. The Government has indicated that it will be necessary to raise additional revenue, but it has not spoken about this in detail. However, my point is that in 1967, although no reference was made about raising additional revenue or about any revenue-raising measure, in that year State taxes and charges were increased by about 17 per cent, and included in those additional revenues was the iniquitous receipts tax, which was introduced by the then Government. As honourable members know, this was a tax on the gross income of primary producers which did not take into account the profitability of an undertaking or any of the expenses thereof. That tax was subsequently declared non-collectable and, much to the relief of this State's primary producers, has since been discontinued.

During the last few weeks many letters have been published in the daily press about the changing of electoral districts and election figures. Indeed, even two members of Parliament have sent in letters. One such letter, which was published on July 2, was written by Mr. Stan Evans, the Opposition Whip of the South Australian House of Assembly, who accused the Country Party of handing Chaffey to the Labor Party. That letter was followed a day later by one from the member for Flinders, Mr. Carnie, who made exactly the same statement. Those two letters, containing their great words of wisdom, were followed on July 8 by a letter from Mr. H. A. Schultz, of Lowbank. That town is in my district. Because I have not met Mr. Schultz, I do not know his political affiliation. However, I wholeheartedly agree with his letter, headed "Loss of Chaffey", which is as follows:

Sir—Why did the L.C.L. lose Chaffey? Was it, as Messrs. Evans (July 2) and Carnie (July 3) would have us believe, the result of "Country Party interference"?

Rubbish! The plain fact is the L.C.L. won Chaffey in 1968 by promising to build the Chowilla dam, and lost the seat in 1970 by abandoning that promise. It's as simple as that.

Perhaps Country Party preferences robbed the L.C.L. of victory? Once again the answer is "No", for most C.P. preferences did in fact go to the L.C.L. candidate. Chaffey was not given to Labor by the Country Party. It was given to Labor by the people of Chaffey.

After the distribution of preferences following the 1959 State election, Mr. King was elected with a majority of 1,110 votes, out of a total poll of slightly less than 8,000 votes. The 1962 election was a straightout contest between Mr. King and me. The result, which was considerably different, was a majority of 15 for me;

that pleased me greatly. That should show members opposite that there was no Country Party interference in that election, as there was a fairly big swing from the previous result, reflecting the disillusionment that people had experienced with the Liberal and Country League. In the 1965 election there was a big percentage increase in my majority—600 per cent. Actually, my majority increased from 15 votes to 100 votes. Unfortunately, the result in the 1968 election was not in my favour. However, in 1970, as Mr. Schultz pointed out, I regained the seat for the Labor Party and I am now very happy to be here representing the Chaffey District. I was born in that district and I have lived there for most of my life. I support the motion.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the motion but I must confess that I do not do so with much enthusiasm. It is a matter of form to support the motion; I am unenthusiastic because of what was contained in the Speech, which was prepared by Cabinet. Nothing that I heard in the speeches of Government members has changed my thinking in this regard. Last night the member for Elizabeth told the House that he had been a member for many years; in fact only two members of Parliament had served for a longer period than he had. The honourable member spoke for about 40 minutes, and for half of that time he spoke in derogatory terms about the speeches of Opposition members. I would have thought that a member who had been here for so long would have given a copybook speech as an example to new members.

It was significant that last night the honourable member wore the correct colours: he wore a red tie. However, today he is wearing a blue tie, which makes one wonder just where he stands. Of course, the honourable member did not speak about his own colleagues in derogatory terms. I wish to refer particularly to the comments he made about the member for Mitcham, who made an excellent speech. Because of the comments of the member for Elizabeth, I am sure that in future any hope that the Government or the member for Elizabeth may have of getting support from the member for Mitcham in connect on with one vote one value will be groundless.

I pay a tribute to those members who are no longer with us, particularly those who died

in office. The late Hon. Colin Rowe, a member of the Legislative Council, gave yeoman service to the State. Furthermore, he was the solicitor associated with South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. He saw that organization grow from its infancy in 1955. I appreciated my association with the late Mr. Rowe not only as a member of the Legislative Council but as a person associated with the co-operative.

I, too, regret the passing of the late Mr. Lawn. Last night the member for Elizabeth had much to say about him, and I concur with his remarks. When Mr. Lawn carried out his duties as Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker, his attitude was as straight as a gun barrel. Although he sat on the opposite side of the Chamber, we greatly appreciated his honesty. I am pleased to say that, although we had some differences last year, Mr. Speaker, the situation has improved greatly. I hope that when we look back on the life of this Parliament, we will eventually be able to say that you were an excellent Speaker.

Several honourable gentlemen have died since Parliament last met and to their families I express my condolences. I trust that Sir Thomas Playford, who has been sick in hospital, will make a speedy recovery from his disabilities. At this time one remembers with great appreciation the services rendered to South Australia by Sir Thomas. I remind members opposite that he has been acclaimed as the best Labor Premier to have served South Australia.

Mr. Jennings: You wouldn't support him in that case.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ross Smith has already made his speech. The honourable member for Rocky River must be allowed to make his speech without interruption.

Mr. VENNING: I congratulate the member for Price on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. One remembers the able way in which he carried out his duties, as Acting Chairman, during the previous session, and I know that in future he will continue to perform his duties ably. A fortnight ago, the Governor delivered the Speech prepared by Cabinet outlining details of things to come. This document is a flimsy piece of history. I am amazed that only three lines in paragraph 15 refer to the rural problems, and in this paragraph the Government merely acknowledges that there are rural problems: it says nothing about how it intends to remedy them.

Last week the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated held its annual conference at the showgrounds. I believe this was one of the best conferences that has been staged since the previous organizations were amalgamated. Many years ago the Australian Primary Producers Union had some excellent conferences. The member for Heysen belonged to the Australian Wheat-growers Federation, and I cannot say how successful that organization's conferences were. Since the amalgamation of the two organizations, the conferences have often not been as one would have wished, but the recent conference was one of the best. In view of the way it was carried out, I believe that in future this will be a most effective organization for the primary producers of the State. I attended the conference and was amazed that members of the Labor Party were conspicuous by their absence. Although I am told that the member for Chaffey was there, he must have been hiding somewhere, because I did not see him. The member for Florey said that, if primary producers wanted to solve their problems, they should join the Labor Party. This was an opportunity for Labor members to show their interest in primary producers, but only one Labor member was there other than the Minister of Agriculture, who spent only five minutes there, during which he said a few words, and then he hastily departed.

Today the Labor Party, on a State and Commonwealth basis, is making a successful mess of things. What were once considered avenues in which the Labor Party could do some good for the community have disappeared, and the Party seems to be acting desperately. At present, for no apparent reason, Mr. Whitlam and his Party have placed in jeopardy the possibility of the Australian Wheat Board's selling wheat to the People's Republic of China. I believe the newspapers must take their fair share of the blame for our not making another wheat sale to China at present. In October, 1969, the board was successful in making a large sale of wheat to mainland China. The Chinese reserved the right to increase or decrease their contract with the board by 10 per cent. The facts are that mainland China decided to take an increase of 10 per cent on its original contract. This meant that the delivery of the originally contracted quantity ran on over the 12-month period. It was considered that this was the reason why the Australian Wheat Board was not invited to negotiate another

sale in October last. The newspapers continually highlighted the fact that they were concerned that mainland China might not require Australian wheat in the foreseeable future. They did not refer to this only once, but highlighted the matter continually.

Recently, Gough and his colleagues went to China and made the mess one would have expected. Honourable members know that the board has done a magnificent job over the years, but it may now have difficulty in negotiating future business with China. There is such a thing as nouse, but I am afraid Commonwealth and State members of the Labor Party know nothing about it. The last sale of wheat to mainland China represented about 92,000,000 bushels, the contract being worth about \$100,000,000. Sales of wheat to mainland China have represented about 30 per cent to 40 per cent of the production of this country. The board has been successful in breaking into new markets to the extent that it now appears that total sales will be close to the record sale of 375,000,000 bushels in 1966-67. It is interesting to note that, in 1969-70, 360,000,000 bushels were sold. I sometimes wonder what would be the situation if China wanted to make further purchases of wheat from the board, and I sincerely hope it will make such purchases. A year or two ago, when the board was having a bonanza in arranging sales throughout the world, the countries that were parties to the International Grain Agreement considered that the board was getting more than a fair share of world trade. Consequently, in order to maintain the relationship that existed at this level, I believe the board may have relaxed its activities a little.

It is well for us to remember that, although Australia is the third largest exporter of wheat in the world, we in this country can talk only of our hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat that we can produce, whereas the other two largest exporters of wheat can talk of their thousands of millions of bushels. As a consequence, although we are the third largest exporter of grain, we are really only small fish compared with the other two countries. I view with grave concern the interference of Gough Whitlam and his colleagues in playing politics with the Australian wheat industry, knowing full that the understanding between the Australian Government and the Australian Wheat Board in relation to the People's Republic of China leaves little to be desired.

The wheat quota system has had to be introduced in Australia. I know it has caused

difficulty to many people but it was necessary for our wheat industry that some restriction be placed on wheat production. We must remember that the other wheat exporting countries of the world put a limitation on production, certainly in America, and if we in Australia were permitted to grow wheat willy-nilly, the other great wheat exporting countries would take a very dim view of the situation if we did not try to contain this important industry. So it was necessary to impose quotas in this State. If we reach the stage where quotas are no longer required, I do not think it will be an open go again. Those who have received quotas for wheat will be permitted to increase the wheat they can grow within the present closed industry.

The appeals committee, comprising Messrs. Travers, Quirke and Barrow, stated that they considered that their activities as an appeals committee should continue for another 12 months. That at present does not appeal to me, nor to many other wheatgrowers of the State. One is inclined to feel that these gentlemen are endeavouring to keep something going and to live with it, too. However, unfortunately, they are asking that they be given another contingency reserve of wheat of about 500,000 bushels to continue the scheme. We may or may not remember that it was picked up in the discussion in the House last year that the industry was concerned about the wheat taken from growers to form this contingency reserve. The growers themselves did not agree, and I think the Labor Party played politics with this last year. The advisory committee considered that 250,000 bushels would be sufficient. The appeals committee considered 900,000 bushels was required. A compromise of 500,000 bushels was agreed on by the United Farmers and Graziers and the advisory committee, but the Minister ultimately said the contingency reserve would be 750,000 bushels. It was all very well at the time to have this contingency reserve, but that cannot continue for ever. Surely this committee should be able to rectify what anomalies there were within the industry.

If it asks for another 500,000 bushels to create a contingency reserve, I think it is reaching the stage where all growers will have to appeal against their quotas, or they will finish up with no quota at all. There has been much discussion recently about grain freight rates in this State. As recently as the day before yesterday, we heard the Commissioner of our own South Australian Railways being interviewed on the radio by Mr. John Evans

from the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The Commissioner said what he thought should take place in South Australia with the delivery of grain to receival depots. The grower at present has the right to deliver his grain where he so desires. Some farmers choose to deliver their grain direct to the port terminal; others deliver to the hinterland silo. This is a matter for the grower himself, according to his situation.

After listening the day before yesterday to the Commissioner, I can see what he would like to do. He would like the growers to deliver their grain to silos zoned throughout the State and the South Australian Railways should then proceed with the work of delivering the grain to the terminals. As it has been in the past, probably one-third of the State's production of grain has been delivered direct to the terminals, and the balance to the country storages. However, there are a few problems in this connection. For a start, the railway freights are considerably higher than those of road transport. The Commissioner the day before yesterday was endeavouring to strengthen his case. Not only did he state it on the air but he wrote to the press and also stated it in his own South Australian Railways Journal.

He said he thought that an unfair advantage was being taken by the growers in this regard in by-passing the railways. He said that building sites had been made available by the Railways Department to the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Co., and for this reason he considered that the grain should be delivered by rail. However, the bulk handling company pays rent for the site and, in my opinion, if the grower decides to use anything other than the railways, he is quite justified in doing so, because the company pays rent for the railway site—and that is it. The bulk handling company in most cases has endeavoured to use the State's railways whenever it could. However, there are times when the shipping programme has been heavy and it has been necessary to bring in road transport for moving the grain. In many cases, a comparison of road transport charges with rail charges has shown the former to be very much lower.

I take now the area of Quorn in my zone. The rail freight there is 16.599c a bushel to Port Pirie, a distance of 160 miles. When road transport was used recently to cart some grain from Quorn, the charge was half the rail freight rate and the distance was 75 miles. So, is it any wonder that growers throughout the State are anxious that this should, in special circumstances, be allowed to continue? I say

“in special circumstances” because in the northern part of the State the railway line serving Quorn is cut off from the terminal by the new standard gauge line. Something must be done in the foreseeable future by the Government of the day to come to some determination of what should happen in connection with the Gladstone-Wilmington line and the Peterborough-Quorn line, as far as the narrow gauge railway is concerned. I suppose that it is fair enough to say that, when times were better, the man on the land was not concerned about paying a little extra in rail freight. I suppose that it came off his income tax or that his income was reduced to some extent. However, now the grower needs every cent and the Government must do all that it can to assist him in this regard.

It is interesting to note that the sole bulk handling authority in the State has produced storage for 117,000,000 bushels and that the primary producers in South Australia have provided, by interest-free loan, an amount of \$29,000,000. This is a significant contribution by the growers of the State to provide storage for their products. In terms of the revolving basis that the growers agreed to for these interest-free loans, after the 13th year the growers were to start to get some of their loan back. It is interesting that now, after the 13th year, about \$3,750,000 has been paid back to them.

Yesterday Mr. Grant Andrews, General Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, replied to comments that had been made by the Railways Commissioner, Mr. Fitch, on the previous day and Mr. Andrews rebutted some of the Commissioner's comments. He did not go into great detail on significant points that the Commissioner had raised but, on a broad basis, dealt with what is taking place in South Australia as far as grain producers are concerned. The Commissioner had said that, if he could get the assurance that growers would deliver their grain to the nearest silo, he would be willing to recommend to Cabinet that grain freights in South Australia be reduced by 21 per cent. I do not know whether he thought that this percentage reduction was significant, but it was most insignificant. That is because as recently as April 1 this year grain freights in South Australia were increased by 10 per cent, which was an extremely large increase.

I consider that the Commissioner may not have wished that this be the case and that the

Minister of Roads and Transport recommended to his Government that this was a way to get further revenue for the Government. I have been amazed to read press reports from time to time about how important grain movements have been to respective Governments. We have read that the finances of the State are buoyant at a certain time, and the reason given is that the Railways Department at that time is moving a large amount of grain. I say in conclusion on this aspect that it seems that the wheatgrowers of the State are financing the State Treasury to a large degree.

Mr. McAnaney: That is so that the Railways Department can give cheaper passenger services.

Mr. VENNING: That is right. It is significant that over the radio yesterday Mr. Evans said to the Commissioner, "Why is it that you cart superphosphate at a considerably lower freight a ton than you cart wheat?" Mr. Fitch replied, "We want to encourage growers to grow more wheat and thereby to be able to pick up the freight on the larger amount." That was not a good argument and I think the Commissioner said it with tongue in cheek. I think that if the annual report of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated had been included in His Excellency's Speech, the speech would have been a fairly decent document. In commenting on the problems in industry, Mr. Andrews spoke of rail freights and said that in Canada grain was carted about 1,000 miles for as little as 4c a bushel, compared with a rate of 20c a bushel in Australia for a distance of 150 miles to 200 miles. The Governments of some countries recognize the importance of providing cheap freights to assist the man on the land, and it is particularly necessary in this State to encourage decentralization so that those who are far away from the capital cities will have the advantage of lower costs. This would encourage people to move out to the distant places.

One matter that has concerned primary producers in this State and members on this side of the House is the unimproved land values established by the new Valuation Department that has been set up. I am concerned when I think of the number of persons employed there. I understand the department has about 150 employees, and I wonder what the future holds, with so many of these Government departments being established and the number of staff being engaged.

The unimproved values sent out were totally incorrect. Officers from the Valuation Depart-

ment attended meetings that were held throughout the State and we had much difficulty in convincing these officers that the work they had been doing was not realistic and that something would have to be done about the valuations. The officers tried just as hard to justify what they had been doing regarding the quinquennial assessment. I consider that the grower organizations and individuals are to be commended for the combined effort and the result that has been achieved. The Premier has stated that a revaluation of unimproved land will be undertaken by the department and we now know that the valuations that have been sent have more or less been put in the waste-paper basket and that new valuations will be undertaken within the next four months. We wait with interest to see what these new valuations produce. In some areas of the State they may not vary much, but it will be interesting to see what alterations take place in the main country areas of the State. If the serious situation that had arisen was allowed to continue, these high and unrealistic values would have affected not only land tax assessments but also water ratings.

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

Mr. VENNING: I appreciate the applause I have just received from members opposite, and I am pleased to see so many of them in the Chamber this evening. Before the adjournment I was speaking on the question of assessments on unimproved land values in the rural parts of the State. Before the session opened the Premier made a statement that a revaluation would be undertaken. I had to smile when the Premier said that, because he gave as his reason that the amount of income over and above that to be derived from this source was more than the amount previously considered. All the Premier had to do to justify that reason was to reduce the rate, and he would have had the amount that should have been derived from this source. Not only did he do that but he also agreed to a revaluation. He was correct in his ultimate action, but very phoney in his explanation of it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What does "phoney" mean?

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to tolerate interjections, and that goes for Ministers on the front bench. I warned honourable members this afternoon, and, for the benefit of those who were not in the Chamber then, I now repeat that warning. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: One of the many problems facing the man on the land today is succession and estate duties: he has faced this problem for some time but not to the degree that it is affecting him today. These two capital taxes have been the dread of the primary producer for generations, but today, for the many reasons mentioned in this House, families that have been primary producers for generations are, on the untimely departure of the senior member of the family, walking off their properties, because it has been impossible for them to meet the taxes so imposed. What is being done by this Government to help these people in their hopeless dilemma? Unfortunately, the answer is that nothing is being done. From time to time in this Chamber we hear about the farmers march, a march and demonstration that was most orderly, particularly when we have seen what has occurred in the State in recent weeks. One remembers that the Premier spoke to that gathering of primary producers and that he made promises to these people. How deluded these people are today when the assurances given to them at Elder Park on that occasion have not materialized.

It is time that an appeals committee was set up to examine the factors of the situation in which many primary producers find themselves today. I believe the time is overdue when the impost of succession and estate taxes on rural lands, at least, should be replaced by a system of paying a comparable amount of tax by an annual payment, either by a direct tax or by the payment of a substantial premium on an insurance policy, the size of which would be determined by the expected need, with this payment not forming a part of the estate. It has been stated that about 40 per cent of the money derived from succession duties comes from about 11 per cent of the people. If, say, a widow pensioner, or a woman with children whose husband had left her, were living in a rented house in the city and could not meet her commitments, eventually being served with a notice to quit the premises, we know that there would be a hue and cry throughout the State regarding the unfair practice adopted and the fact that this situation had been forced on the person concerned.

But what happens to the members of a family unit on a farm in a similar position today who have to walk off their properties because they cannot meet these duties? I am afraid that the only answer to be given to this question is that nothing whatsoever is done. The time is overdue for an appeals committee

to be set up in this State so that these unfortunate cases can be considered. We often hear of a person who may have shares of a high value at the time of his death but, when the executors come to realize on these shares in order to pay the duties involved, they find that the value of the shares has dropped considerably, and so the family finds itself in a hopeless financial position with only one thing left to do: that is, to sell and quit the property. I believe that, if an appeals committee were set up in South Australia to consider these unfortunate situations, people who had been farming perhaps for generations might be able to continue farming and not suffer through the imposition of succession duties.

We have heard much in the last few days about compulsory unionism in South Australia. Even this afternoon the member for Stuart referred to this matter and to what he considered was our attitude on this side of the House. We do not believe in compulsion of any sort; we as members of the Liberal and Country Party are free to vote on all things according to our conscience. Unlike Government members, we do not believe in compulsion. We know what is taking place at present: the unions are applying pressure in order to increase their membership. I do not know whether they are trying to get as much money as possible to help pay for the new building on South Terrace, but whatever their reasons are I know that this present move is being met with much unpleasantness from many people in this State.

Many sons of primary producers who have had to leave a farm in view of the present situation have found that the first thing they must do is join a union, and this is a most unfortunate situation. Would it not be a fair thing if perhaps some of these compulsory union fees could be paid into L.C.L. funds? After all, as many people who are compelled to join a union are L.C.L. supporters, why should some of their contributions not go towards the L.C.L.? We hear that the L.C.L. receives contributions from big business, etc. However, that is not necessarily so. All members know that big business pays much money into the coffers of the Labor movement in this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: This Government is not satisfied with compulsory unionism: it has gone one step further and instructed the various Government departments that where work is to be undertaken preference

must be given to unionists. Last November a contract for certain work to be done in connection with the railways was let to a person in my district. Recently, that person received a letter from the South Australian Railways stating that, because of a Government decision that he would have to give preference to union labour, he could resubmit his contract price, which could, of course, be higher than the original one. The fact that such a contract could cost the Government more does not seem to worry it: it does not worry about a matter such as that, so long as it ensures that preference is given to unionists. It is indeed a sorry situation in which we find ourselves today.

Earlier in the debate the member for Florey said much about unionism and industry. He talked about the proceeds of industry as a piece of cake, and he said how he and other workers in industry wanted their fair share of the cake. However, we have now reached the stage where they have eaten the whole cake. Indeed, they are not only killing the person who produces the flour but also they are killing the goose that lays the golden egg. Government members had better wake up to this situation before it is too late. They do not seem to realize that they work in the best State in the Commonwealth. Only a few years ago it was said that South Australia was the envy of the Commonwealth. However, we are finding now that that position no longer obtains and that industry is looking to move away from South Australia. Instances of this have been referred to in this House in the last fortnight.

Mr. BURDON: How many moved away during the term of office of the L.C.L. Government?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not continually rise to my feet. I warn the member for Mount Gambier that, if he interjects again, he will have to put up with the consequences.

Mr. VENNING: If industries are leaving South Australia, one can rest assured that many others are contemplating a similar move, and this is indeed a sorry state of affairs. One should remember that much work has been done for many years to build up South Australia's industries, and it was to our benefit that Sir Thomas Playford had the foresight to industrialize South Australia. Industries are essential in any community: they are a home market for our products, and anything that is done to drive them out of this State, as is happening at present, is indeed

a retrograde step. I emphasize that before it is too late, and I remind members opposite that they should examine and straighten out the trade union movement.

At about this time last year I asked the Premier some questions about problems at the Gepps Cross abattoir. The busy killing period will soon be with us, and advance information that I have been given is that there will again be problems at the abattoir during that period. When the number of lambs yarded reaches 20,000 on the Wednesday, restrictions will be placed on deliveries for the market. I am very annoyed at the whole situation, because it has continued for so long, with very little being done about it.

Over a period much has been spent on this abattoir, yet problems still arise there. Last year I asked the Premier to look at the situation for himself, because there seemed to be little progress in solving the problems. Unfortunately, the Premier did not go there to see what the situation really was. As a result, restrictions will be placed on producers of fat lambs and sheep during the coming busy killing period. The time is overdue for the existing abattoir to be replaced with a new set-up. It is pleasing to know that endeavours are being made to establish a rural abattoir in the South-East. If it is established it will greatly assist the Murray Bridge abattoir and the Gepps Cross abattoir. Because the situation is most unsatisfactory, something must be done very soon to help the primary producers.

In his Speech the Governor said that the Government would introduce legislation to extend the operations of the Prices Branch. That has been the policy of the Liberal and Country League, and I am pleased that it has been referred to in the Governor's Speech. I am afraid that the Prices Branch is most ineffective at present, because prices in South Australia have got out of control as a result of unsatisfactory legislation. It is difficult to see how the branch can keep prices at a satisfactory level.

Although the member for Elizabeth spent half his speech in criticizing the speeches of Opposition members, I was pleased that the honourable member referred to high schools in my district. Last Friday the Public Works Committee, of which the honourable member is Chairman, visited Gladstone to inspect the site of a new high school and to inspect the old school. It appeared to me that the committee members were unanimous that the old school buildings should have been replaced

many years ago. I very much appreciated the committee's visit to Gladstone. The Gladstone High School project was first included in the Loan Estimates as far back as 1938. At that time the late Mr. Jack Lyons was the member for Rocky River. He was followed by Mr. Jim Heaslip, who was member for 19 years, and I have had the honour to represent the district for the last three years. After all that time we now find that possibly a new high school will be built at Gladstone to be ready for the commencement of the 1973 school year.

When the Minister of Education visited Gladstone last year, he told the school committee that it was hoped that a Matriculation class would operate there at the commencement of the 1972 school year. Through unforeseen circumstances, the new school will not now be ready until the commencement of 1973, but it is hoped that the part of the Minister's promise relating to the Matriculation class will come true and that that class will commence at Gladstone in 1972. This will be the only Matriculation class in this part of the North; at present children from this area who wish to matriculate must attend the Clare or Port Pirie High Schools, with the result that many teenagers must leave their homes much earlier than is desirable. I hope that next year, even if in the old school, Gladstone will have a Matriculation class and that the following school year will commence with the brand new high school completed. I support the motion and thank members for patiently listening to me.

Mr. RYAN (Price): I support the motion. With other members, I wish to express my sympathy to the relatives of members who have passed away since the last Address in Reply debate. Although two of the deceased members, the late Sir Collier Cudmore and the Hon. John Cowan, were only names to me, they were apparently well respected members of the Legislature in their day. I knew the Hon. Colin Rowe, who was a member of another place, over several years, and I know that he was held in high esteem by those close to him. I knew the late Mr. Sam Lawn extremely well, and I do not think any member who knew him could speak other than highly of him. As one of the toughest and most able debaters in the Chamber, he was always listened to with great respect. He will always be remembered by those who knew him well. Although Sir Norman Jude was a member of a Party other than my Party, I got to know him rather well through

our association on several joint committees, and I believe he was highly respected. We wish him well in his retirement. We also wish the new member for Adelaide well; we wish him a long and happy career as a member of this House. May he serve his constituents well and may he always be considered by them a worthy representative.

I compliment him on the effort he made in this House at the beginning of the session. I think it was unique that he was declared on one day and on the next day he delivered his maiden speech. I have not known it to happen before. Not only did he make his maiden speech on the day after his declaration, but also he delivered his second speech on the same day. Irrespective of Party affiliation, I know we would all say that the effort he made on both occasions was noteworthy and, if this is to be the tone of his future contributions to debates, he will be a force to be reckoned with in this Chamber.

I think the other new member, the Hon. Martin Cameron in the Legislative Council, has lined up at the barrier but failed to salute the judge more than any other member I have known. He was known as "the unsuccessful candidate" and even earned himself a high reputation with the press over that. Not only did he earn his reputation but it is apparent that his reputation will continue with us because, before he was elected as a member of this Parliament, he hit the headlines in the press on Tuesday, May 25, with "Attempt likely to block endorsement". This is rather an interesting report. Nobody could ever say that the *Advertiser* is the official organ of the Australian Labor Party. The member for Rocky River mentioned the various organizations contributing to the A.L.P., but I think even he would admit that the L.C.L. would have no greater contributor, financially, physically or materially, than the *Adelaide Advertiser*. This is what it states:

An attempt is expected to be made at an L.C.L. council meeting on Friday to block the endorsement of Mr. Martin Cameron for the Legislative Council Southern district by-election. Delegates planning the move are understood to object to statements by Mr. Cameron that he favours full adult franchise for the Legislative Council.

I can see the smiles of members opposite. They will not tell us what happened, but we can all guess. Every time we have a debate on an Address in Reply or on any other matter in this Chamber, the rule book of the A.L.P. is produced. We get a history of it. It is the most historical document or booklet that has

ever been quoted in this House. It has been quoted from the front cover to the back cover in almost every debate I have heard in this Chamber. In view of the report I have referred to, this is very interesting. I was amazed by this press report because I believed what the members of the Liberal Party had told me, and I thought they could tell the truth sometimes. They told me of the dictatorship we were under and the rules and pledges we had to sign. However, it is obvious that we are not orphans in the political world, because the L.C.L. does similar things. The press report also states:

They claim that before standing for pre-selection Mr. Cameron was required to sign a form stating that he believed in the principles of the L.C.L. and its platform. One of the principles is good government "through the Legislative Council and the principles of its franchise."

The report mentions the word "principles" and my old mate Sam Lawn used to say that "principle" was spelt with a "pal". We were told that an attempt would be made to block the endorsement because Mr. Cameron broke the pledge that he had signed when he joined the L.C.L. I remind members that they are not my words. On the next day, May 26, the editorial in the *Advertiser* dealt with the matter, and, for the benefit of the member for Rocky River, may I say that the *Advertiser* is the main contributor to the funds of the L.C.L. The editorial states:

The Cameron endorsement. The disclosure is that an attempt is likely to prevent Mr. Cameron's formal endorsement as the Party's candidate at an L.C.L. council meeting on Friday night. He is in effect, being accused of something bordering on dishonesty in signing a declaration of beliefs in the principles of the Party which include the Legislative Council and the principles of its franchise.

I remember a time when members of the Liberal Party were trying to hold my colleague the member for Playford up to ridicule because of what happened in Elizabeth when the honourable member stuck to his pledge. He was accused of breaking his pledge, a pledge that he signed willingly and knowing its ramifications. Now we find that L.C.L. members sign a pledge and if they do not abide by it they are charged with dishonesty and suffer the consequences. I think that in the next few days we will be reading in the headlines of the so-called dishonesty of the Hon. Mr. Cameron, but time will tell about that.

Having heard many Address in Reply debates, I have always considered that these debates are open and that in them a member may speak about practically anything under the sun. I

am not criticizing that. The member for Torrens spoke about Mr. Hawke and his dictatorial attitude so far as trade unions are concerned, about Mr. Whitlam's visit to China, and about many matters that had no connection directly with this Parliament. I am not being critical of what the member for Torrens said. The member for Mallee took us on a Cook's tour of such places as Fiji and the Solomon Islands, giving us a history of the Parliaments in those places and, once again, I do not object to his doing that. Many other members spoke. The judge that was never appointed, the member for Mitcham, went to great lengths to speak about Canada and the Bill of Rights. He gave a long history of the Bill dealing with human rights in the United States. I do not object to what the honourable member said, but I criticize the behaviour of the member for Alexandra, who took a point of order because a member on this side voiced an opinion which was dear to him and his constituents but which was opposed by the honourable member.

Mr. Coumbe: Was it upheld?

Mr. RYAN: It was not, and I do not think it should have been on that principle. I do not believe that any member should have more privileges than any other member, but I also think that no member should have fewer privileges than any other member. The member for Alexandra should be honest and sincere in what he wants to have done in this Chamber. Since I have been a member, the Address in Reply debate has been an open debate, in which members can speak on any subject.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You can even interject!

Mr. RYAN: If I did not receive any interjections I would have to sit down: without interjections I would be like a workman without a shovel. In this debate a member can say what his constituents want him to say. If this debate remains on that plane this is the principle that should apply to all members, and if I have any control of the affairs of this Chamber that is how it will remain in future. Each year the Liberal Opposition members say that they have heard a dry and dull Governor's Speech, but when we were in Opposition we tried to make constructive criticisms of the contents of the Speech. If we objected to something we tried to suggest an alternative, but this was probably a mistake. Despite our constructive opposition and our suggested alternatives, we were opposed to an

astute politician in Sir Thomas Playford, who would object to what we had suggested. Within a couple of years, however, the suggestions we had made would be incorporated in legislation introduced by Sir Thomas, who would go to the public and say, "I'm the best Labor representative this State has ever had." The present Opposition continually describes the situation under this Government as a hopeless one.

Let us see how hopeless was the former Labor Government, its members having been in Opposition for many years. In 1965, for the first time for over 30 years the Labor Party came into office in this State; it achieved a political impossibility, bearing in mind all the obstacles in its path at that time. The then Premier (Mr. Frank Walsh) created the Ministerial office of Premier and the Premier's Department. Has the present Opposition ever asked us to take away that portfolio or department? It has complimented us on this move, because the present Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Langley: He might not be after tonight.

Mr. RYAN: I could not say anything about that. The former Labor Government created the new portfolios of Housing, Social Welfare, and Transport. Did the subsequent L.C.L. Government abolish these portfolios, which it had previously said were unnecessary, a waste of money, and of no advantage to the State? Those portfolios were not abolished; they were used to a great extent by the Liberal Party when it was subsequently in Government.

When the route of the natural gas pipeline was made known, we were told that it was being taken to all the wrong places and that, the moment the L.C.L. got back into power, it would alter what the Labor Government had done. But that was just idle boasting, because the Liberal Government did absolutely nothing; indeed, it praised what we had done. In addition, we introduced a Bill relating to succession duties to provide an exemption of \$12,000 in respect of an estate passing to a widow or children, and what a fight we had to put up to get this on the Statute Book! The Labor Government was subsequently able to convince the members of another place, where the L.C.L. has a majority, that this was the will of the people. At that time, the present Leader of the Opposition (the back-bench member for Gouger, who sat behind the then Leader of the Opposition) said:

Although we have listened patiently, we have heard nothing.

Mr. Venning: How right!

Mr. RYAN: I cannot help it if the member for Rocky River has a vacuum in his head: that is the way he is made and he is not my responsibility. These are the things which were done then and which were so hotly contested by the Liberal Party Opposition, which discovered to its dismay that in Parliament numbers count. In his 1965 Address in Reply speech, the present Leader of the Opposition welcomed the member for Victoria into the ranks of the Parliamentarians of the House of Assembly and said he had no doubt that the honourable member would be a force to be reckoned with and that his presence would always be felt in the House.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: However, he did not realize in 1965 when he made that statement that in 1971 the member for Victoria would be on the front Opposition bench as the Leader of a splinter Country Party in the House of Assembly.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And backed by the League of Rights.

Mr. RYAN: I do not know about that. However, the member for Victoria can speak for himself; I am merely quoting what I have heard.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria has already spoken in this debate.

Mr. RYAN: I am referring to future occasions, Sir, such as when he presents his credentials as the leader of the new splinter group.

Mr. Rodda: Is that an educated guess?

Mr. RYAN: No, an intelligent observation. In past Address in Reply debates members have not so much criticized the contents thereof but the omissions therefrom. The importance of the Governor's 1966 Speech will become more evident to the public and members generally as time goes by. The Government said then that it had appointed a committee to revise the Local Government Act—a horse-and-buggy Act that needed to be brought up-to-date. No-one would agree with that statement more than the present Minister of Local Government. How his officers or those involved in local government can operate under such out-moded legislation, I do not know. A proposal for strata tiles was included in the Governor's Speech of 1966, too. Through their demand for home units the people have shown how much they appreciated the Labor Government's introduction of legislation on strata tiles, which they would never have got from a Liberal Government.

The creation of a Government Insurance Office was also referred to in the Governor's Speech of 1966. Within the next few months we will see that office established in South Australia—something that other States have had for many years. I challenge any Opposition member to say that any future Liberal Government will abolish the Government Insurance Office. Anyone hearing the speeches of Opposition members during the debate on the State Government Insurance Commission Bill would have thought that a future Liberal Government would abolish it. Two matters of supreme importance in the Governor's Speech of 1966 were the establishment of the Lotteries Commission and the establishment of the Totalizator Agency Board. This State would be in a desperate financial position today if it were not for the foresight of the Labor Government in 1966. Up to the present, lotteries have contributed about \$5,500,000 to State finances, and the T.A.B. has contributed about \$6,000,000. It is important to realize that in establishing the Lotteries Commission and the T.A.B. the Government was not inflicting a further taxation measure on the public. There was proof that before the establishment of the Lotteries Commission much money was being sent to lotteries in other States.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We made it possible for that money to be kept within the State.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. Further, before the establishment of the T.A.B. much money was going into the pockets of S.P. bookmakers. In referring to the Governor's Speech at that time the present Leader of the Opposition said:

It is perhaps debatable whether the session will be successful.

Those two measures alone have raised nearly \$12,000,000, yet the Leader of the Opposition said that. Regarding the T.A.B., he said:

Racing in this State is heavily taxed at present ... a tremendous burden will be placed on the racing industry.

The lack of a T.A.B. prior to 1966 cost the taxpayers a huge sum. We had the vice squad running around South Australia chasing milk men to check on bets that had been left in milk bottles. We made off-course betting legal and, as a result, people are able to bet and the Government is receiving additional income. It is one thing to criticize something, with tongue in cheek, when in Opposition but, in the unlikely event of the Liberal Party regaining office, we can be sure that such a Government will not repeal the legislation that created the lottery

and T.A.B. in this State. People have come to enjoy these amenities and they have been worthwhile revenue raisers.

Much has been said about the fact that the Governor's Speech states that the Government may have to examine taxation in this State. The member for Rocky River and other members have said that any increase in taxation will drive industries from South Australia. As a result of reading a certain press report, I can assure members that industries will not go to New South Wales. Because of the level of Commonwealth reimbursement, the Liberal Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Askin) will be forced to increase revenue. A newspaper report of June 23 states that, if tickets can be printed in time, the new bus fares in New South Wales will be 50 per cent higher from July 12. Train fares will also increase by 50 per cent, and ferry fares by 33 per cent, and I believe that public transport is used more extensively in Sydney than in any other capital city in Australia (I hope to see similar use in South Australia).

Mr. Askin also announced that general rail freight charges will be increased by 15 per cent, yet the member for Rocky River has complained about the expected increase of 10 per cent in South Australia. In New South Wales higher hospital fees are expected and, from August 1, the new rates are expected to be 50 per cent higher. They are only some of the revenue-raising measures which, if they have not already been introduced, will be introduced in New South Wales shortly. Yet members opposite criticize this Government, which is forced to increase its revenue as a result of the bad deal it gets from the Commonwealth Government.

The member for Alexandra says that we should not be permitted in this Chamber to criticize the Commonwealth Government. The honourable member criticized the member for Mitchell, who condemned the low pensions received by some of his constituents, and he had the audacity to say, "This has nothing to do with the State." If the welfare of a member's constituents has nothing to do with the State, we may as well pack up and go home, because our constituents' welfare is of the greatest concern to all of us. What Billy McMahon does to this State is our concern. When a member voices his condemnation of what another Government is doing to this State, he should have an unfettered right of making his voice heard in complaint.

Nobody will say I was slow in my condemnation of what has been and is going on.

For many years my colleagues and I have heard about those Labor Party "faceless men". Even the member for Unley has heard of them. Every time certain members rose to their feet, there was a regular sermon about the A.L.P. "faceless men", how we in this Chamber used to take our instructions from them. I have here a newspaper cutting that I saw somewhere the other day. It is headed, "Politics". It talks about "finding Liberal faceless men". We are used to being accused of having faceless men on our side, but this article refers to Liberal faceless men. The article, which quotes what the federal President, Robert Southey, said, is as follows:

At the end of the two days, federal President Robert Southey saw no need to hold a press conference, although his predecessor, Brigadier Pagan, invariably did. Mr. Southey made it clear he regarded the proceedings of the council—

that is the Commonwealth Liberal Party conference—

as none of the press's business—or, for that matter, Australia's.

In other words, what was decided in the Liberal Party conference was not the President's business or Australia's business.

Mr. Jennings: Yet they tell these people what to do.

Mr. RYAN: Exactly; that is what I am coming to. The article continues:

And the Libs returned to their natural habitat—in board rooms all over Australia, conscious of a job well done.

They sign a pledge, yet they say they are free men! They are worse than the free riders, because at least the free riders have to try to earn a living. Fancy this happening at an A.L.P. conference! During the conference, the President stated:

Delighted as I am to welcome Mr. McMahon as our Federal Parliamentary Leader, I hope it is the last time for many a day that I or, for that matter, any future President will find himself in a similar position. It is the privilege of the Federal Parliamentary Party to choose its Leader and we of the organization stand aside but it is not a privilege that we care to see exercised with embarrassing frequency. Complacency will not be in order.

That is the President's criticism of Australia's Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has not the confidence of members of his own Party. Can the same be said about the present Leader of the A.L.P. Government in South Australia? No: he has the united and undivided confidence of every member of his Party. The member for Alexandra wishes that he could

say that about the present Leader of the Opposition. If he said that, when he died and we were giving his obituary in this place we would be looking down on him and he would be looking up at us.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why did you uphold my point of order the other day?

Mr. RYAN: I did not, and I criticized the honourable member for it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. RYAN: As the matter has been raised, I will deal with it. I am pleased that the member for Alexandra has brought it forward, because if he is deaf it is about time my voice penetrated his deaf ears. I refer to what I said, as reported in *Hansard* at page 266. The passage states:

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

If the member for Alexandra believes that his point of order was upheld, he is as dumb as I thought he might be. I notice that the judicial representative on the disputes committee has returned to the Chamber. Fancy being in the condemned cell if the member for Mitcham was the lawyer whom one wanted to save one's life! Much has been said about the Labor Party, compulsory unionism, about the Party being dictated to from outside, and about our being puppets in the hands of Trades Hall. Is there any difference between unionism in industries and unionism in professions? I do not think there is: if anyone wants to enter the profession of politics it is compulsory for him to join a political Party. That is the first fundamental principle. The member for Glenelg could not be a politician (and that is obvious): let us say that he could not be a replica of a politician unless he compulsorily joined a political Party.

Mr. Mathwin: I could have stood as an Independent.

Mr. RYAN: I challenge the honourable member to stand as an Independent at the next election.

Mr. Mathwin: In your district?

Mr. RYAN: If the honourable member wants to be an Independent he will never join the professional ranks of politicians in South Australia. He has said that he hates compulsion. I compulsorily pay my fees to the Australian Labor Party, and I am proud to do it.

Mr. Mathwin: Is that because you may be made Chairman of the Public Works Committee?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. RYAN: No member on this side would get as low as the Leader of the Opposition when he criticized, as a Labour-dominated committee, the Public Works Committee and its recommendations to this Parliament. I had the honour and privilege to serve on that committee with many members of the Liberal and Country League Party. Never did it make a recommendation that was politically loaded, and I believe that the committee will carry on in that tradition and will decide matters submitted to it on their merits and for the benefit of the people of this State. I am sure that no-one will reach as low a level as did the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke about this committee. Much has been said by members opposite about what they call the lack of action by the Labor Party on behalf of primary producers. The member for Eyre and the member for Rocky River (and other members) have referred to this matter, but that is the only subject about which they have any knowledge. I do not hear any statements being made or pressure exerted by representatives of primary producers concerning a most important aspect of their industry that is referred to in an article in yesterday's *Advertiser*, headed "Talks on Freight Crucial" stating that the Chairman of the Australian Wool Board (Sir William Gunn) will be present at talks concerning policy on wool shipments and freight rates for the 1971-72 season. These talks are taking place because of the ransom to which the primary producing industry is being held.

It is expected that there will be an 11.5 per cent increase in export freight rates as soon as it is agreed on by the Conference Line. It is a wonder that the Labor Party is not blamed for this; it is blamed for everything else. The Commonwealth Government, through Billy McMahon's attitude and through lack of action in the past, has done nothing to help the primary producers send their production overseas. We have in Australia one of the best shipping

lines in the world, but it is hamstrung by the prohibition placed on it over the years by the Liberal Governments, which have refused to allow this line to compete overseas.

If Labor gained office in the Commonwealth sphere, one of the first policies it would implement would be to allow this line to carry primary production overseas. If this line were completely subsidized by the Commonwealth Government in order to carry primary production overseas on a c.i.f basis, the saving to the producers of this country would be astronomical. What does the Minister for Trade and Industry (Mr. Anthony) do to relieve the present position confronting the primary producer? He is prepared to allow the Conference Line to hold the primary producers to ransom and to allow them to have their 11.5 per cent increase but to do nothing about the situation otherwise. If he were genuine, he would force Billy McMahon to allow the Australian National Line to carry primary production overseas, even if this had to be subsidized wholly by the Commonwealth Government. This would cost nowhere near the \$110,000,000 or \$140,000,000 that the taxpayer has to meet in order to subsidize the primary producer.

Mr. Gunn: What about the tariffs that protect—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: Someone had better protect the member for Eyre, because he is due for preselection shortly and I hate to think what the result will be. I know what is going on in his district; I have been there many times. The following is an article, appearing in last Saturday's *Advertiser* and headed "Wool Subsidy Plan Only a Pain-killer", which states:

There are several virtues in the wool support price plan which Federal Cabinet has approved for inclusion in the August Budget. By setting a guarantee price of only 36c a lb. instead of the 40c demanded by the wool industry, it has kept the likely outlay to about \$120,000,000 instead of \$200,000,000.

The article goes on to say that the rich wool-growers will gain as a result of the wool subsidy plan and that the poor primary producers will get even poorer. If the Australian National Shipping Line were allowed to operate overseas independently of the Conference Line, and if it were completely subsidized by the Commonwealth Government, it would not cost anything near the \$120,000,000 or \$140,000,000 subsidy. This would be a way of getting our production overseas more cheaply. The freights would be paid within Australia, and the benefits therefrom would be returned to the Australian taxpayers. Also, the insurance, which would

probably be even a larger amount, would also fall into Australian hands. Now, however, freight and insurance charges are paid overseas in foreign currency and oversea insurance companies are gaining the benefit of business that should remain in this country. If it were in operation, the South Australian Government Insurance Office might obtain some of this business.

If members of the public want something done, let them go to the people who can do something for them: let them go to their members of the Commonwealth Parliament and ask them to do something. It is no good their going to their local members and telling them that they have done nothing. People often complain when the Premier goes overseas, yet they also complain when he does not do so to try to help them. The Premier will never be right in the eyes of Liberal supporters, but he will always be right in the eyes of Labor supporters. I support the motion.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): The member for Price referred earlier in his speech to gas. However, it was more hot air than gas that we heard in this Chamber. I support the motion. I was interested in the honourable member's remarks regarding the cream in the cake; I imagine that it was only a thin layer of cream in the centre of a sponge. However, I believe that Sir Thomas Playford placed the icing on the top. Despite any conditions that may have obtained during his years of office, I do not think it would be reasonable or, indeed, wise to take away from Sir Thomas Playford any of the credit that is due to him.

When I followed the member for Price in the Address in Reply debate two years ago I said that, if he had not been signed up compulsorily or otherwise by Actors' Equity, it had missed out on a wonderful opportunity. To some extent it is a pleasure to listen to someone who does not take himself seriously. However, it is important not to take what such a person says seriously. At least, that is how I react to the member for Price. I cannot agree with his statement that, because the Totalizator Agency Board brings \$5,000,000 into this State annually, it is a good thing. I consider that there must be other things, too, to justify what a Government does. I do not believe that the dollars at the end necessarily justify a measure. We might just as well say that it is sufficient justification for the existence of the liquor industry that the Commonwealth Government takes \$2,000 a minute, \$3,000,000

a day, and \$1,170,000,000 a year in revenue from liquor sales. That is not a very reasonable basis for an argument.

I support the motion and I express my delight at the fact that the Governor was well enough to present the Opening Speech. At the opening of the previous session he was unwell and therefore unable to perform that duty. I am sure that all members are delighted to know that His Excellency is able to move around South Australia, meet the people of the State, and see the activities of this State.

I offer my sympathy to the families of those who have passed away since the opening of the previous session. I refer particularly to the gentleman whom I knew affectionately as Sammy Lawn. When I first became a member of this House he was one of the first members of the then Opposition whom I got to know. I appreciated his friendship immensely; I always thought that he was extremely down to earth and honest, and I had faith in my conversations with him. On one or two occasions he helped me to get some necessary background during my early days in Parliament, and I was grateful for his help. We formed a good friendship.

Mr. John Cowan virtually followed in the footsteps of his father, Sir John Cowan, who was a member of the Upper House from 1910 to 1944. Several years after Sir John Cowan ceased to be a member of Parliament, his son John became a member of the Upper House and served there for 10 years. Mr. Cowan was very active in the community. He assumed most of the responsibilities that an active man assumes. He was president of a high school council and the hospital board, and he was State President of the Local Government Association. He made a tremendous contribution to his district and his town. I congratulate the new Chairman of Committees, the member for Price. I have always thought that he has been just in his interpretations. I am sure the honourable member will carry out his duties without fear or favour.

I congratulate the new member for Adelaide on his election. He looks pugnacious to me, but I do not mean necessarily in the physical sense: physically, I think he may be out of trim at present. He looks to be the type of man who is a fighter, and I am sure his performance in this House early this session showed us that he has opinions and that he is prepared to express his views forthrightly and to fight for his cause. I believe that, with his physical proportions, if he can apply his mind to such proportions, as I hope he will, his outlook will

be broadened and his experience extended, and this applies to all of us.

The member for Chaffey referred to the citrus situation, which is a most unfortunate one at present. Perhaps the honourable member almost answered the question he raised. He spoke about the report of the secretary of the Commonwealth citrus organization (Mr. King), his attitude towards the Premier, and what he is attempting to do at present about citrus sales. In a roundabout way, the honourable member told us just why the secretary had this attitude; he said that this gentleman was, in days gone by, a member of this place. Therefore, while he was here no doubt he became accustomed to the activities and promises of the present Premier, and no doubt he came to believe that some of these promises did not always come to pass and that often some of these things boiled down to a somewhat useless amount of publicity. I was interested in some of the remarks of the member for Elizabeth. I say kindly to him that if, as we grow older, we must repeat much of what previous speakers have said and make comment, caustic and otherwise, on their speeches, and if we do not have a great deal else to say, perhaps we should say less anyway. Paragraph 15 of the Governor's Speech states:

The Government is conscious of the problems affecting the rural section of the community and will continue to take steps to find solutions to these problems.

That definitely states that the Government is aware of these problems, but I should have thought that the Government would spell out much more clearly what those problems were. We should be told what solutions the Government has in mind for these problems in the rural industry. I agree with the member for Fisher, who reminds us that each member of the community has a responsibility in these days to examine carefully whether he applies himself honestly for 40 hours, or whatever is his working week, for his week's pay. At the successful annual conference of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, which was held recently, the Chairman referred to this fact. He said in passing, as part of that address, that 40 hours' honest work for 40 hours' pay could be the starting point to get some stability back into the economy. I think there is a tendency in all sections of the community these days for us to try to get all we can for as little effort as we can possibly make. This is not in the best interests of the

country's economy or, ultimately, of the average man.

It is not healthy to have the outlook that we are here in this world to get all we possibly can and to contribute as little as we can. We should all have a very square look at the quality of our physical and mental contribution to our place of work. Surely we should not be able to live with ourselves, in all conscience, if we do not face up to the fact that we are not doing a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. In all sections of the community, the efficiency would improve and we would make a very real contribution to the economy if we accepted seriously the fact that it surely is a moral obligation on us that we do a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

Continuing with the rural industries, much of my particular area is dairying land. I believe the dairymen of the present and the future will at least be able to meet his commitments (although he may not make much money) provided that the costs of his fuel, machinery, parts and everything that he requires on his property remain stable. The person in my area who is most seriously affected is the one who is predominantly a woolgrower or whose wool forms a large portion of his mixed farming unit. The farming community in Australia at present, as we all know only too well, has to live with wheat quotas. However, I believe that what has harmed the rural community very much more is the poor price received for wool over the last few years. While the Commonwealth Government intends to assist the farming community by fixing a base price of 36c a lb. for wool, this is temporary and there needs to be, particularly in the wool and grain area, finance made available on a long-term basis. I want now to quote the words of the Minister for Primary Industry, who recently stated:

The wool industry's net farm income has probably fallen from some \$770,000,000 in 1966-67 to \$290,000,000 to \$300,000,000 in the current year as a result of the fall in wool prices, drought and flood.

He went on to say:

With the wool industry's outstanding debt at about \$1,200,000,000, the debt position has moved from one where debt represented one and a half times net farm income in 1966-67 to two and a half times or so in 1969-70 and over four times in 1970-71. This year about one-third of the industry's average farm income of \$3,200 per property is required simply to meet interest payments on existing debt.

I consider that there is a very real necessity for more money to be made available to rural

areas in order that these people may be able to take longer to finally pull out of their debt situation. To support this I quote again from this little publication by the Victoria Graziers Association, for June, 1971, at page 5. It suggests that the seriousness of the debt problem in the sheep industry can be gauged from the following exercise:

The total sheep industry debt is \$1,200,000,000. Assume that one-third of the total sheep population of 180,000,000 sheep owes no money. This is some 60,000,000. The remaining 120,000,000, therefore, have to service the debt of \$1,200,000,000, which is equivalent to \$10 a sheep, and at an 8 per cent interest rate, this would cost 80c, with a total cost of \$10.80.

In a study of Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures on the capacity of farms in wool-growing and higher rainfall areas to pay interest on debts it has been shown that, in 1966-67, after allowing for normal costs and the station hand award rates, plus a small margin to the operator, and depending on size and efficiency of the farm, there was between \$1.50 and \$2 a dry sheep a year available to service debts. What do other countries do in regard to providing long-term finance for agriculture? This, as I have said, is the area in which I consider we must work in regard to the rural industry in its present situation. We accept that there is a deficiency, in primary industry, of money available for long-term facilities. In the United Kingdom, the British Agricultural Mortgage Corporation is apparently the basic unit that provides this finance. Land purchase is dealt with on terms up to a period of 60 years, and improvements to land and buildings up to 40 years, at a normal interest rate of 94 per cent. About 20 per cent of the agricultural sector debt was held by the corporation in 1969.

In Canada the organization is the Federal Farm Credit Corporation, and in 1967 the Corporation provided about two-thirds of the long-term mortgage credit outstanding to Canadian farmers. The total outstanding in 1967 amounted to about \$1,000,000,000, which was 23.7 per cent, or almost one-quarter, of the total estimated rural debt. The corporation was empowered to lend up to \$40,000 for a 30-year period, if this is not more than 75 per cent of the appraised productive value of the land, for the purpose of enlargement or acquisition. A recent amendment raised the limit of a loan to \$80,000 for two individuals who combined their operations and to \$100,000 for three or more partners. The situation in New Zealand is interesting. The State Advance Corporation supplies funds

for the rural sector. Loan finance to farmers is granted for the purchase and/or the development of farm properties. The present policy is directed towards stimulating production and in assisting suitable farmers who have not owned economically viable property. The maximum loan normally available is \$40,000 at an interest rate, usually 54 per cent, for terms up to 35 years.

In South Africa, the Land and Agricultural Bank of South Africa basically provides the funds for rural carry-on finance and development. Long-term loans are granted to full-time farmers for up to 35 years for the purchase of land, the improvement of stock or equipment, or for the redemption of debts. In the United States the Farm Credit Administration is the basic institution, and most loans are for terms ranging from 20 years to 35 years; and interest rates were 7 per cent in 1968. It is interesting to note that the 37 banks in that administration employ a fiscal agent located in New York who sell bonds and debentures in the central money market to secure funds to lend to farmers. The recent report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics states:

There is a need for a long-term credit facility for agriculture because access to capital will become an increasing problem and particularly because it is necessary to facilitate the development of the farm enterprise. The problem of farm finance is much more one of length of term of repayment periods than of interest rate. It is apparent from the above therefore, that there is a desperate need for the provision of some type of long-term credit facility in Australia.

The situation in my district, and in those of other rural members, is that the particular problem at present is a matter of long-term finance. Many of these people will have to obtain it in order to remain on their property, because I believe most of them have a viable unit. I do not think it is a matter of adding more and more hundreds of acres to the already existing units, although this may be the case in smaller dairies and smaller rural properties. Generally, the situation is that several years ago a farmer bought land at a high price and arranged a short-term loan, either with the bank or on a stock mortgage, but at present he finds himself unable to service this mortgage and these commitments.

I refer briefly to the great disappointment in not seeing more progress made in constructing the Dartmouth dam. My district has considerable interest in this matter, because its livelihood depends on the supply not only of water but also of good quality water. The

member for Chaffey this afternoon viewed the matter purely from today's point of view: I remind him that the greatest disappointment of all is not only the inactivity of the present Government (which I acknowledge) but the inactivity of the present Government when it was in Opposition 18 months or two years ago. I believe that, at that time, we had a golden opportunity to obtain an assured water supply, irrespective of where future reservoirs or storages were to be built. At that stage there was an opportunity to gain a tremendous 37 per cent increase. It is important to have this additional storage, and it was terribly important at that time to accept that offer by the other two State Governments and the Commonwealth Government to increase our entitlement.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: And give Chowilla away!

Mr. WARDLE: It is a lot of rubbish for the Minister to say that that would have meant that we would completely sign away all our entitlement to having a storage constructed at Chowilla. I have already explained that, prior to the 1968 election, I believed that Chowilla was the dam for South Australia, and there is no secret about that.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I wonder why you say now that—

Mr. WARDLE: The Minister would interject as though he were putting me on the spot, but he is not putting me on the spot at all. I have already explained the situation prior to the 1968 election: from the information available at that time, it seemed that the ideal site for a water storage was in South Australia, at Chowilla. We have been through all that again; we had the opportunity, to which I have referred, early in 1970, and we lost it. Only time will tell whether we get that opportunity again to obtain additional water supplies for South Australia. I have here a copy of a pamphlet that I think was circulated in River towns in late 1970 or early this year, together with a comment concerning it made by the Minister for National Development (Mr. Swartz). As the comment is dated mid-January, 1971, I presume the pamphlet was issued just prior to that. The pamphlet states:

This issue affects your very livelihood. Urge your Government to take action with South Australia in its move to get Dartmouth built but with an inbuilt protection to build Chowilla later.

To my mind, it has always been utter foolishness not to have seized the opportunity to build Dartmouth and to obtain the inherent advantages at the time the agreement was offered.

I believe that all members in their hearts know that the signing of that agreement did not mean that we had automatically lost Chowilla for South Australia. It does not mean that, and the Minister of Labour and Industry knows that it never meant that. The Minister well knows that every site from the Snowy Mountains to Lake Alexandrina would be considered by the commission as the site for another storage after Dartmouth was built. Although there is no reason why the Chowilla dam should not be built, South Australia does not want a dam that will not measure up to the other storages along the river system. We hope that perhaps one day the Chowilla dam will be built, but only if it can stand on its own two feet. We are not saying that we are willing to accept a third-rate position for a dam. Of course, Murray Bridge wants water and, very sensibly, it returned someone whom it believed would agitate for it. I think the people of that district were wise and were only protecting their own future in doing so.

The sort of literature to which I have referred and so much of which is complete and utter rubbish certainly has no influence in areas where people depend on water for their livelihood. Eighteen months ago the Liberal and Country League Government, which was so interested in the welfare of the people of this State, including those in the metropolitan area, realized that over the years South Australia would need more and better quality water. Surely every sensible member of this Parliament should have given his complete and utter support to the ratification of the agreement to construct the Dartmouth dam. However, what happened? Now we cannot even be sure of getting those advantages that were then right within our grasp.

Mr. Payne: I see you don't blame us about its not raining now.

Mr. WARDLE: I am glad the member for Mitchell said that, because people on the Murray River dread the thought of having another year like 1967. The honourable member would not have the slightest idea what it is like to live in an area that is so dependent upon the river for its water, or of what it is like to live on the edge of the Murray River growing lucerne, vines or citrus fruit as his entire livelihood, with the prospect of having no water. I am convinced that the honourable member has no real appreciation of what it would be like to live under those conditions.

Mr. Payne: Have you lived under those conditions?

Mr. WARDLE: Yes, and I would certainly challenge the honourable member if he expects me to think he appreciates the difficulties involved. The people of the river districts have a much better appreciation of the need for more and better quality water than the honourable member thinks. South Australia's water is not polluted greatly in Victoria and New South Wales. I remind honourable members that more than two-thirds of the total pollution content of the river water emanates from South Australia between the border and Lake Albert: the water becomes polluted in this State much more than it does in Victoria and New South Wales. At lock 5 the highest test of which I am aware gave a reading of about 350 to 360 parts per million, yet at Lake Alexandrina the salinity increased to well over 1,000 p.p.m. Therefore, it is not fair or reasonable to say that the water coming into South Australia is well and truly polluted by the other States before it arrives here.

I should like now to turn to the section of His Excellency's Speech dealing with tourism. Paragraph 5 states:

My Ministers recognize the importance of the tourist industry to South Australia.

One would not quarrel with that. However, I have always believed that local government has never had the type of finance it ought to have for developing tourism. About \$80,000 a year is distributed as subsidies through the Tourist Bureau to local government. I am sometimes told that it is not even possible to give a \$1 for \$1 subsidy: the subsidy given is actually less than that.

Many important organizations have argued that local government ought to receive more money for developing tourism and I have previously said in this House that South Australia ought to channel at least 2 per cent of motor vehicle registration fees to local government in the form of subsidies, as is done in Victoria. That might not be entirely acceptable to the Royal Automobile Association but, as the money would be largely used to benefit motorists, my proposal is fair and reasonable. It would result in about \$300,000 being channelled through the Tourist Bureau to local government, which could use it to provide parking areas, foreshore parking, caravan park improvements, comfort stations at tourist resorts, and so on. With the present declining financial position of the rural sector, the allocation of those funds to country councils would help them in employing staff and developing tourist areas. Local government

in Victoria receives a subsidy of between \$2 and \$4 for every \$1, as a result of the assistance given through the method of financing I have described.

I take to task the member for Mitchell, who spoke about elderly people. I am glad that the member for Peake is informing the member for Mitchell that I am going to take the gloves off. Some of the honourable member's statements were some of the most extravagant, most outstandingly lavish and completely untrue that I have ever heard in this House. Of course, I have not been here long and more extravagant statements may have been made before I became a member.

I would be one of the first to say that I certainly hope that in the next Commonwealth Budget there will be a considerable increase in financial assistance for elderly people. I am prepared to be levied additional tax for the purpose of paying more money to pensioners. The member for Mitchell said that he was in a good position to know the situation of many of these people. Speaking of the plight of elderly citizens, he said:

The position of these citizens who are on the bare pension today is terrible. The Liberal Commonwealth Government, after being in office for 20 years, has reduced the income of these people to a mere pittance and has reduced their lives to a misery . . . The Commonwealth Government gives them a miserable few dollars a week. It is clear that the Commonwealth hopes they will go away and die somewhere.

That is the incredible part of his statement and is the most hypocritical thing I have ever heard in this House. As I have said, I certainly hope there will be an increase in pensions in the next Commonwealth Budget but, when a member can make this sort of statement in the House and then support a Government that increases electricity costs, motor vehicle registration fees, water rates and other charges that affect the same people, it just does not make sense. These people would have their financial situation improved by being given another \$10 a week, but their position would be improved equally by having \$10 a week less commitments. That hypocritical statement is not borne out by statistics. The 1969-70 report of the Housing Trust states:

There has been a keen and increasing demand for housing for age pensioners in South Australia for many years. The reason is indicated by the first graph on the facing page which shows that the number of persons over 60 years of age has increased rapidly since 1947.

From 1947 to 1966 the number of persons over 60 years has increased from 87,057 to 131,657, an increase of 51 per cent. If, as the member for Mitchell suggests, these elderly people have to go away and die somewhere under a bush because they lack means of support, that is not borne out in this report. The report continues:

A male born in 1933 had a life expectancy of 64 years; the female's life expectancy was 67 years. The comparative figures in 1966 were 68 years and 79 years. Females over 70 represented 3.4 per cent of the State's population in 1966, and males over 70 accounted for 2.2 per cent.

Therefore, what the member for Mitchell said was completely untrue and hypocritical. I pay a tribute to the Housing Trust on the effort it has made towards providing housing in this State. Since the 1965-66 financial year the average number of applications received a week has increased from 125 to 197. The number of houses built by the trust since its inception in 1937 is 68,093. While almost 550 houses have been built in my area, including the townships of Tailem Bend, Mannum and Murray Bridge, there is still a great demand for housing. I think the member for Mount Gambier has said that the waiting time for houses in his area is a year or more; in my area it is almost a year.

One of the most deserving housing needs at present is that of homes for elderly people. I hope that eventually the Housing Trust will accept the fact that, while I have in my area an excellent elderly citizens small cottage group, where the occupier virtually becomes the owner by paying \$2,500 for his unit and the Commonwealth pays two-thirds of the cost, there is a very real need for pensioner flats where people have only perhaps \$100, \$500 or \$1,000 and cannot put down a deposit to buy a unit. Such flats provide perhaps better housing than rented rooms or large houses that these people could not maintain themselves. There have been one or two instances of people who several years ago lived with relatives and boarded; but at the moment there is a need for this type of housing, and this is the most economical way of providing it. The Housing Trust plans to build at least two groups of three for these people.

I come now to the mining activity in my area. The activities at the Kanmantoo mine have increased tremendously. In fact, the operators are moving as much earth in one day now at Kanmantoo as the quantity moved in its 29 years' history, the mine having been

opened in 1846. Such is the nature of the equipment and its enormous capacity that it will shift 5,000,000 tons of overburden before the ore is reached. A sum of \$8,000,000 will have been spent on the Kanmantoo mine before any mineral is processed. For 10 or 12 years there will be sufficient ore in that area to operate an open-cut mine 750ft. deep, with a dependable water level, about 800ft. across.

There is a sufficient vertical seam of ore to keep this company mining for at least the next 12 years. It is believed that there will then be sufficient ore to be able to go underground from that depth of 750ft. down to 2,000ft. One interesting aspect is that the firm of David Shearer has most of the contracts for the building of the large sheds and supplying much of the equipment for that area. The miners are using 500,000 gallons of water a day in their activities. This water is coming through the newly pressurized Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main, which in about 18 months' time will be running freely into the Onkaparinga River. The Housing Trust has again come to the aid of those people seeking houses and the number of employees will, within 12 months, be about 130. This work force is expected to remain fairly stable in the next few years. The trust has been able to supply additional houses for employees of the Kanmantoo mines, and it will supply other houses in future. These will be located in the three surrounding districts, namely, Murray Bridge, Strathalbyn and Nairne. Unfortunately, it was not possible for Callington to receive help by having Housing Trust houses built in that small town. However, that town is without reticulated water and therefore the trust was not able to provide the houses.

One other interesting aspect of this mining venture is the ability to win ore with present-day methods, when one considers that the ledges on which these trucks and equipment travel is 20ft. to 25ft. wide, and it is possible to fire sufficient explosives to bring down 250,000 yards of material in one blast. I was fortunate to be at the mine on an occasion when that was done. I shall conclude my speech with some remarks about protests, and my remarks will be consistent with those of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Canberra-Goulburn (Archbishop Cahill).

Mr. Crimes: They don't all agree.

Mr. WARDLE: That is one of the nice things in life (that one does not always have

to agree) and it seems to me that this is where the honourable member and I stand now. A report in the *Advertiser* of Monday, July 19, states:

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Canberra and Goulburn (Archbishop T. V. Cahill), yesterday condemned violent protests against the Springbok rugby tour. Archbishop Cahill said it was "unjust" to place on the shoulders of a group of footballers responsibility for injustice practised by the South African Government. "They have not come to arouse bitterness and discord, and should be able to expect from Australians courtesy and charity," he said. Archbishop Cahill made his criticism of anti-apartheid demonstrators in a pastoral letter read out in all churches of the archdiocese yesterday. His remarks came the day before the Springboks are due in Canberra.

I also add that I appreciate the words of the cleric who is taking Cardinal Gilroy's place as Archbishop of Sydney. This morning Bishop Freeman was quoted on the Australian Broadcasting Commission news as saying that he considered that the church should never get itself into a position where it was attached to a Party politically and should always be able to retain the situation where it could be critical of all Party politics. I think it is a sad day for the Christian church when it manoeuvres itself into a situation where it comes alongside a political Party. If my interpretation of the history of the church means anything, that interpretation is that, whenever the church has strayed from its independence and its ability to criticize in all situations and under all conditions, it has lost the influence that it has created on history over the years and lost its effect. I believe that the church should always retain its independence. I support the motion.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): In supporting the motion, I join my colleagues in paying a tribute to those members of Parliament who have left Parliament in the last year, either from death or retirement, and in particular, I refer to Mr. Sam Lawn who served in this House for many years. I had the good fortune to see Mr. Lawn in action for a few months and in that time I formed a high opinion of his knowledge of Parliamentary procedure, his scrupulous fairness and the firm control he exercised in the Chair. I congratulate his successor in that position, you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who I believe will be a worthy replacement. So also will be the new occupant of Mr. Lawn's other seat, that of Adelaide.

The mover of this motion demonstrated twice in his second day in this House what a valuable

contribution he will make to its deliberations. Certain it is that his knowledge of industrial affairs would exceed the combined knowledge of all Opposition members, as they will find to their cost. I believe the most important issue facing any Government, particularly in affluent countries such as ours, is the preservation of our environment. For years the world has shrunk aghast from the prospect of nuclear war and the annihilation of the human race. However, it now seems that the world may end, not with a bang but with a whimper. Many things are wrong with all societies, including our own, but they are all dwarfed into insignificance by the seemingly inevitable extinction of life on this planet. Perhaps a feeling of hopelessness about the future of life is the root cause of the basic insecurity and nihilism that afflicts so many of our young.

The very progress in science, technology, and living standards which made early generations bear their current burdens cheerfully, and look forward in hope, now seems likely to be self-defeating, as affluence produces tension, waste, pollution and despoliation of the environment. The position is not hopeless. Man is a rational being and as such is capable of solving his problems. All that is needed is the will, and I am delighted that the Government has the will to do something about this problem. The Governor's Speech states:

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

The State Planning Authority will continue with the preparation of development plans for towns and regions throughout the State and my Government proposes to introduce legislation to amend the Planning and Development Act.

The Foreshore and Beaches Committee has made recommendations concerning the establishment of a Beach Protection Authority with adequate staff and finance. A new Department of Environment and Conservation will be created and a Director of Environment will be appointed who will be responsible to the Minister for Conservation.

My Government will consider introducing appropriate legislation during this session to give effect to these policies.

I congratulate the Government on creating the extra Ministerial portfolio of Conservation, and I congratulate the Hon. G. R. Broomhill on the energy and ability that he has already displayed in this position. An important part of the Minister's responsibility is to ensure that not only is our natural environment preserved but also the architectural and cultural heritage created by man in earlier generations.

Australia, as a relatively young country, is sadly lacking in historic buildings. It is almost incredible how little of the worthwhile still stands in Hobart for example. In this connection I trust that success will attend the efforts being made now, at first by a small devoted group and currently by a widening group of civic leaders, to preserve the A.N.Z. Bank building. I know that the Minister and the Government have been concerned for some time to assist in this matter within a Budget that is under constant pressure in regard to expenditure on such services as health and education and on conservation measures. I believe that within a few years this building will be a viable proposition and a worthwhile investment; artistically, it is undoubtedly a worthwhile investment.

One form of pollution which is most insidious and which is now only being recognized as such is noise. For example, we have seen noise-induced hearing loss recognized as a compensable disability in the recently passed Workmen's Compensation Act. One group of people, many of whom live in my district, has long been aware of the evils of noise, especially when it has been associated with excessive vibration and airborne filth. I refer to those unfortunate people who live in the flight path of aircraft landing and taking off at the Adelaide Airport. For years they have had to endure ear-shattering noise and house-shattering vibrations, and they are now gravely concerned that their suffering will be intensified.

Recent actions by the Department of Civil Aviation and widespread rumours have led to the belief that the Commonwealth Government intends to extend the north-east/south-west runway. As a result, widespread opposition to the proposal has arisen, culminating in a recent meeting at the Thebarton Town Hall, attended by 600 or 700 people. At that meeting, certain motions were carried, including one moved by me, congratulating the Leader of the Commonwealth Opposition (Mr. Gough Whitlam) on his emphasis on forward planning, and calling on the Commonwealth Opposition to combat any move to extend the airport. Another motion was moved by the member for Hanson calling on the State Government not to acquire some of the land held by the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust so that it might in turn be transferred to or acquired by the Commonwealth Government. A subsequent question I asked in this House indicated that, even without any such decision by the State Government, the Commonwealth Government could still acquire the land in question.

The Deputy Premier's subsequent reply indicated that this area is not land that the Commonwealth Government may acquire pursuant to the provisions of the Commonwealth Land Acquisition Act, 1955-66. However, by an appropriate amendment to that Act or by the passing of a special Act to apply to the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust, the Commonwealth Government could acquire that land for a purpose in respect of which the Commonwealth Parliament has powers under section 51 (xxxi) of the Commonwealth Constitution. Therefore, the Commonwealth Government could, in fact, acquire the land in question, thereby severely harming that valuable public asset and also forcing the State to acquire houses for demolition in order to re-route an important road.

The member for Hanson, earlier in this debate, maintained that South Australian Executive Council has the only say concerning the land, but I hope he will now inform his constituents of the correct position. Even if the Commonwealth Government could not amend the existing Act, it would still be able to acquire private houses at the other end of the runway, so that there is no real legal bar to the Commonwealth Government's extending the airport, and the residents' fears are well founded. Several powerful forces are operating to extend the runway and, even worse, to lift the existing curfew on the use of jets.

At a seminar at the University of Adelaide on May 5 last, the Regional Director of the Department of Civil Aviation (Mr. Barclay) revealed that an increase in passenger traffic to 2.8 times the present level was expected by 1980. However, he said that because of the increased aircraft size the number of landings would be considerably less—something less than 100 per cent, if I remember correctly. Obviously, there is a plan to provide for aircraft like the Boeing 747 jumbo jets.

We were consoled by the thought that these larger aircraft were responsible for only one perceived noise decibel more than the 123 decibels currently generated by the existing Douglas D.C.9's or Boeing 727's and that that was not a big price to pay for an aircraft twice the size of these. Of course, the existing level is already intolerably high. In any case, the expected increase in the frequency of flights will lift that noise to an even more intolerable level and will cause interference to the lives of men, women and children living in the vicinity.

While the airport remains in its present position, there will be an ever-present danger

that the curfew will be lifted. There are excellent economic arguments for the 24-hour use of expensive aircraft such as the Boeing 747 or even the Boeing 727. However, there is something basically stupid about maintaining an airport the efficient operation of which is prevented except by taking the intolerable step of ruining the amenity of the neighbourhood for scores of thousands of citizens. Add the ultimate need for an international airport, and there is only one obvious conclusion. I have long been of the opinion that the only satisfactory solution to the growing noise pollution problem at the airport and to the economic disadvantages of the curfew is the resiting of the airport well outside the built-up area. This view was strengthened when I heard papers presented at the recent seminar to which I have already referred.

During question time I asked Mr. Barclay, the Regional Director of the Department of Civil Aviation, what would be the cost of resiting the airport. He replied that it would cost about \$55,000,000, plus about \$3,000,000 for each mile of freeway (he is also hooked on the freeway bug) and the cost to the airlines of moving their facilities. He also said that the sale of land would bring in about \$17,000,000. However, I find it hard to believe that figure, because 2,000 acres of what would be prime building land (and it would be such, as there would be no airport noise) within four miles of the G.P.O. would at current values be worth \$25,000 to \$30,000 an acre for high-rise development or, indeed, industrial development. This means that the area would be worth \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 altogether. Therefore, the net cost to the Commonwealth Government for a new modern airport would be negligible. Also, the more efficient use of aircraft would soon return the outlay of the airlines, the State would acquire a new urban area remarkably free of transportation problems, and the residents over a wide area would be able to rest in peace.

I am not qualified to draw up guidelines for the design of such an area. However, I believe the present airport site has several advantages for use for this completely new purpose that are worthy of consideration. For example, we have a fairly good set of access roads, both north-south and east-west, including Airport Road, some of which are already quite wide or are being widened (for example, Henley Beach Road). Secondly, the easy provision of a first-class rapid transit system using existing railway land on the old North Terrace to

Glenelg railway route (the old train line) would be possible. This facility could involve new techniques in transportation referred to by Dr. Bruening. The extensive paved areas could be used for parking or for roads. Substantial open areas exist to the north, south and west, the latter providing good recreation facilities within easy reach. The existing industrial zone bordering the eastern side of the airport could be readily extended westwards. Finally, we would have a valuable airport terminal building.

I would not expect that the whole site would be used for high-rise development; however, that would be an excellent use for part of the site. It would be an excellent way of reducing the growth of flats which has plagued many municipalities, particularly the West Torrens council. Some councils have experienced great trouble as a result of belated efforts to incorporate necessary high-rise development in established residential areas.

We have heard much about industrial development from Opposition members. In referring to the Government's policy of promoting industrial development in this State, His Excellency said:

Agencies of the Government have been appointed in Tokyo, Singapore, Hong Kong and Djakarta, as well as a roving trade officer in each of the Northern European and South-East Asian zones. A programme of promotion of export of South Australian products is being undertaken in these areas. A full-time Director of Industrial Development will shortly take up duty as head of the Industrial Development Branch of the Premier's Department.

I suggest that the appointment of a full-time Director contrasts with the previous Government's reliance on a part-time head of that most important department. The Speech also referred to an increase in expenditure on industrial premises by the South Australian Housing Trust from \$940,000 in the last year of Liberal Administration (and I mean the last!) to more than \$1,600,000 in the financial year just ended. In the first six months of 1971 alone, the Industries Development Committee approved \$3,665,000 worth of buildings compared to \$3,531,500 for the six years from 1964 to 1969. Government guarantees, advances and grants approved under the Industries Development Act in the first half of this year totalled more than \$3,500,000—more than the total for the seven years from 1964 to 1970, which total was \$3,320,900.

It is no wonder that the Opposition's puny attempt to criticize the Government on industrial development failed so miserably last week.

And those figures are not the only sign of the Government's vigorous promotion of private industry. The Industries Development Act Amendment Bill, which was passed a few months ago, provides for further assistance by the advance or grant of Government funds to industries that have potential but are unable to obtain finance through normal channels. I only hope that excessive subordination to established private enterprise does not unduly inhibit the activities of the Industries Assistance Corporation. Perhaps the greatest service that Opposition members could give to this State would be to stop knocking its industrial potential. The Opposition's persistent attempts to make political capital out of the Premier's overseas visits, which are undertaken to promote the State's prosperity, and the Opposition's resort to scare tactics, based on incomplete statistics and motivated by political prejudice, do little credit to the Liberal Party and even less good to the State.

Mr. Hopgood: Didn't the Opposition urge the Premier to go overseas?

Mr. SIMMONS: It has been pointed out already today that whatever he does is bound to be criticized by the Opposition. I think that is a poor show, when we consider that the Premier runs himself into the ground trying to promote sales of South Australian products in overseas markets, especially in Asia, where we must look for markets in view of the likely entry of Britain into the Common Market. I think members opposite would do well to applaud the Premier for his efforts and to congratulate the Government on having such a vigorous salesman. This is still a relatively low-cost State. Its relatively few natural resources are being well exploited to offset the transport disability it has as a result of our position, while the skilled work force is only too willing to make its contribution to the advancement of the State, provided it gets a fair go from employers.

Honourable members will recall persistent attempts by the member for Mitcham last year to refuse to conform to the small change in procedure for asking questions in this House. Now that even he has agreed to accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, the procedure seems to be working smoothly and well. Perhaps that experience has caused the member for Mitcham to recast his beliefs and to call for other reforms in the procedures of this House. With that I do not necessarily disagree, but I do object to his attempt to create a red herring to divert attention from the basic cause of disrespect for Parliament. Most members of the public do not know what goes

on in this Chamber, so it is nonsense to say that the widespread disrespect for Parliament, which I believe exists, is occasioned by procedures in this House. I think the real reason was succinctly put by the *Central Times*, referred to by the member for Stuart. People demonstrate because they despair of honourable conduct by the Government in Canberra. Their consciences are affronted by the slaughter in Vietnam, and they are determined to demonstrate, to stand up and be counted and to show their dissent from it.

About four or five years ago, when I was in the United States, I met many liberals in universities. These were true liberals, not Liberal miscreants who have misappropriated the title and misused its meaning. These people even then were bitterly opposed to the Vietnam war and were sufficiently far-sighted and patriotic to deplore its effect on the fabric of American society. They recognized the inevitable diversion of funds from such worthwhile projects as Operation Head Start, a scheme designed to give a head start to children from socially and culturally depressed areas. They recognized that the President's commitment to such projects was unlikely to withstand the financial drain involved in the mass murder, maiming, mutilation, rape, arson, plunder and pillage in which their country was engaged in Vietnam. How much more disgusted would they have been had they known then that their President, the leader of the most developed and powerful nation on earth, had systematically deceived them by deliberately concocting incidents to involve their country further in the war while publicly proclaiming his intention to opt out.

At that time, these liberals in America were sadly disappointed that Australia was supporting their President in his folly. This was at a time when the Liberal lackeys in Canberra were saying, "All the way with L.B.J.", and of course they were supported by their lickspittle followers in South Australia. We still see this blind subservience to an overseas master. I am not sure what is their slogan now; perhaps it is "Silly Billy's for tricky Dicky". It is a pity that our Liberal leaders in Canberra are unable to see that they are only bringing about the needless weakening of our powerful friend. Even a boxer's second has enough intelligence to take his man out of a fight which he cannot win and which can only do him harm. It was like a breath of fresh air recently to hear the proclamation of an independent, soundly-based, sensible foreign

policy for Australia. The pity of it is that we shall have to wait until the end of next year to see it put into effect.

If I may return briefly to the matter of disrespect for Parliament, may I endorse the member for Stuart's criticism of the media? I believe in a free press, but a press that considers itself free to distort, invent and mislead is an enemy both of itself and of democracy. It is easy to give examples, but the classic one was Onlooker's column in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* which, for those who knew anything about the matter it covered, was unadulterated tripe. The uneducated guesswork of the member for Hanson looks like the essence of informed comment by comparison. Tomorrow, a welcome addition to our press will appear—the new *Herald*, a monthly journal published by the Australian Labor Party and edited by men of principle who are concerned with humanity, truth and justice. I wish the *Herald* well.

Housing is dealt with in the Governor's Speech. I agree that much has been done in the last year, but much more still needs to be done. There is an ever-increasing need for housing for people on lower incomes which the trust, under present conditions, is obviously unable to meet. In order to borrow money at current rates of interest (for which no-one can be blamed but the Commonwealth Government) to buy land at the current scandalous high prices, the Housing Trust will have to charge about \$17 a week to obtain an economic rent. This is far above the means of many people in our society who lack decent houses. I suppose there is hardly a problem with which members, at least those in Labor areas, are more concerned than housing. Something will have to be done urgently. The State's resources are limited. The only solution is to subsidize low rental housing. The halving of the interest rate, for example, would bring the price of houses down to a level at which even pensioners could enjoy them. The only solution is for the Commonwealth Government to make special provision for housing for low-income people, in the same way as it is belatedly getting into the field of housing for the aged.

His Excellency's Speech gives the people of South Australia many reasons for congratulating themselves on the choice made in May of last year. It points to a year of progress, expansion, and initiative in a wide range of activities, several of which I have dealt with in detail earlier. The Government's work

during the past year is reflected in a record legislative session. Some 120 Bills were considered by this House, of which 110 became Acts of Parliament, 100 of those originating in this House. This reflects the industry and efficiency of the members of Cabinet, half of whom were holding Ministerial office for the first time. Bearing in mind also the problems associated with getting legislation through a hostile Upper House, the Government has reason to be proud of its legislative achievements in its first year of office. The achievement of the first session is mirrored by the promise of the second. A wide range of legislation and activity is foreshadowed in His Excellency's Speech.

This will include, apart from matters raised earlier, promotion of the tourist industry, promotion of exports from South Australia, construction of the new Government Printing Office, amendment of the Planning and Development Act, ratification of a satisfactory agreement to link Adelaide with the standard gauge railway system, commencement of conversion to the metric system of measurement, strengthening of the Packages Act, reorganization and revitalizing of the State's welfare services, introduction of a new industrial Bill, linking of the Police Pension Fund benefits and Superannuation Fund benefits to the cost of living, revision of the Building Societies Act and the Friendly Societies Act, the introduction of further consumer protection legislation, amendment of the Companies Act to give greater protection to the investing public, provision for the continuation of the Prices Act, the introduction of new legislation dealing with the valuation of land, provision for better administration within the Public Service, amendments to the Electoral Act to provide for democracy in the Legislative Council, the abolition of capital and corporal punishment, protection of the right of privacy of citizens, and so on. With a legislative programme of this order, it is hard to comprehend how such a basically sensible member as the member for Torrens can complain that Parliamentary Paper No. 1 is a glossy-covered document with an attractive appearance but no real content. What does the honourable member want? I guarantee that, by the end of this year, given a fair go in the Upper House, this State will be proud of what has been placed on its Statute Book.

I conclude by saying a few words about education. Last year, at a similar time, I

pointed out that there was a crisis in education, a crisis of which, apparently, members of the Opposition were not aware. However, I gave chapter and verse to try to convince them that this was so, and I pointed out at that time that the crisis would still be with us in the future. Indeed, this is so. I pointed out then that the reason for the crisis was the long-continued delay and refusal by the Commonwealth Government to accept its proper responsibility in this most important process of education. It is quite obvious that it would not be possible to overcome these deficiencies in any short time. In the meantime, unfortunately, the Commonwealth Government has still refused to carry out its national obligation in this field, despite the publication of a report, prepared at the direction of Liberal Education Ministers, that shows a frightening gap between the resources available to the States and the amount of money they will need to spend in the next five years.

Although this crisis still exists (and I am sure the Minister will agree because he has frankly admitted the existence of the crisis), nevertheless I think both the Minister and the Government are to be congratulated for doing what they can by redoubling their efforts to ensure that the children of this State receive a proper education. The Minister and the Government have not relied on the fact that the Commonwealth Government has failed to play its part. Expenditure on school buildings last year was a record. The amount spent was, I think, \$17,900,000. This compares with about \$13,800,000, I think, spent in the last year of the Liberal Administration. At the same time, current education expenditure has increased by 20 per cent to another all-time high and this, I may say, compares with an increase in the reimbursement from the Commonwealth Government of about 17 per cent. It is quite obvious that the Minister and the Government have done more than their share, in the absence of effective help from the Commonwealth Government, to bridge this gap.

During the year many worthwhile improvements were introduced. Amendments to the Education Act in November last year provided many improvements in the conditions of teachers, and these, I hope, with the recent teachers' award, will stem the loss of teachers that has been so catastrophic to the education system. The same amending Act provides for the setting up of two advisory curriculum boards, on which there are representatives not only of teachers from the Education

Department but of teachers from independent schools, as well as representatives from parent bodies and from industry. I believe that this is a long overdue reform and one that will be of betterment to education.

Other amendments were made to the Act. One of them provided for the incorporation of school councils and committees and for these incorporated bodies to be able to borrow money to erect major capital items, such as school halls, swimming pools and the like. This is an action that school parent bodies had been told for years was impossible, but it has now been placed on our Statute Book: I think it is a major improvement. At the same time as I welcome this opportunity to add to the capital items in schools, I also welcome the announcement by the Minister yesterday that he is to discontinue the subsidy system for current expenditure in schools.

I drew attention to the evils of this system in my maiden speech last year. It definitely operates against children in poorer areas. Under the old subsidy system a Government subsidy was forthcoming if the money was raised by parent bodies within the schools, with the result that children living in affluent areas could raise much money and obtain the Government subsidy, whereas children living in poorer areas, where the fund-raising activities were more difficult, suffered in two ways: first, they enjoyed fewer privileges provided by the parents and, secondly, they enjoyed fewer provided by the Government. I believe that the new system will be worth while.

Other action has been taken by the Minister to improve the condition of education, and some are referred to at length in the Governor's Speech. I have taken a keen interest in education for many years, and I welcome the opportunity of being a member of a Government that is systematically and energetically setting about the task of instituting improvements that are overdue in the education system. As does the Minister, I recognize that there is a long way to go. As I pointed out last year, the third-rate system (at the best) that we had, could not be better than second-rate without massive injections of Commonwealth funds. In the meantime this Government, within its capabilities, is trying to provide that second-rate system, and we are bringing pressure wherever possible on the Commonwealth Government to take action, which alone can give a first-class system and which is appropriate to one of the richest countries on this earth. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I join other members in expressing sympathy to the families of deceased former members of this Parliament. I never had the pleasure of meeting the late Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore, and I met the late Hon. John Cowan only once. However, I met the late Hon. Colin Rowe and the late Mr. S. J. Lawn on becoming a member of Parliament about three years ago, and I still have pleasant memories of the association that we had in this Parliament.

The commencement of this session brings to a close the first years of members' representation of their new districts. For those members who gained large new areas in their districts the task has not been easy. In my case, I gained a large new area in my district and have found the task of becoming acquainted with that area difficult indeed. However, I am now acquainted with the new areas and consider that I know just what and who makes those areas function. I have been graciously accepted by people in those new areas, and I am looking forward to a happy association with them. I congratulate the new member for Adelaide on his election to this House, and I hope that his efforts in this place will benefit his district.

The member for Adelaide, in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply, referred to the part that minerals were playing in South Australia at present, and I think everyone in this House agrees with him on that subject, because mining is having the effect of cushioning the current rural recession being experienced. The honourable member referred to the commencement of mining operations at Kanmantoo, Mount Gunson and the Burra, but he did not point out that these three mining operations became viable during the term of the last Liberal and Country League Government. I believe that some preliminary discussions concerning the Mount Gunson project had taken place in the term of the former Labor Government, but both the Burra and Kanmantoo projects became a viable industry during the period of the last L.C.L. Government, when the Hon. R. C. DeGaris was Minister of Mines. From 1965 to 1968, which was the term of the previous Labor Government, there was a definite down-turn regarding mineral exploration in South Australia, and if anyone doubts that statement he will find that it is correct if he examines the records. However, between 1968 and 1970 there was the most rapid expansion in this area so far this century, and it was in this period that the operations at the Burra and Kanmantoo became viable.

I recall the time when I first visited the Burra with the Minister of Mines, the Director of Mines, and the directors of Samin Limited. Until that time, Mines Exploration had the leases at the Burra and Kanmantoo, but it then decided to vacate its operation at the Burra and to concentrate on Kanmantoo only. Samin Limited then came into the picture and took over the lease at the Burra, commencing negotiations for a mining operation there. I recall on the visit to which I have referred that the Chairman of Directors of Samin Limited asked me what were the prospects of available labour at Burra to work this mine, and I replied that I considered sufficient labour would be available, because at that time land prices in the district were high, and I said I thought there might be farmers' sons who, rather than pay extremely high prices for land, would possibly prefer to work the mines.

There has always been a small available labour force at Burra, and I assured the Chairman of Directors that I thought there would be no difficulty in obtaining labour there. My prediction proved correct, but in a different way: when operations were due to start at the Burra, the rural recession had begun and, instead of farmers' sons going into the mine on account of high land values, they chose to go into the mine to seek additional work in order to supplement their farm incomes.

The member for Adelaide said that for the first time many farmers and their sons had been asked to join trade unions and that they had done so and were now enjoying the benefits resulting therefrom. The honourable member was correct in saying that farmers and their sons were joining trade unions. However, they considered it necessary to join the union because they feared industrial strife in the mines if they did not do so. They were so anxious to obtain this type of employment to supplement their farm income that they were happy to join the union.

When it was first suggested that operations at Burra would be commenced, the local people envisaged an increase in the town's population. A person remarked recently, however, that there had been no significant increase in Burra's population, and, unfortunately, that is so. On the other hand, had not the mining operations commenced there, the population of Burra would have declined, as has the population of many other country centres. However, it has remained static. This proves that the mining operations in the district have been of terrific benefit to the people there.

His Excellency mentioned the importance of the tourist industry to South Australia, and most members have spoken on this subject. The member for Hanson touched on it and gave a good explanation of what is needed in the metropolitan area to boost the tourist industry. It is my experience with tourism that there must be a balance of both country and city attractions, and we must concentrate our efforts in both these areas if we are to attract tourists to South Australia. Practically the entire area of the Flinders Ranges, which has an excellent tourist potential, is in my district. When speaking on this topic yesterday, the member for Unley referred to Wilpena Pound in the Flinders Ranges. Although he probably had the best of intentions I must take him to task on a statement he made in relation thereto. He was probably sidetracked by an interjection and possibly did not finish the statement he was making. He said:

With other members, I have been lucky enough to visit the Flinders Ranges, a wonderful tourist attraction. I have always found that most people visiting that area are from New South Wales and Victoria, as I have seen few South Australian number plates on cars in that area.

I take the member to task on that statement, which is incorrect. Although the situation to which he referred may have obtained during his stay there, it does not do so generally. There are usually many more South Australian cars in the area than there are cars from other States. However, the local residents would be pleased if what the honourable member said was correct. Much progress has been made on the roads in this area. For instance, most people who visit the area, particularly in caravans, will be pleased to know that the Hawker-Wilpena road is at present being sealed, and part of it has already been completed. Also, the Wilmington-Quorn road, a strip of about 20 miles of which is at present unsealed, is to be sealed this year, and another road running north from Yunta, which runs through Teetalsa, Waukarina, Curnamona, Martins Well, Wirralpa and Arkaroola stations has been considerably upgraded. I believe that this road is to cater for travellers from the Eastern States coming through Broken Hill. These people will be able to use this road to travel up to the Flinders Ranges to Arkaroola and then across and down through Wilpena. I hope that we will have more cars in the area from other States than we have at present. About \$750,000 will be spent on the Birdsville Track, which has been consider-

ably upgraded. It is now a pleasure to drive on the first 100 miles of the track.

In seconding the motion, the member for Florey spoke on the problems of rural industries. I was not in the Chamber on the afternoon he spoke but that evening I was told that he had solved the problems of those industries. That was excellent news. Hundreds of submissions have been made to me on this matter, but no-one else has claimed that he could completely solve those problems. The solution came in reply to one of the rare interjections from the member for Rocky River, which was as follows:

Have you ever tried to run a business?

The member for Florey replied that he had not, and he then said:

I shall tell the honourable member later in my speech how to conduct his business, as a farmer. ... If the honourable member listens, he will learn how to put his business on a proper basis. I am earnest in saying this, and I shall give concrete proof that this can be done by taking my advice.

I felt excited: here we were to have solutions to rural problems. I thought to myself that the honourable member's speech would be well worth reading. Later in his speech he said:

This Government is aware of the sad plight of primary producers in South Australia, and His Excellency's Speech stated that legislation would be introduced early to bring a relief valuation to primary-producing land because of the decline in values of such properties.

I point out to the honourable member that it was partly as a result of the pressure put on the Government from this side of the House in regard to the quinquennial assessment and partly as a result of pressure from the United Farmers and Graziers and from farmers that the Government decided to provide for a new assessment. Officers of the Valuation Department who addressed packed meetings in the country became convinced that their valuations for the quinquennial assessment, although perhaps about correct for 1970, were far in excess of present values. The member for Florey, in referring to farmers, said:

They are recognizing the value of affiliation to the A.L.P. and are joining the ranks of the A.L.P. in droves. They are flocking to the A.L.P. banner.

In many districts (not only in Burra and Kanmantoo) farmers are being forced to take outside employment. They realize that, in doing so, it is necessary for them to join a union. In doing that, they have to pay a political levy. So, they become members of

the Australian Labor Party. At present farmers are cancelling their weekly papers to make ends meet. So, I cannot imagine that they would enjoy joining a union at \$15 a year. The honourable member continued:

To indicate the way in which the bloodsuckers have latched on to the primary producers in this State, I will cite some statistics; my authority is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which states:

Farm costs over the past 10 years have escalated alarmingly by the following factors:

- (1) Insurance on farms has increased by 37 per cent.

So, apparently the insurance companies are bloodsuckers. The honourable member continued:

- (2) Farm rents have increased by 23 per cent.
- (3) Rates and taxes have increased by 57 per cent.

To my knowledge, the biggest land holder in South Australia is the Government. The Government collects the largest amount of rent from farms. So, apparently the Government is the bloodsucker. Most Opposition members have had much experience in local government, so they know that rates come from councils. Therefore, councils are also bloodsuckers. I could probably give 23 instances of increased costs to rural industries. However, we do not want to know the reasons for increased costs: we want to know how to cope with them.

Another avenue of increased costs is that of machinery repairs and spare parts. I wish to deal with the price of implement shares used in agriculture. I did an exercise on this matter last September, and since then steel prices have increased so that, in all probability, the price of implement shares has also increased. I have taken four types of shares for illustration. First, there are the L.P. steel plough shares, which are made from $\frac{1}{4}$ in. specialized steel and could be purchased in September of last year at a retail price of \$152 a ton. After allowing for a wastage of 10 per cent (which is an educated guess), the sale price of the shares is \$730 a ton. Secondly, there are Cultivator Lucerne Points of the bolt-on type which are made from tin. specialized steel and which sell for the retail price of \$147 a ton. Allowing for 10 per cent wastage, the sale price is \$944 a ton. Thirdly, there are Combine shares of the bolt-on type, which are made of tin. specialized steel. The cost of steel is \$162 a ton. In this case, I have allowed for 15 per cent wastage because of the unusual shape of the shares, so that the sale price is \$807 a ton.

Fourthly, there are Cultivator shares of the bolt-on type, which are made from $\frac{1}{4}$ in. specialized steel. The cost of steel is \$154 a ton and, allowing for 10 per cent wastage, the sale price is \$530 a ton. I do not condemn the agricultural machinery firms for these prices, as their costs will have increased to the same extent as those of other firms. I have given these examples to illustrate how the rural industry is presently suffering from increased costs.

The Governor's Speech refers to the appointment of a Minister for Conservation, and I congratulate the Minister on his appointment. The *Advertiser* of June 9, 1971, contains a report stating that the Minister had announced that legislation would be introduced to protect the wedge-tailed eagle over the whole of South Australia; at present it is protected in only the southern part of the State. This announcement has caused much concern in the North, especially in the pastoral areas. When I recently visited the North, I asked pastoralists what were their views about protecting the wedge-tailed eagle, and the overwhelming majority of them suggested that this eagle was a far greater menace to the pastoral industry than was the fox. They said that foxes eat a few lambs, usually taking the weakest. However, the wedge-tailed eagle takes a lamb for breakfast, eating only the choice parts and leaving the rest for crows and other birds to eat. It takes another lamb for dinner and a third for tea. These pastoralists claim this eagle is the biggest predator in the North.

It is recognized that these eagles breed farther north in the cattle country, and they are no worry to the cattle industry. They breed in large numbers and migrate southwards. The people of the North generally agree that there is no fear of the wedge-tailed eagle becoming extinct. They cannot understand why there is a move to protect that bird at present. Not only the eagle but all types of hawk in that family have no natural enemies; they live on the smaller birds and most of the fauna we are trying to protect. So I cannot see the wisdom of trying to protect that bird.

The animal that should be protected is the common hare. It is not because of open coursing that the hare is in danger of becoming extinct, but there are places where it may not be legally protected. In the North of the State it is becoming scarce. The wedge-tailed eagle, the fox, the domestic cat, the dog and even the motor car are enemies of the hare. In that area 20 years ago it was possible to organize

a 16-dog course with hares on a property at Andrews, but three years ago there was only one hare on that property. If the Minister took up this matter and protected the hare in preference to protecting the wedge-tailed eagle, it would be of more benefit to the State. The Minister should tackle this problem from the source of the trouble—the indiscriminate use of firearms.

I have spoken on this in the House before but I am sure the matter could well be aired again. There is no need for people living in built-up areas even to own firearms, for there would be no use for them there. A person needs a permit before he can shoot. He cannot shoot on the roads; he has to travel to the country to shoot on private property, and he should obtain the landholder's permission before doing that. The usual practice is that a person goes to the country to shoot. There was a day when a rabbit could be shot anywhere, but today such game is very scarce. After a while, when there was nothing left to shoot, people turned to the birds, and then finished up shooting at signposts. If the Minister introduced a Bill to limit the use of firearms, that would be better than protecting our birds.

Recently, I went to the Far North up the Birdsville Track where the Cooper Creek crosses it. Right alongside the track, at the Kopperamanna Bore, there is an artesian bore about 10 miles away from Etudunna station. A main has been laid to the station, the pressure from that artesian bore being controlled. That main supplies the homestead with water. To do this, it was necessary to have a pressure gauge fixed to the bore to give the required pressure. This keeps a supply of fresh water on hand but, because the bore is close to the track, everyone bearing a firearm usually takes a shot at the pressure gauge.

In England I believe no-one is allowed to have a firearm unless he is a property owner, and even then he cannot use it on private property without permission. He has to have a licence for it, and then a further licence enabling him to shoot game. The landholder in England protects his game the same as the Australian landholder protects his sheep. At present, in England it is not necessary to own firearms because there is no use for them anyway.

His Excellency has said that the Government is conscious of the problems affecting the rural sector of the community and that it will continue to take steps to find solutions to these problems. The real problem that affects both the Government and the farmer at present relates to freight rates on wheat.

My colleague the member for Rocky River has touched on this subject lightly but I consider that I must dwell on the matter at length, because recently I have had many approaches on it.

Members will recall that, since the sharp increase in freights in 1966, a considerable quantity of grain has been carted to the terminals by road, and I may say that the freight increase in 1966 added about 3c a bushel in our district. The district that has one of the greatest problems in this regard is Andrews, on the Clare-Spalding line. I will deal with other districts later but I consider this to be a good example. This centre is 109 miles from Port Adelaide and the grain freight rate is 13.721c a bushel. It is 50 miles by road from Port Pirie. People are carting their grain to Port Pirie because of the short distance. This line terminates at Spalding, which is 25 miles north of Clare. Andrews is the only station north of Clare with bulk handling facilities, having storage for 240,000 bushels. The passenger service on this line was discontinued about 14 years ago and the people now have a bus service between Jamestown and Riverton, which service is running very well indeed and more than paying its way.

Members will recall that 1968-69 was the year of the record grain harvest and during that year about 400,000 bushels was stored at the centre, but that was stored at the centre only because the neighbouring silos were full and all other terminals in the area were full; the farmers had no alternative but to deliver to the centre. However, since then deliveries have fallen off considerably. It is estimated that deliveries in the forthcoming harvest will be one-quarter of the available storage, and this estimate was given me by two or three persons who are well acquainted with the industry.

The farmers are being forced to do this. With the advent of wheat quotas their income is limited and they must make every cent count, so they are carting their wheat to the terminal to save these few cents a bushel. It would cost farmers in the district of Booborowie, which is about nine miles east of Andrews, about 2c a bushel to deliver their wheat to the silo and then another 13.7c to the terminal, so it would cost them about 16c a bushel for their wheat to reach Port Adelaide. At present they are having their wheat picked up for 11c a bushel or, alternatively, they are carting it themselves and saving the

full 16c a bushel. There is serious danger that, unless something is done to alleviate this situation, this line will close.

Having studied the reports of the South Australian Railways Commissioner for the years 1968-69 and 1969-70, I have found that they contain some interesting figures relating to this line. In the year 1968-69, the total freight revenue from all goods carted on this line was \$26,856. The haulage of grain accounted for \$18,398, leaving a total freight from all other goods with the exception of grain of \$8,458. In 1969-70, the total freight revenue in respect of goods carted in and out on this line amounted to \$62,319. Receipts from the haulage of grain amounted to \$55,531. This was a result of the large 1968 harvest, which was carried over until the next year. The total freight revenue from all other goods was \$6,788. The 1970-71 figures are not yet available but they would be very similar to the 1968-69 figures. If the haulage of grain on this line is lost, the revenue from all other freights would only pay the wages of three permanent way men. The unfortunate part about the whole situation is that this line has recently been re-laid with new sleepers, and it has been re-ballasted. The work was done by permanent way hands from the surrounding districts on Sundays at penalty rates, but it took five years to complete the job.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which line is this?

Mr. ALLEN: The Spalding to Clare line. I should be sorry to see this line closed. I was present when it was constructed in 1919 and when it was opened, and I have seen as many as three trains in the railway yard at the same time. I have lived for 50 years about 200 yards from the station, and one could say that I have seen this line from go to possibly whoa. I have been told that, in future, the goods service on this line will be reduced to one train a week. If only about \$6,000 worth of goods are carried each year; that is understandable. Unless the Government and farmers can get together and work out some way of diverting the grain to the local silos, I see no hope for this line.

Spalding is a small country town, and like other country towns at present it is suffering from the effects of the rural recession. If the line were closed, five families would leave the district, and this would be a blow to the town. I do not favour control on road transport; I consider that we must have competition to keep prices down. If controls of road transport were allowed but no road transport was

available, possibly rail freights would increase almost immediately. In the same area there are other receiving centres that have similar problems as those affecting Andrews, namely, Farrell Flat, Burra, and Hallett, on the Burra line, and the freight rates to these towns are based on Port Adelaide. At present, Hallett, situated 120 miles from Adelaide and 60 miles from Port Pirie, has identical problems to those at Andrews. Burra and Farrell Flat have the same problems, but not to the same extent as Andrews and Hallett. Further north Quorn and Orreroo are in the same situation.

The member for Rocky River referred to the position at Quorn, but Orreroo has much the same problem. I understand that last year in Quorn 3,000 bushels was delivered to the local silo, but the rest of the crop was moved by road to Port Adelaide. The ironical part is that by rail the freight is 16.599c a bushel, whereas the road freight is about 8c a bushel. We can understand the position in which farmers are placed. Recently, the service on this line has also been reduced to one goods train a week. Members may ask what the answer is to these problems: the member for Florey would suggest that all farmers should join the A.L.P., but that is not the answer. I understand that the Railways Department has suggested a policy relating to wool freights in South Australia, which have been reduced considerably. On the Broken Hill line a considerable increase in patronage has resulted from this move.

In the Clare district, the previous freight on wool was \$1.34 a bale, but a contract has been entered into with the local carrier, who will collect the wool within a radius of 12 miles of Clare, bring it to the railway and load it, and it is then delivered to Port Adelaide for 80c a bale. That is for a minimum of 28 bales. Assuming the road cartage is 18c a bale, this leaves 62c a bale for the railways; at 320 lb. a bale there are seven bales to the ton. This would return \$4.34 a ton, which is a 50 per cent reduction on the freight rates, whereas the freight on wheat from this centre is \$4.36 a ton, which is almost identical with the present price charged for the cartage of wool. From the figures obtained from the 1969-70 annual report, I point out that 960 tons, or about 6,720 bales, of wool was railed from Clare, as against 3,262 bales in 1968-69 and 3,283 bales in 1967-68. Since the reduction has been made in respect of wool, the quantity transported from the centre has more than doubled. As 185 bales of wool can be loaded on an O-class railway truck, seven bales

a ton at \$4.34 a ton would return \$115 a truck. As the same truck loaded with wheat would return \$172, there is much more profit in the haulage of wheat than of wool.

As trains are running on this line nearly empty, there would be no problem in implementing a scheme similar to that concerning wool. I suggest that, regarding the stations to which I have referred, there be a reduction in freight so that the railways can compete with road transport. If this can be done on the Clare line in respect of wool with excellent results, why cannot it be done on the same basis in respect of wheat? I have been told that, because of the increase in freights since last year, bigger tonnages will be moved by road transport. I have obtained this information from reliable people in various districts. The present opinion is that more wheat will be carried to terminals by road transport this year than was carried last year.

I attended the opening of the United Farmers and Graziers conference at Wayville last week, at which the General Secretary, in his report, said:

The United Farmers and Graziers have requested the Commonwealth to adopt a realistic and positive economic rural policy; that basic costs, such as freight rates, fuel and even district council and shire rates, be directly subsidized by the Commonwealth Government in the national interest. It is interesting to note, for example, in respect to rail freights that in Canada grain can be carted almost 1,000 miles for a cost of 4c a bushel, as compared with 20c a bushel for 150-200 miles in Australia.

That may be the solution to the problem. I appeal to the Government to consider my suggestion. It could be tried at perhaps one or two centres for a 12-month period just to see whether the growers co-operated, and I am sure they would co-operate.

I am continually being asked by growers in the area what has happened in respect of grain freight rates. They are conscious of the fact that they should be patronizing the local silo, but at present through sheer necessity they are carrying their grain direct to the terminal silos. My suggestion represents the only way in which we can prevent our spur lines in South Australia from closing. I do not know whether this has been done before, but I suggest that a Select Committee be formed to inquire into this great problem. If the line in question closes and road transport takes over the haulage in the districts concerned, I suggest to the member for Rocky River, who is a director of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, that he take steps to have these silos painted white, because they will become white elephants, anyway. Further, I would suggest that plaque be placed on these silos commemorating the fact that the line and the silos became redundant because of the present Government's inactivity. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 29, at 2 p.m.